# HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

## OFFICIAL REPORT

SECOND SESSION—THIRTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT

39 Elizabeth II

**VOLUME XII, 1990**

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-SECOND DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1990
TO THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF DECEMBER, 1990

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Thursday, November 22, 1990**

The House met at 11 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

STRIKING—PRESENTATION OF FIFTY-FIFTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the Fifty-Fifth Report of the Striking Committee, in both official languages. This report concerns the membership of legislative committees and, pursuant to Standing Order 113(1), shall be deemed adopted upon presentation.

BILL C-82—PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

**Mr. Gilbert Parent (Welland—St. Catharines—Thorold):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the report of the legislative committee on Bill C-82, an Act to amend an Act to provide for the appointment of a Port Warden for the Harbour of Quebec and an Act to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the office of Port Warden for the Harbour of Montreal, and to validate certain fees and charges established pursuant thereto, without amendments.

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENT—FIFTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Hon. David MacDonald (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Environment.

I should report to members of the House that I believe the difficulties which have existed have been overcome and that we anticipate the minister appearing before the committee at four o'clock next Tuesday afternoon.

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

* * *

### PETITIONS

VIA RAIL

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, indeed it is a pleasure to have the opportunity to present a petition on behalf of a number of residents of Kamloops who are well known environmentalists.

The petitioners point out the fact that the most environmentally friendly way of travel is by passenger rail. They as the government to reconsider the decision to curtail a number of VIA Rail routes and to invest in this environmentally friendly way of transportation.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** On an unrelated matter, Mr. Speaker, it is my honour, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present a petition again on behalf of a number of British Columbians who oppose the government's goods and services tax.

The petitioners point out that a recent referendum in the city of Vancouver found that 85 per cent of those participating in the referendum oppose the goods and services tax and are asking the government to listen to Canadians, respond to the wishes of Canadians, heed the concerns of the small business community, in particular, and back off the GST.

• (1110)

[*Translation*]

PARLIAMENT HILL

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to table a petition in which residents of Val d'Or and Barraute, in the Abitibi area, call upon the Government of Canada to scrap the so-called Hill project that would spend $68 million on building an underground parking garage and shopping mall under the Parliament Buildings, and ask the gov-

ernment to recognize the need to preserve the site and historic character of the Parliament Buildings and Parliament Hill in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, your petitioners also ask that members of Parliament continue to park outside in the spaces behind the Parliament Buildings, like factory workers do in this country, and they maintain that the Government of Canada has more important priorities than building an underground shopping mall on Parliament Hill.

[*English*]

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Gilbert Parent (Welland—St. Catharines—Thorold):** Mr. Speaker, I join with many colleagues on this side of the House to condemn the putting in place of the goods and services tax.

I have the pleasure to present a petition signed by Canadians from across Ontario and, more specifically, from my riding of Welland—St. Catharines—Thorold.

This ignoble bill is possibly going to be read into effect before the end of this year, but we as Canadians will be paying the price for it for many years to come. Once again we ask the government to reconsider and to kill this bill.

NORTHERN TAX BENEFITS

**Mr. Ray Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of rising in the House to present a petition on behalf of residents of Tahsis, British Columbia.

Virtually every resident of Tahsis has signed this petition, urging the government to reinstate the northern and isolated area tax benefits. Tahsis is a single industry community which is in desperate economic shape.

If the government were to provide the northern and isolated area tax benefits, it would be of immeasurable help.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, I have the obligation or the duty this morning to table five petitions dealing with the government's intention of imposing a tax on all goods and services purchased by Canadians.

The people who have signed this petition claim that the government has increased the existing federal manufacturers' sales tax from 9 per cent to 13.5 per cent over the last six years, that it will now impose a 7 per cent tax on all goods and services which will be hidden, that the imposition of this goods and services tax will cause serious and unfair hardship to low and middle income Canadians, and that the imposition of this tax will create an onerous burden on small business.

I could go on, but I will just say that these people ask Parliament, plead with Parliament, pray that we do not proceed with this very bad tax.

The British had its poll tax, and we know what happened to Madam Thatcher. This government has its GST tax, and we know what is happening to this government.

NORTHERN TAX BENEFITS

**Mr. Réginald Bélair (Cochrane—Superior):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition in which the undersigned residents of my riding of Cochrane—Superior, more specifically citizens from the town of Manitouwadge, respectively requesting the federal government to reject the task force report on tax benefits for northern and isolated areas.

If the report were adopted by this government, it would be another blow to the residents of Cochrane—Superior. The loss of $5 million in revenue to northerners would seriously impair the efforts of the people to improve the quality of life in their remote areas.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, like my colleague, the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier, I have the honour and the privilege to submit seven petitions today pursuant to Standing Order 36, wherein the petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to withdraw the goods and services tax.

In their petition they make specific reference to the goods and services tax which is planned to be implemented with regard to books, particularly those petitioners in the province of Ontario as well as those elsewhere across this country.

Like the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier, I remind members of the House that Britain had the poll tax and we know what happened to Madam Thatcher. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that if this GST goes through the same will occur in Canada as occurred in Britain.

LOW-LEVEL FLIGHTS

**Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River):** Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to present two petitions under Standing Order 36.

The first one is signed by a large number of Canadians from many different parts of the country, including British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, New Brunswick, and Ontario. The petitioners join many other Canadians who have signed petitions calling for an end to low-level flight training in Canada. They support the Innu of Labrador and the Assembly of First Nations in that request. These people also ask Canada to redirect its NATO-NORAD funding toward enabling Canada's aboriginal population to regain control of their lands and livelihood and to promote sustainable development for all Canadians.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River):** Mr. Speaker, this petition which I have the honour to present was signed by virtually every resident of the community of Pine House in my constituency in northern Saskatchewan.

These petitioners, as well as millions of other Canadians, are calling on the government to reconsider its goods and services tax. They point out that this burden will fall heaviest on those who can least afford to pay, particularly those in northern areas of our country.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to submit petitions from the people of Saskatchewan who take exception to the fact that the GST will be applied to reading material.

They state, and correctly so, that books, magazines, and newspapers are free from tax in this country. Now the government is going to be subjecting these materials to the GST. Reading material has always been a foundation of the democratic process.

The petitioners move to reaffirm historic principles embodied in the tax free status of the printed word by retaining the zero rate of the GST legislation and regulations as they apply to books, magazines and newspapers.

GASOLINE ADDITIVES

**Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present petitions containing some 300 names, the first of literally thousands. Residents in southwestern Ontario are demanding that the government ban the use of methylcyclopentadienyl manganese tricarbonyl, a gasoline additive; the manganese part of which is an insidious neuro-toxic substance which attacks the brain cells, particularly in young children whose immune systems are not fully developed.

We ask the government to move immediately to ban this substance and replace it with environmentally friendly ethanol as an octane enhancer in the gasoline of Canada.

[*Translation*]

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour and privilege to present a number of petitions. These petitions are signed by members of my family, relatives and some of my friends and neighbours from the village of Sarsfield, in Ontario, where I live. They are all unanimous in their opposition to the GST proposed by the Conservative government. They ask that the GST be withdrawn before the government loses its Prime Minister because of a tax measure, like what happened in England.

[*English*]

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of tabling a petition in the House signed by numerous residents of the riding of Glengarry—Prescott—Russell who, like those put forward by my honourable and distinguished colleague, are opposed to the goods and services tax.

These people recite that the tax will hit them not only with higher taxes but with higher inflation, higher interest rates, and higher unemployment. They and all other Canadians have more than enough of that already without the additional impositions that the goods and services tax will make on them. They call upon Parliament to reject the goods and services tax.

**Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise, pursuant to Standing Order 36, and present petitions in the House of Commons. About 300 petitioners, over 200 of them from my city of Nepean and

the city of Ottawa, the rest being from Oxbow, Shaunavon, and Silton all in Saskatchewan. They are protesting the imposition of the goods and services tax on books and reading.

This is the first time in Canada that this has ever been done. These petitioners call upon Parliament to reaffirm the historic principles embodied in the free status for the printed word by retaining the zero rate in the GST legislation and regulations.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Barry Moore (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)):** Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

* * *

• (1120 )

[*English*]

## PRIVILEGE

### STANDING COMMITTEE ON ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

**Mr. Raymond Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** On November 19 Your Honour commented on the House order to the aboriginal affairs committee on the Oka matter.

The committee meeting last night would indicate that the committee, for whatever reason, is incapacitated and unable to deal expeditiously with the House order.

I wonder if Your Honour might ask the members of each party sitting on that committee to meet informally with the Speaker to explain how they intend to go about carrying out the wishes of this House.

I wonder if Your Honour might also review the minutes of that meeting to determine whether the expertise of your office and yourself might be of assistance in launching this very important inquiry, that really cost Canadian taxpayers $60 million and tied up one third of the Canadian army.

The matter is important for every member of this House. I know that Your Honour at this point might want to be appraised of the situation in a formal way and offer whatever service that might assist the committee to carry out the wishes of the House.

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** Mr. Speaker, I had a brief note passed to me earlier this morning about the events of yesterday. I understand there are a series of motions that have been prepared by different members of the committee.

I also understand that there was a tendency on the part of the opposition yesterday, which perhaps could be characterized as a filibuster, so that they were only able to deal with one of the motions that was available to them.

There are some other motions that might settle the situation if members would talk a little less and get on with the job of voting. I think then we might very satisfactorily come to a resolution and get on with the inquiry. The opposition has to bear some of the responsibility for their decision to deal with their motions only, and not be willing to deal with motions presented by other members.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, a number of days ago I had the opportunity of talking about this issue privately with the Speaker for a few brief moments after the issue was raised in the House of Commons.

Might I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the proposition brought forward by our colleague this morning is an important one. Although committees generally operate with their own mandate, it is not true of a special committee. A special committee operates quite otherwise and it can only operate on the premise that it is a creature of the House, and not that it has its own mandate under section 108 because it does not apply to those special committees.

Therefore, I think it is incumbent on the House to ensure that its directions are followed. Of course you, Sir, are the servant of this House and one on whom we count in order to ensure that those things happen.

I refer to Beauchesne's citation 621, as well as Standing Order 116 of this House to back up the claim that I am making. Perhaps the best way to ensure that the House order is followed would be for Mr. Speaker to have an informal meeting, which was mentioned by our colleague from the New Democratic Party. In this way we will not delay the House unduly this morning, or any

other time for that matter and get the committee to do what the House has ordered because the committee does not have the choice to do anything otherwise. That is quite clear in both Beauchesne's citation 621 and the Standing Orders of our House.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, I am slightly confused by that presentation. At page 16 of last Wednesday's *Hansard* you will find a list of special committees. It does not include any committee dealing with Oka or any issue of native affairs.

We are dealing with a standing committee of the House, which has all of the powers that apply to standing committees according to our Standing Orders, plus a reference to that committee from the House.

It is a bit premature to conclude that anything about that standing committee as being different to any other committee. Any of the standing committees of the House can be charged by the House with a specific responsibility at any time. It is my understanding that they are taking the responsibility which was handed them—relating to the Oka situation—very seriously indeed. They are trying to develop an approach and a pattern that will be truly productive in terms of providing the House with good, solid advice for the future. That is what they are after.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, we are anxious to get on with the business of the House.

I would like to emphasize what my hon. colleague raised earlier. No one is impugning motives. It is an important committee. The work is extremely important. There is $60 plus million of taxpayers' money and about one-third of the Canadian army involved in one way or another. It is a major issue to consider. It would appear for whatever set of reasons that the committee's work is not functioning as it ought.

Mr. Speaker, you mentioned, in your comments of November 19, on page 15393 of *Hansard*, that "I", meaning yourself, "of course assume, having said that, that the committee is working". The point being made this morning is that it would appear that the committee has ground to a halt and is unable to proceed. I do not think this is a major problem. I think it needs to have further discussion. We are asking, Mr. Speaker, if you could not facilitate that discussion to ensure that it takes place.

SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Speaker:** The Chair has been very patient in hearing the submissions. We know what the general procedural law is, and the strictures against the Speaker interfering where the Speaker ought not to be.

From what I hear there is disagreement in the committee as to a motion or certain motions that have been proposed. I also hear from the government side, as the hon. member for Calgary West has asserted, that the committee is dealing with the matter. It is not closed. The committee has not walked away from the House order of reference.

The better thing to do at the moment would be to continue the discussions within the committee and perhaps that will resolve the matter.

It is fair to say that the issue, which I think is accepted on all parts of the House, is an important issue. Members on both sides, I think, are in agreement that it is. It is also an issue which has been placed with the committee as a consequence of a consent order of this House. There does not seem to be any argument about the importance of this issue. There seems to be still some disagreement as to how to deal with it. I would hope that those disagreements could be worked out as soon as possible.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief.

I would like to remind the House that Standing Order 621, subsection (2) says very clearly:

> A committee is bound by, and is not at liberty to depart from, the Order of Reference.

This issue has been referred to that committee. The debates in committee as to whether or not the committee should follow the order of reference of the House is out of order. That debate itself should not, and cannot, take place in that committee and it is. That is the contention this morning, the fact that the committee is debating whether or not it should follow what we, as a House, have ordered. It does not and cannot have that mandate, according to our rules. That is the other point I wanted to make.

I refer to Beauchesne's 621, the fifth edition, in order to remind the House and the Speaker of that particular rule.

**Mr. Hawkes:** I think perhaps the deputy House leader on the other side misspoke himself slightly. There is no rule 621. In the latter part, he said it was a citation from Beauchesne's. In fact, we have only 159 rules, which some days seems like quite a lot, and others may be not quite enough.

The committee is trying to move through a series of motions to set their agenda and set the work pattern to meet the terms of reference of the House of Commons.

There was a motion yesterday which was defeated. There are other motions on the table that need to be discussed and then decided upon. Then they will be able to get on with their work. That is all we are dealing with.

• (1130 )

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has brought a matter to the Chair and to the Chamber. It is clear that there is some disagreement in the committee, but I have to accept the assertion of the hon. member for Calgary West that the committee is trying to deal with that matter. I think as long as that is going on, that is where the discussion here today should end.

I am mindful of the citations which the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell has raised and the comments of the hon. member for Calgary West, but I am looking primarily at the comments raised by our colleague from British Columbia, the hon. member for North Island—Powell River. What he has in effect said—although it came as a point of privilege, it is more probably a point of order—is that he is asking the Chair if there is some way the Chair could help to facilitate the ongoing work of the committee. I think that is the very calm and reasoned way that the hon. member put the matter to the House.

It just might be that, because we have had this discussion, it might in itself help facilitate the working of the committee. The hon. member for Calgary West, who is the Whip for the government, seems to be of the view that the matter can be resolved. I think that at least for today that is where we should leave it.

I hope the hon. members can make the committee work, because, as I said before, it is seized of an order from this House, which was a consent order, and there was complete agreement in it. As both sides of the House have clearly indicated, it is a matter of very great concern to the House and to the country.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### BILL C-80

REFERENCE OF SUBJECT MATTER TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada)** moved:

That a Special Committee of the House of Commons be appointed to study the subject matter of Bill C-80, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Customs Tariff in consequence thereof;

That the said Special Committee shall have all the powers of a Standing Committee pursuant to Standing Order 108(1); and

That the said Special Committee be composed of eight members, to be recommended by the Striking Committee.

**Mr. Waddell:** I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker, and it is this. There is a motion by the government to refer Bill C-80, the proposed gun control legislation, to a committee for pre-study. There is also on the *Order Paper* Bill C-80 itself, as a government bill, for second reading, which is approval in principle.

On behalf of my party, I say to the minister we are prepared to put up one speaker on Bill C-80. We will deal with the real thing, the bill. I cannot speak for the Liberal Party, but I noticed before that the Liberal Party was prepared to proceed with the matter. We could proceed with the government bill, refer it to committee, and then any amendments or any witnesses can be heard in the committee.

I know the minister has committed herself. She said right after the massacre at the École Polytechnique in Montreal last December 6 that she was committed to improving gun control legislation in the country. The government did bring down a bill, which is this Bill C-80. I want to say to the minister on behalf of my party that we are prepared to deal with the bill. We can deal with it

today and we can get it into committee so we can study the real bill in committee.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Madam Speaker, there is total confusion in the government in regard to this very important and serious matter.

Members will recall that we have Bill C-80 which deals with the gun control legislation. We also have Motion No. 13 which dates back to June 20, 1990. I guess the government was getting cold feet at that time and wanted to refer the whole thing to a committee during the summer. It never proceeded with that motion, of course.

Now we have another motion tabled 48 hours ago which calls for a standing committee, or a committee with standing committee powers, composed of eight members. So, we have three items: a bill and two motions.

The *Projected Order of Business* today called for the bill to be called at 11 o'clock. That is second reading and reference to a legislative committee of Bill C-80, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Customs Tariff in consequence thereof. We find now the government has changed its view and is going to call the motion.

We do not order Business of the House. The government does that. What we are trying to find out is exactly what is in the government's mind here. If it wants to debate a motion that sends the subject matter of gun control to a committee, because it cannot handle it, because its legislation is faulty, or because it cannot take the heat on the issue, then I think the House must know. If the government proceeds with the motion, then we will all know that what it is trying to do is pawn off the issue to a standing committee of the House.

However, it cannot call Motion No. 13 any more, Madam Speaker, if it calls this Motion No. 23 today. I hope it will give us an undertaking that it will not call the principle of this whole issue, that is Bill C-80. If it did that, we would have a committee looking at the subject matter and we would have the House of Commons looking at the principle of the bill.

I have a difficult situation here to resolve, Madam Speaker. If the government gives me the undertaking that it will not call the bill, then fine, it can proceed with the motion. However, if it is going to give the committee to be struck the object of the bill, that is the whole subject matter, to study if Motion No. 23 is adopted, then it cannot, in my view, have it both ways. It must give us an undertaking that its bill is dead. Therefore, it will not be called back to the House and it will be withdrawn.

**Mr. MacLellan:** Madam Speaker, I would just like to follow up on what my friend from Port Moody—Coquitlam and the member for Ottawa—Vanier have said.

This is a very peculiar situation. As the member for Ottawa-Vanier said, the government brought forward a motion on June 20 to have a pre-study on this question of gun control. Then on June 26 it brought forward Bill C-80, the bill to deal with this question of gun control. It has been sitting without action until the present time.

Yesterday, the government brought forward a second motion where it wants to refer the matter to a special committee. The *Order Paper* this morning stated that we were going to be dealing with second reading of Bill C-80. Now, we are back to Motion No. 23.

The government wants to kill its own legislation. It wants to refer it to a special committee which will not be able to finish studying the bill, and have it printed and translated until well into the new year. It is not going to be able to bring forward the legislation before the government's own intention to prorogue the House.

This is absolutely unprecedented. It is absolutely unnecessary. It is incredible that the government would make such a botch of its own procedure and destroy what is basically a fair bill. It is perhaps not perfect, but it is a bill that can be amended at second reading and in committee, and one which the House wants to get on with.

As the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam has said, we are prepared to give swift passage on second reading to get the bill to committee, so we can hear the views of all concerned, instead of delaying it and, as the government wants to do, killing it.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Madam Speaker, I have been a party to some of the discussions that have gone on in a second-hand way in terms of the justice committee and in a direct way in terms of House leaders' meetings.

I think it is wise for the House to recall the reality that cabinet moved very swiftly in the spring to present the House with a bill prior to the summer recess so that there could be input for all members of Parliament of all parties in all parts of the country as to whether or not the proposition was going to get the job done.

That, Madam Speaker, was accompanied by a motion to refer the subject matter of the bill, in a pre-study sense, to the justice committee so that that committee could have the resources, in terms of research and help from the House of Commons, to conduct in a more formal way that examination during the summer. That would have passed in a moment with the concurrence of all members of the House or even with the three parties. It was not forthcoming.

• (1140)

**An hon. member:** Don't let the facts get in your way. You never did before.

**Mr. Hawkes:** The government would have preferred to have that committee up and running during the summer, but there was no way to get concurrence.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** If I may, it would be useful to the Chair if hon. members would allow the Chair what is being said on the floor. That courtesy was given to my left, and I think it should be given to my right.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

There was a suggestion made at a steering committee of the justice committee, with representatives from all parties present, close to two weeks ago that the justice committee set up a subcommittee for the purpose of studying the subject matter of this bill so it could get on with the job of calling witnesses and making public presentation from knowledgeable people about what is right and what is wrong with this bill.

The opposition indicated that it felt that the workload of the justice committee was such—

**An hon. member:** That is not true.

**Mr. Hawkes:** —that it could not handle this assignment in this particular timeframe. Therefore, the government has created a new motion, Motion No. 23, which will set up a special committee of the House.

We will be able to identify eight members of the House who will make it a priority to get on with the business in a formal way of receiving public input from knowledgeable Canadians about what is right and what is wrong with this bill. We hope we can then get on with the process quickly—if we could come to a concurrence in this House—with a piece of legislation that will get the job done the way that Canadians want the job done.

All that is happening is that we keep getting blocked by the opposition.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Every time we try to create action on this situation to get on with the protection of Canadian society, we get blocked by the opposition.

We could put it to a test this moment. I make an offer to the members on the other side that we simply accept, without debate or amendment, Motion No. 23 right this instant which sets up the special committee and we will get on with the job. We would then be in a position, if the opposition wanted, to debate for the balance of the day second reading on Bill C-80. Let us pass the motion without debate or amendment so that the action is in place and then get on with the issue of debate in terms of the bill.

There is a proposition that accomplishes what I believe Canadians want to accomplish. It is on the table, and all it takes is unanimous consent of this Chamber to adopt this motion right now. I would ask you, Madam Speaker, to ask for that unanimous consent.

**Mr. Allmand:** I rise on the same point of order, Madam Speaker. What total incompetence and disorganization.

First, we look at the *Order Paper* for today, Thursday, November 22, and the order listed is Bill C-80. When we arrive at the House, we then find we are asked to debate Motion No. 23, which is to refer the subject matter of Bill C-80 to a special committee.

Now, the House leader of the government is asking us to approve Motion No. 23 without debate, but he says we can debate Bill C-80 at second reading after that is done. I might ask, for what purpose, if we have already referred the subject matter to a special committee without debate. Does this mean that we are going to proceed with

the debate on second reading of Bill C-80 and then have a vote?

The reason the government is not proceeding with the second reading of Bill C-80 is that it has now lost the political will to proceed with that bill. It knows it cannot even win a vote from its own caucus on the bill.

The minister went to the École Polytechnique in April where she received 25 boxes of petitions containing 500 names. She promised legislation before the end of May. We never got the bill until the end of June. Now, they are so confused over there, they do not know what the hell they are doing. They are incompetent and disorganized.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** We are now discussing the possibility of putting this motion to the House. I would not want us to get into debating the subject matter, talking about petitions being or not being written on the subject.

On the same point of order, the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam.

**Mr. Waddell:** Madam Speaker, I raised the point of order and the government's acting House leader got up and made an offer.

I see the Minister of Justice sitting there, silent. I just say that I offered on behalf of the New Democratic Party that we would put the bill through today, in principle. That is second reading of the bill.

We have heard from the Liberal critic who offered the same thing. So we have a case of the opposition offering to put forward the gun control bill, and we have the government apparently filibustering its own bill.

The minister is sitting there, quiet and gutless. She has, in fact, lost control of her own bill to the gun control lobby. That is very tragic.

I see the member for Calgary West. I say to the government again that we are prepared to offer that we deal with second reading in principle of the bill, rather than this motion. The bill can go to committee and it can be studied in committee.

I think that is a pretty good offer. This will be the first time I have ever seen a government turn down an offer to pass its own legislation. Could we please hear the reply from the member, preferably from the Minister of Justice.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan:** Madam Speaker, I refer to what the deputy House leader has said about what is right and what is wrong. What is right is proceeding with second reading of Bill C-80. What is wrong is the way this government is managing its legislation.

I would like to correct the member who was not at the meeting of the Standing Committee of Justice and Solicitor General. He was not there. He misquoted a meeting he did not even attend.

The chairman proposed a pre-study Bill C-80. I would ask the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam to speak for himself, but as far as I was concerned there was not going to be any pre-study. There was not going to be anything but second reading on Bill C-80. If the government was to withdraw Bill C-80, then it would have to take responsibility for that. But under no circumstances was anything going to proceed except second reading of Bill C-80 as far as this party was concerned.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Madam Speaker, if I may be helpful in this debate. I think that the message we want to convey to Canadians is that this is a most important issue with which this House wants to deal.

The government has already put, and the Clerk has already read the Order of the Day, for today. It is Motion No. 23. I would recommend to the government that it withdraw that motion at this time, give us notice that it will withdraw the motion and go to second reading of that bill. We will then co-operate with the government, but we need to have some direction from this government as to what it wants to do in terms of procedure. They propose: We will dispose. We cannot dispose of something when it is so flim-flam and so confused.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Madam Speaker, I do not understand the difficulty in terms of clarity. We are very clear. By calling Motion No. 23, we are setting up a special committee of the House with the powers of a standing committee, the investigatory powers, the budgetary underpinning and everything else to thoroughly investigate the issue of gun control.

What the opposition is asking for is the House to pass at second reading Bill C-80, which would restrict the legislative committee. The legislative committee does not have the mandate to look into the entire situation. It is bound by the principles inherent in Bill C-80 itself.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Are they good?

**Mr. Hawkes:** Those principles may be right or they may be wrong. Certainly members from all three parties are on both sides of that issue. Some believe the principles are correct. Some believe the principles are flawed.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Put it to a vote.

**Mr. Hawkes:** The only way, Madam Speaker, for this House to be satisfied about a good, solid recommendation for the future for gun control of this country is to have a committee with the powers of a standing committee, rather than a legislative committee so that the entire situation can be assessed.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I think I have heard all that is needed to be heard at this time.

**Mr. Waddell:** A point of order, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member on a point of order. Is it on the same point of order? I think we have heard all sides on this one. The government has called for Motion No. 23. The government has the right to do so. The only thing that the Chair can do right now is put the motion to the House and let us debate it.

**Mr. Waddell:** Madam Speaker, it is a further point of order.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** On a further point of order. The hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam.

• (1150 )

**Mr. Waddell:** Madam Speaker, I understand what you are saying, but I want further clarification to end the point. The hon. member for Calgary West is now saying that the government wants to propose the motion to send the subject matter of gun control to the committee so there will be a broader look at the whole subject matter, rather than just the narrow look that he claims is contained in Bill C–80. This is the first time the hon. member has said this, so that is his position now.

My question then, and further to this point of order, is what then will happen to Bill C–80?

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member may want to answer, but my feeling is that the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam is really now debating the motion which I am about to put to the House.

**Mr. MacLellan:** Madam Speaker, what I find completely unacceptable is that the hon. member for Calgary West stood up and said that this bill had to go to a special committee and not a legislative committee. Under the rules of the House, when a bill passes second reading, it goes to a legislative committee. The hon. member is saying that a legislative committee is not suitable to deal with the government's own legislation which the government has brought before the House.

What the hon. member is doing is condemning his own proposed legislation, yet leaving the proposed legislation on the Order Paper. It is a complete mish–mash. This government is a disgrace. This government does not know what it is doing; it is against its own legislation.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** If we are to be into debate, I will recognize the minister. On a point of order, the hon. member for Kamloops.

**Mr. Riis:** Madam Speaker, I am sorry to interrupt my hon. friend leading off the debate on this motion. I wonder if I could put a question, through you, to the Minister of Justice. Since we are going to start on this rather creative course to deal with a very important matter, normally the government's first speaker would receive an immunity in terms of questions and comments. I want to ask my good friend, the Minister of Justice, whether she would agree to at least a 10–minute question and comment period at the end of her presentation.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Madam Speaker, let us proceed with the normal course of events, unless we have unanimity in the Chamber to accept this motion. You have not asked whether there is unanimous consent to simply accept the motion and then move to second reading debate.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Madam Speaker, may I plead with the minister to give us an occasion to ask her a few questions in this House. We have had a bill, before committee, pertaining to young offenders on which she has refused to appear to answer questions of members of Parliament. We are just asking her now: will she please answer questions dealing with this important proposed legislation on this very important subject matter? Ten minutes is not much.

**Mr. Crosby:** Madam Speaker, as I understand it, to depart from the normal rules of procedure would require the unanimous consent of the House. What the member for Kamloops should have asked for was the unanimous consent of the House to have a question period following the minister's speech. Had he asked for unanimous consent, I would have denied it.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I guess that settles the argument.

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to finally enter the debate on this motion. I look forward to the appropriate procedural opportunities to discuss this with members of the House at the committee hearings. I think that is the appropriate occasion to do that. What I want to do is to put on the record a number of propositions and discuss to some degree what it is I would like the committee to deal with.

I have been wanting to get this legislation into a committee since before we rose for the summer because, as members of this House and I think of the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce and others who have served in this House for a very long time will know, this is probably one of the most contentious subject matters with which Parliament will ever deal. My colleagues, who go back to 1978 when the previous package of gun control legislation came before this House, have told me that it was, without question, the most contentious issue that the House ever dealt with and in terms of their own ridings whether people were for or against the legislation. It roused an enormous amount of public controversy and interest.

That is why, on our side of the House, there is not a disposition to have a very quick second reading debate because on all sides of the issue on this side of the House members want to—

**Mr. Waddell:** Oh, oh.

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** I wonder if the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam could even consider in his wildest dreams offering the same kind of courtesy that he is regularly granted from me in the course of debate in this House. I am minister and he is my critic and I think we have a responsibility to try and debate the issues in this House—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I would like to call the House to order. I am sure the hon. member for Port Moody-Coquitlam will eventually talk on this motion and he will want to be given the courtesy of speaking quietly. He will please allow the minister to do the same. The hon. Minister of Justice.

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is really interesting that what the hon. member calls shameless, or shameful and gutless, is in fact the essence of democracy because when we have issues in this society that are highly divisive, it is important to ensure that we move forward with support of the public and, more important, with the understanding of the public.

I have spent a lot of time since the tabling of Bill C-80 and even before talking to people in Canada who are concerned about the question of gun control, and listening to them. What we need is a process that will move this legislation ahead. I have been wanting to get into a committee, a public process, since before the bill was tabled, and certainly since the bill was tabled.

**Mr. Waddell:** You offered us a bill.

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member talks about offering a bill. The point is that the members on this side of the House regard this as one of the most important issues they will deal with and they want to have a full second reading debate. They all want to get their views on the principle of this bill on the record. It is not, in their view, a subject of legislation that should have a perfunctory nod of the head, go through a committee process, and come back for third reading when it is too late to discuss the philosophy of the bill. Third reading debate is generally a slow debate.

It is because of my respect for their concerns and my concern to move the legislation ahead and get it into a timely public process that this motion has come forward.

**Mr. Waddell:** You are killing the bill.

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** We are not killing the bill, Madam Speaker.

So, Madam Speaker, I want to have the opportunity today to explain what it is I would like the committee to address. I think it is, as I say, one of the most important issues we will deal with in the House during this session, an issue absolutely fundamental to the question of public safety in this country.

I have met, as I say, with people across this country on the issue, not just the students at Ecole Polytechnique who, as the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce pointed out, did present me with their petition of 500,000 signatures. I might say about the students at Ecole Polytechnique that in attempting to make some kind of sense out of the tragedy which they experienced, it was very deeply moving to be there. My first career was as a university professor. There is something about being in the company of these young people, young students, who are the future of our country. I guess at my stage in life, I am touched by their youth, seeing them trying to make some kind of sense out of the tragedy they experienced. I was struck by the very sensible, pragmatic, reasoned way in which they tackled a very otherwise emotional issue, the extent to which they, in fact, met with people in Canadian society who are interested in using firearms for sporting and hunting purposes and how their recommendations to me were very much influenced by a sense of fairness and a recognition that in Canada there are people who use firearms in responsible, law-abiding ways. That is why their brief to me and their meeting with me was so helpful. They really did attempt to look at the broad issue of policy.

• (1200)

It is important that Canadians have an opportunity to discuss this issue and to have input into a parliamentary committee that will come back and recommend.

I am very confident about Bill C-80. I think that the committee process will reconfirm what we are attempting to do with Bill C-80, in fact the package that I have put forward because the package is more than just Bill C-80.

I also think it is terribly important that where we have contentious issues there be an opportunity for public participation. In this issue as in no others, I think there are people who want to have the opportunity to speak. I have been frustrated at the lack of a public process.

We may in fact complete second reading before the House rises. I think it is unlikely that we would have the opportunity to bring it back for third reading and a final disposition, which is why I do not want to delay any longer. The last time this subject matter was before this House, interestingly enough it was brought forward by one of my predecessors as member for Vancouver Centre, who at that time was the Liberal Minister of Justice, Mr. Ron Basford.

**An hon. member:** He lost his seat over it.

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** The hon. member says: "He lost his seat over it". It is a contentious issue.

I think Bill C-80 is an excellent one but, for those who will remember, the last time it was before this House it took 70 days to deal with that legislation after a quite extensive public process.

I want to get this legislation through in the most timely way possible, and that is why I do not want to wait for a long second reading debate to get it out in a public process. If we complete second reading on this before the House rises, that is fine.

My colleagues have advised me that they want to participate in second reading debate, but they are uncomfortable with a perfunctory second reading debate. It is too important an issue. If there ever was an issue on which the members of this House want to discuss the philosophy of legislation, want to have their views on the bill recorded, it is this one, and they will do so.

I welcome the opportunity, in the course of debating this motion, to outline for members of the House some of the elements in the government's bill to amend the Criminal Code gun control provisions and why I think it is so important to have these before the public for discussion.

I believe that the measures contained in this bill will significantly enhance the existing gun control system in Canada.

It is a very important occasion for me, and I would like to take the opportunity to thank my colleagues in this House for their valuable suggestions and contributions to the development of this package.

I might say that contrary to the assertions of the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam, first of all, after the very tragic events at École Polytechnique last December I was not in fact the Minister of Justice, so I did not make the comments that he attributed to me. However, the development of this package long predates that. My predecessor as Minister of Justice, after those tragic events, pulled the package back for a further review because he recognized that in light of those

events it was perhaps important to make sure that the package was as responsive as possible.

When I was appointed Minister of Justice at the end of February, because this was to be my legislation I wanted to give it a thorough review as well and in fact made some changes to the package before it was brought forward. But the genesis of this package of legislative changes quite considerably predates the events at École Polytechnique. That is why, there having been a considerable amount of consultation and input by colleagues in this House, I am anxious to move forward in the most timely way.

The legislation has been improved by representations made by members of this House through the discussion that has surrounded private members' bills, by proposals of members, and by proposals made on behalf of constituents.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, notwithstanding the unfortunate and tragic incident at the Université de Montréal last December, and the recent events at Akwesasne, Kahnewake and Kahnesatake, all of the evidence suggests that the current legislation has been effective in reducing the number of deaths and injuries from firearms in Canada since it was enacted in 1978.

I believe, however, that there is still room for improvement. The measures I have introduced will effectively combine with the existing law and address the very real concerns of all Canadians about public safety and the place of firearms in our society. Canadians are very concerned about violence and the misuse of firearms.

I am convinced that the combined effect of the enforcement of the existing law, the amendments I am proposing, and non-legislative measures such as the implementation of firearms safety education programs, will significantly reduce firearms incidents and increase public confidence in the law.

I challenge Canada's firearms community to assist us in building public confidence that firearms have a legitimate place in Canada and that they will be owned and used safely.

I know that all members of this House share my belief that Canada's firearms community is prepared to support a balanced program to encourage the responsible ownership and use of firearms and to protect the safety of all Canadians.

Public safety is everyone's responsibility and we must all work together to preserve it.

[*English*]

Bill C-80 is part of a larger package of proposed changes to Canada's gun control system. It is because of that larger package that the context of a special committee is appropriate to look at it, rather than a committee that is confined to the terms of the actual legislative draft.

Many of the existing elements of the system are based on regulatory measures or Order in Council powers based on legislative authority. Others are based strictly on statutory provisions. Bill C-80 will continue this two-track approach.

It makes a number of changes to the Criminal Code itself, but many significant changes will be made by regulations or Orders in Council based on either the existing law or the proposed amendments.

I have received a great many representations from firearms owners who feel that regulations or Orders in Council are an attempt to circumvent the normal review of Parliament.

As hon. members of this House will understand, the purpose of regulations and Orders in Council is to enable Parliament to delegate authority in areas where frequent or urgent changes may have to be made in a time frame that will not permit normal parliamentary scrutiny.

The provisions allowing the Governor in Council to designate prohibited and restricted weapons by order, for example, enable the government to respond quickly and effectively to new devices that come on to the world market. Using this power, it is possible to prohibit importation and possession before large numbers have entered the country.

Many of the provisions that cause members of the firearms community the greatest concern are actually proposed regulations for Order in Council provisions. As I suggested, it would perhaps be out of the framework of discussion of Bill C-80 itself because they are not in the bill itself.

This is because the provisions that deal with the status of specific firearms must do so in a very detailed and specific manner. Such language is not well suited to statutory provisions.

I must emphasize that there is no hidden agenda. It is not our intention to enact overly restrictive measures, either by Order in Council or by amending the statute itself. Nor is it our intention to bring in the various supplementary measures without giving Canada's firearms owners a fair and reasonable opportunity to review them and make their views known. I would point out that it has been very much the policy of this government to make our regulatory process as fair as possible to give ample prior warning to members of the Canadian public to allow their input. In this way we have in many ways revolutionized that process since 1984.

It is also important that there not be a blithe assumption on the part of Parliament of the wisdom of always giving the Governor in Council a blank cheque. The concerns raised by firearms owners about the use of regulatory power are interesting ones and force us to reconsider some of our what I call legislative reflexes. It is always the instinct of legislative drafters to attempt to give to the executive the broadest possible discretion. But where there are issues and subjects of legislation that are contentious, it may in fact be more appropriate for Parliament to be as explicit as possible in legislation in order that those who are affected by these regulations are confident and feel comfortable with them.

That is one of the issues that I would like the committee to look at: the extent to which perhaps some of the things that I am proposing to do by regulation could perhaps be incorporated in legislation. What we must do is not be arrogant about the use of the regulatory power of Orders in Council and listen genuinely to people who are of the concern that perhaps orders will be made without taking into account their views.

There is a perception in part of the country, for example, that gun control is an issue that is an urban–rural split and the fear that regulations will be made by urban people. I am not sure that is true. In fact it is my observation that there is an enormous effort made to be sensitive.

If further review by Parliament would give some sense of security and confidence to people who are affected by these regulations, then I would not want to make a strenuous argument on behalf of the right of the Governor in Council to make these regulations if it was not necessary. I would like to have a system in place that people are confident of and feel comfortable about.

That is a very appropriate subject for the special committee that we seek to have created by this motion to deal with, to look at the balance of how we use the very extraordinary powers that we have as government. I really hope to get some sensitive and well thought out advice from the committee on that subject.

• (1210 )

For example, one of the most contentious proposals, the size limits for cartridge magazines, is not contained in the bill. It depends on the expansion of one of the existing Order in Council provisions made by the amendments. Once the necessary power is placed in the statute, Orders in Council must still be developed and evaluated before they are enacted.

The provision in Bill C–80 is the provision which would allow the Governor in Council to designate certain devices as prohibited weapons. The power already exists to designate weapons, in other words those that are self–contained. Devices would be those which are accessories or parts of a weapon, and high powered cartridge magazines are what we are looking at.

The proposal to prohibit or restrict specific types of military or paramilitary guns by Order in Council does not depend on the amendments at all. That statutory power is there now in the Criminal Code. The Governor in Council already has the power to enact such orders under existing legislation, provided that the firearms involved are not commonly used for hunting or sporting purposes in Canada.

I would like to reassure the legitimate gun owners of Canada that it is not our intention to use any of these powers to prohibit or confiscate large numbers of commonly used firearms. Every attempt will be made to keep the firearms community informed about proposed changes to the law and to obtain their views before changes take effect.

I might just mention with respect to my proposal concerning magazines and cartridges that we consulted broadly with the sporting and hunting community and were advised that our proposals for a limit of five for long guns and ten for handguns was appropriate.

I am now advised that there is another category of competition shooting where people use registered firearms. These are people who are working within the firearms system in Canada. They are known to the authorities. These are not people who are outside the law but who use firearms that have built-in magazines of perhaps 12 or 15 cartridge capacity. These are Brownings or Colt 45s, and there is a certain kind of competition shooting that uses that.

It is precisely to get the input of the firearms owning community into the proposals I put forward that I want this before the committee, a committee with the broadest possible mandate. Our desire is not to harass people who are doing perfectly lawful activities and, as I say, who have firearms.

Those who are registered and in the system have never traditionally been a problem in Canada, barring the concern we have that such firearms not be stolen. There are provisions in Bill C-80 to make more stringent requirements for storage and satisfying those storage capabilities for people who are private owners of restricted firearms as opposed to the gun sellers.

This is the kind of thing I would like to get input into. It has been a source of frustration for me that I have been doing consultation but I have not had a process in place, broadly based, and with the opportunity of advice from members of Parliament on how this should be done.

The measures contained in Bill C-80 itself will improve many aspects of Canada's gun control system. I believe they will reduce the accidental misuse of guns. They will help to keep firearms out of the hands of those who should not have them or who might use them for criminal purposes. They will encourage the responsible ownership and use of guns by all Canadians.

I believe that these measures, with strong support, will help alleviate the personal sense of fear and vulnerability that many people experience in today's society. One of the most poignant insights that was made in the brief to me by the students at *École polytechnique* was the notion that freedom from the stress of the presence of unregulated firearms or high powered firearms in society is a right of people. People have a right to live free of that kind of stress and pressure. That is why we have an obligation to put into place a system of firearms regulation that addresses that concern.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, one major focus of the legislation is a number of measures intended to place effective limits on certain types of high firepower or military-type firearms.

High firepower military type guns were a concern before the Montreal shootings and concern has greatly increased since then. They have been used repeatedly and in many countries to commit terrible acts of mass murder.

Just last week a man armed with a Chinese version of the AK-47 assault rifle shot 16 people in a small town in New Zealand, killing 13 of them. The standard magazine for such a rifle holds 30 shots.

Our police officers and soldiers were confronted with a veritable arsenal of these weapons during the disputes at Kahnawake and Kahnesatake this summer.

Many Canadians have shown sympathy for some of the Mohawks' claims, Mr. Speaker, but the use of violence or military weapons to achieve them is another matter.

I share the view of all Canadians that the use of such weapons for any such purpose is totally unacceptable.

[*English*]

Earlier this year the Federation of Canadian Municipalities unanimously endorsed a resolution calling for the prohibition of military and paramilitary weapons, and I have received some 100 municipal resolutions and petitions demanding the same thing.

I have also met with representatives of the students, as I said, at the University of Montreal to receive their petition which included the signatures of over half a million Canadians.

I was impressed by the presentation, and all of us should share the concerns that effective action must be taken against high firepower guns in Canada.

Since Canada prohibited fully automatic firearms in 1978, there has been an increase in the traffic of fully automatics which has been altered to semi-automatic mode. These guns are dangerous because they have

large ammunition capacities and military designs, and because they can be converted back to machine guns.

This bill will make fully automatic firearms that have been converted to semi-automatic prohibited weapons. They will also, I might add, make such conversion a criminal offence.

These firearms have been a source of growing concern, particularly over the last decade, and prohibiting them will put a stop to their importation into Canada.

The package includes a provision that would permit genuine gun collectors who already have these weapons to keep them, subject to strict limits on transfers. The RCMP will create a special registration category to track these guns and ensure that they are subject to effective controls.

The effect of these measures will be to place a ceiling on a number of these weapons and their owners in Canada. Eventually, as owners dispose of their guns, this number will be reduced and the guns will be taken out of circulation.

My colleague, the hon. Mr. Jelinek, who is responsible for Canada customs, has made it clear that these weapons will be stopped at the border, and he has already done so on the authority of several recent court cases involving the legal status of these guns.

[*Translation*]

I further intend to deal with other para-military or high firepower firearms, many of them semi-automatic, by developing criteria to distinguish between these guns and firearms commonly used for hunting or civilian sporting purposes in this country.

These distinctions would be developed to enable the government to declare specific types of firearms prohibited weapons or restricted weapons using Order in Council powers that are already contained in the Criminal Code. I believe that these standards will make it clear to everyone in Canada which types of firearms are acceptable in Canadian society and which are not. I believe that we can, and should, develop clear standards that will enable us to make this distinction.

A number of criteria have already been identified, and I hope to be in a position to begin preparing specific Orders in Council soon. I will also refer this matter and some proposed criteria to the new Canadian Advisory Council on Firearms for their consideration.

Dealing effectively with these firearms will give voice to the belief of Canadians that firearms which are exclusively designed for warfare have no socially acceptable purpose in this country.

[*English*]

The amendments will also permit the government to prohibit cartridge magazines that have unacceptably large capacities, if they can be used in semi-automatic firearms.

There are many semi-automatic firearms in Canada that have found legitimate use for both hunting and target shooting in the hands of responsible gun owners. It is the addition of a large capacity cartridge magazine to one of these guns that can transform it from a hunting rifle into an assault weapon, capable of the tragic mayhem seen in Montreal, Stockton California, Hungerford England, or just last week in New Zealand.

Clearly, some degree of restriction on this kind of firepower is called for, and the proposed size limits for cartridge magazines will allow the government to set up effective limits with a minimum of interference for those who have legitimate uses for the guns themselves.

A 30-shot magazine is not necessary for either hunting or target shooting.

At the time I introduced this bill, I proposed some specific limits for magazine capacities. As I have said, I had proposed limits of 10 shots for handgun magazines and five shots for centrefire semi-automatic rifles and shotguns.

Since that time, I have received a number of representations from members of the firearms community suggesting that there may be legitimate uses for a few types of magazines that exceed the limits I had proposed.

I am willing to listen to suggestions for change, and I am aware of the need for some degree of flexibility in preparing these restrictions.

Indeed, Madam Speaker, that is one reason for using Orders in Council to set the limits instead of the amendments themselves.

• (1220 )

I anticipate that the committee hearings into the bill will consider this matter in some detail and will receive input from those who have interest in the outcome. That is why I am very much looking forward to receiving the committee report.

[*Translation*]

The bill also contains measures that will make it possible to tighten the process for screening firearms owners.

[*English*]

Canadians who wish to obtain guns must first have a firearms acquisition certificate, or FAC. Several of the new measures will take concrete action to improve the screening of those who want to obtain these certificates.

The new stricter screening measures will require a minimum 28-day waiting period before the issuance of the FAC. It will require applicants to provide the names of two references who can furnish information to local firearms officers. It will require the new FAC document to include a photograph of the holder to prevent use by unauthorized persons.

I am also convinced of the need to encourage a high standard for the responsible ownership and safe use of firearms. Therefore, I intend, with provincial co-operation, to make it mandatory for all FAC applicants to pass a firearms safety course or test. These courses are already provided for in the Criminal Code, but were never proclaimed in force. They were part of a package of amendments introduced in 1978.

I am now prepared to take immediate initiative to remove the obstacles that prevented them from being implemented sooner.

[*Translation*]

The implementation of this measure will extend the scope of these programs to all parts of Canada and to all classes of firearms owners and users, and we are prepared to work with the provinces in launching them.

We are also prepared to contribute to the important development and start-up costs for this project.

[*English*]

We are also prepared to contribute to the important development and start-up costs for this project, as I said. We will be developing national standards and curricula for the programs that ensure knowledge of the law, the responsibilities of firearms ownership and safe practices for using and storing guns.

I also want to ensure that the new measures will be as close to self-financing as possible. The current FAC fee has been unchanged since the law was last amended in 1978, and falls far below the actual costs incurred by even the current screening process. The amendments will place the authority to set the future of FAC fees in regulatory provisions.

We do not believe that high costs should be used to deter legitimate gun owners, but we are committed to maintaining cost recovery in the future. This will permit further adjustments without amending the Criminal Code.

The new FAC fee will be set at $50 for a certificate that is valid for five years. This should bring the new programs close to complete cost recovery by the end of the initial five year period.

I believe that it is important to involve all interested Canadians in developing a more effective firearms control program. For this reason, I am establishing the Canadian Advisory Council on Firearms to draw together a broad range of expertise and interest in the field of firearms and gun control, and to represent the widest possible range of views.

I have been receiving nominations for this body throughout the summer and I expect to be able to announce a number of appointments in the very near future. This new advisory council will give Canadians with many perspectives on the role of firearms in society a real voice in the development of new gun control laws and policies.

The council will be asked to consider some of the most difficult issues raised by the screening of gun owners and the guns themselves. They will be asked, for example, to consider the role of medical or psychiatric information in the FAC screening process. We need to know whether it is possible to identify persons such as Marc Lépine beforehand. We also need to know what sort of information to look for.

There are also difficult questions of confidentiality and access to information that must be addressed. Is the safety of the public better protected by preserving the confidentiality of psychiatric treatment, or by ensuring that information is disclosed to the police.

The advisory council will also be asked, first of all, to consider the questions relating to the use of safety training programs for FAC applicants. What should be taught? Who should teach it? Should the same thing be taught to all applicants or should the subject matter reflect the use for which the person wants the gun?

Perhaps the most valuable role of the council, Madam Speaker, is that it will serve to bring Canadians with a wide range of views on firearms together into a single forum. This will ensure that issues are considered fairly and thoroughly, and that the interests of all Canadians are taken into account in the development of new policies.

I want to just emphasize again that the first mandate of the committee will be to bring to me a blueprint for the implementation of the training provisions that have been in the Criminal Code since 1978. I am sure that members of the previous government will recognize that it is a complex matter to implement these provisions and will require a considerable amount of federal–provincial co–operation.

I believe that bringing those training provisions into place will be a very important part of creating a climate of public trust. Those very many Canadians, who are uncomfortable with the presence of firearms in our society, will have the confidence of knowing that those who purchase firearms in Canada have satisfied a requirement of competence and training, and that they have been vetted much more carefully by those who issue the firearms purchasing authorization.

As I said, I would like the committee to look into even a more stringent form of vetting. We have discussed this before. I do not want to hold up the legislation pending a resolution to that issue because I think it is more complex and raises, as I have said before, some interesting privacy and charter considerations.

I have spoken to the House about changes to two of the three major elements of Canada's gun control system: the screening of those who own guns and restrictions on the guns themselves.

The third element is the use of offences and sentences to deter the criminal misuse of guns. I have heard the views of many Canadians, especially members of Canada law–abiding, responsible firearms community, on the question of deterrence. They are of the view that responsible citizens are being asked to pay the price of maintaining public safety while criminals go unpunished. They are concerned that too much emphasis is placed on crime prevention and not enough on deterrence or punishment.

I believe that the present Criminal Code measures provide for adequate deterrence and punishment, but I share the concerns that these provisions are not always applied as perhaps they should be. As the hon. members of this House will understand, criminal law enforcement, prosecution and sentencing for firearms offences are matters left with the provincial authorities and the judiciary under the Criminal Code.

I will, on behalf of the Government of Canada, undertake to urge my provincial counterparts to do everything in their power to ensure that firearms charges are laid in appropriate circumstances, that they are prosecuted vigorously and that appropriate sentences are sought.

[*Translation*]

I further intend to make every effort to inform Canadians about the changes in the law and the role of our existing gun control system. Steps will be taken to make this information as available as possible, especially to firearms owners and users.

A communications, public legal education, and information package will be assembled and disseminated over the coming months, leading up to the implementation of the new measures.

I am also discussing with my provincial counterparts the options for a general firearms amnesty program that would coincide with the proclamation of the new measures.

[*English*]

This would be intended to encourage Canadians to dispose of unwanted guns safely, to register handguns and other restricted firearms and to allow those who have guns that may be affected by the new changes to clarify their status without fear of prosecution.

I hope to be in a position to announce the details of this amnesty program in the very near future.

Madam Speaker, I hear grumbling from the other side of the House. There is a legislative basis in Bill C–80 to provide for an amnesty for that new category of firearms which is being designated as prohibited weapons. I hate to think that the hon. member would actually listen to what I am saying to get a clarification. These will be designated as prohibited weapons under Bill C–80, but in terms of a broader amnesty, lack the statutory authority. That may be a recommendation of the special commit-

tee, that such an authority be put in the Criminal Code on a general basis.

As I have indicated previously, such amnesties can be put in place any time by provincial or local authorities. They very much depend upon the ability of those authorities to deal with the logistics of such an amnesty; in other words, to have the person power available to administer the program and have the storage facilities to store safely what may be an unanticipated quantity, or find it difficult to determine in advance firearms that may be turned in by the public.

I would like, in terms of the amnesty that I promote, one in conjunction with the implementation of our legislation because I think it is an opportunity to combine such a program with a broad public education campaign to make Canadians aware of the new regime, their responsibilities under it and the extent to which it addresses their concerns. If it is the view of the committee that such a broad power ought to be incorporated into the Criminal Code, I would be very interested to get their recommendations.

There is a growing concern over the role of firearms in all parts of Canadian society, particularly in the wake of the Montreal tragedy and other incidents in recent months.

[*Translation*]

Our present system has greatly reduced the threat of firearms in Canada, but the situation in the last decade has changed and this government has an obligation to respond. We have a duty to restrict opportunities for the careless and criminal misuse of guns as far as it is possible for us to do so.

• (1230)

[*English*]

It is for all of these reasons that I ask the House to support this motion in order to put in place a process to respond to those public concerns in the most timely and effective way and ultimately to support these legislative proposals.

I think I have stated very clearly the reasons why the particular breadth of the firearms package that I have put forward. Those provisions which are outside the strict terms of Bill C-80 and the kinds of concerns that Canadians have raised on this issue make this a subject matter uniquely suited to the kind of treatment that is envisaged in this order.

I hope that we will be able to move ahead on second reading of this bill. As I have said, my colleagues on this side of the House are very keen to make it a full second reading debate, not a truncated one.

I also recognize the very real possibility that the bill would not be concluded with even if we proceeded with second reading debate today by the time the House rises. I am very anxious that this subject be given full public consultation, not simply as a way of getting input on the measures that I proposed, but as an opportunity to inform Canadians about what we are proposing and perhaps to counter some of the misperceptions that Canadians have about the level of gun control in Canada.

Research on public opinion shows that the view of Canadians on the level of violent crime in Canada, for example, is that it is at a much higher level than it in fact is. The fact that many Canadians watch a great deal of American television leads them very frequently to be of the view that the kind of gun control legislation—or the absence of gun control legislation—that prevails in the United States prevails here.

This is really an issue which ought to be quite non-partisan. In fact, the Liberal government in 1978 showed a great deal of courage in tackling this very difficult issue. It was built on a legislative tradition that began, I think, in 1892. I believe handguns were restricted in the 1930s and 1978 was a major change. The fact that the training provisions were not proclaimed does not mean that they were not good provisions. It is very comforting to have them already in the code and now be able to consider whether this is the time and whether we have the opportunity to implement them, notwithstanding the problems of jurisdictional differences and making sure that people in remote areas have the same access to meet the criteria, et cetera.

It is a very important opportunity to inform Canadians of where we are now and of the fact that we do have in Canada a very good system of gun control legislation, and that what we are proposing is a fine-tuning, an

improvement, and a response to some of the concerns that have been raised by people on all sides of the issue. Some of the proposals in Bill C-80 in fact address concerns of the firearms-owning community about some of the red tape and inconveniences that they face in using firearms for what are otherwise legal and accepted uses.

It is a very important opportunity to put this issue before the Canadian public to reassure them that we have in fact in place a good system of gun control legislation and that we wish to make it better. We can also focus attention on something which I see particularly in my own city of Vancouver. It is a large urban area with a port where we have a drug trade and a lot of crime. Very often these crimes are accompanied by the use of firearms and many of those firearms that are used are firearms that are prohibited under the Criminal Code. They are firearms that are not readily available to the public whereas the perception that is given to Canadians is that anyone can go and buy these guns. That is not the case and we do face a very serious question of law enforcement. I hope the committee may want to make some comments about the question of penalties, et cetera, and whether we in fact have a regime in place that meets the needs of Canadians.

On that note, I will conclude my lengthy introduction to debate on this motion with the very sincere plea that the House will respond to this motion to get a public process in place to address what may be one of the most serious and most contentious issues that the House will be asked to deal with in this session.

I have said to people across the country on all sides of the issue that my goal is to have a regime of gun control legislation that enables those great many Canadians who are uncomfortable with firearms to be confident that those who have them are using them correctly, that there is a process of vetting, and that they are competent to use them. That other group of Canadians wish to use firearms for sporting and hunting purposes, which are a longstanding part of our culture, and I will not even get into the question of our aboriginal people who have hunting rights protected by treaty, for example. Those Canadians who wish to use firearms in a law-abiding and responsible way will be able to do so with confidence as well.

That is the most we can ask of a legislative framework—a sense of balance and a sense of sensitivity that enables us to proceed as a civilized society with a concern for public security and a respect for all Canadians.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce):** Madam Speaker, I have a very short serious question, which I think could advance the debate, that I would like to put to the minister.

I know the member for Halifax said that he would not agree to a question, but I am wondering if he would reconsider. I could put a very short question to the minister which I think would help in the debate. I ask for agreement to put the question to the minister.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent? Will the hon. minister agree to respond to one question?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Allmand:** Madam Speaker, the question is this. In the comprehensive package of measures that the minister announced on June 26, there are many items that are not in Bill C-80, as she admitted.

However, the motion before us today simply refers the matters in Bill C-80 to the committee. Would the minister give us an assurance that, as far as she is concerned, the committee could look at all the measures that she put forward on June 26 and not simply the measures in the bill? I think that is her intention, but I would like to make it absolutely clear. I would hate to see the committee bog down on some strict rule of interpretation that we could only look at the bill and not her entire package.

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** Madam Speaker, yes, I would be very pleased to give that assurance to the hon. member.

My understanding was that this wording would encompass that. That is certainly the intention on this side of the House because it is a comprehensive package. I do think it is an important opportunity.

The hon. member who asked the question is a veteran of the previous engagement with this subject in the House, and will recognize how important it is to look at it from all aspects. Yes, I am looking forward to a comprehensive response from the committee on all aspects of the package that I have put forward. That is my anticipa-

tion of what I understand this means, and we support this motion.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys):** Madam Speaker, you will be surely forgiving if we seem cynical about the motives of the minister and the government.

The minister says that she is serious and that her party looks upon this as one of the most important issues to come before this House in this Parliament, but the government is obviously not treating it as a serious measure.

The minister, as she admitted herself, received the petition from the students in Montreal. She brought forward a motion on June 20 to put this in a pre-study. Then she brought forward the bill on June 26. Nothing was done on the bill. This is the first day of debate on the whole question of gun control since June 26. This is following yesterday when we were told that there was going to be a second motion. Then, last night, we were told that, no, we were going to proceed with second reading of Bill C-80. Then this morning, after the second reading of Bill C-80 was stated on the *Order Paper*, we were told that, no, we were going to go ahead with Motion No. 23, asking ask for a special committee study on this question.

If this is a serious issue to the government, why has it treated this issue so cavalierly? Why has it delayed in bringing this motion before the House? The bill to privatize Petro-Canada, Bill C-84, was introduced around the same time. That was brought forward as soon as we came back. That has almost finished committee hearings. Yet, we have not had even second reading on this bill. It is obvious that the government was serious about privatizing Petro-Canada but it is not serious on getting new gun control legislation.

For the minister to say that this is a serious issue with the government, it is really stretching the point of the true belief of the government. She says hopefully that Bill C-80 will yet come to second reading. We have made the offer.

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** I offered to pass it today.

**Mr. MacLellan:** Good, that is great. This is going to be really something. We will have two committees at the same time studying the same question. That is going to be peachy-keen. Talk about a boondoggle. The government is digging a deeper hole for itself by the minute.

The minister said that she hoped that second reading will come. The member for Port Moody—Coquitlam and myself offered to put this through second reading today so that it could get to a committee. The government turned that down. Now the minister wants to bring this to second reading, presumably, to have it before a committee and yet we have the special committee which is starting before second reading.

• (1240)

Obviously, the minister is not going to have a speech at second reading because she read it today. In her speech she defended Bill C-80, yet she is now in the process of killing Bill C-80. That is exactly what is going to happen.

We all know the worst kept secret in Ottawa is that the government wants to prorogue. Of course, it wants to prorogue. It wants to get the Opposition out of the House of Commons. It does not want any flak. The problem with the government is that it is so bad that Question Periods are backed up for both parties until some time in February. The fact is, if it did everything right, that there would still be enough material for Question Period into March. But the government wants to prorogue.

Let us look at this situation, this special committee. If the special committee is set up, we have to advertise it. We have to set up the committee. We have to give people a chance to prepare their presentations. Presumably, the very earliest that this special committee could report back would be probably the end of January. It must prepare the report. The committee's report must be translated before it can actually be tabled in the House. We are talking mid-February before this committee could finish, presumably, at the earliest.

Is the minister prepared then to give us the undertaking that we will go through second reading, report stage, third reading and introduction into the Senate before the House prorogues? I think not. I would be interested to hear whether or not the minister will give us that

undertaking. If not, then it is obvious that what the government is doing is trying to kill this bill.

The minister has not given any terms of the committee or when she expects the committee to report back. She has not given us any undertaking that there is going to be passage of a bill on gun control, be it C–80 or whatever, before the House prorogues.

What has happened is that she has complaints from people in her party who do not like the bill. The government has thrown its hands in the air. It has backed away completely from the subject and said that it is turning it over to a special committee. Let them grapple with the subject. It has backed away. It cannot handle it. That is what it is saying. It is saying it cannot handle it.

Perspective members of the committee should be flattered that the government is saying that it cannot deal with this, that it does not know how to deal with it, and it wants the committee to deal with it. The government is in fact turning over the legislative authority to a special committee. It is saying that it does not want to deal with this particular subject. I think it is incredible that the government has taken this position.

The minister herself said: "—if second reading takes place before the adjournment." There is no intention of the government to have second reading on this bill. We have waited two months and still this is the first day we have had to deal with this very important subject.

The minister also said that Bill C–80 was part of a bigger package. She had proposals in her release on June 26 of other matters, yet, they were not included in Bill C–80.

It is a very, very sad trick that the government is playing on the people of Canada in this very important issue, not to deal with it and to back away from it as it is doing. The minister makes some pretension, as did the hon. member for Calgary West, that this is a more complicated subject. It says that, even though it has been introduced and all other legislation goes to a legislative committee, this bill should go to a special committee. Why should this bill go to a special committee when all legislation goes to a legislative committee? Why can possible amendments not be introduced at a legislative committee? There is no reason at all, other than the fact that the government does not want to proceed.

Certainly, there have been complaints about Bill C–80. There is no question. No one would say that Bill C–80 is perfect.

How many people would say that any legislation that comes through this House is perfect? How many members of Parliament agree on every piece of legislation that is more than three sections long? How many? Very few.

That is the reason for a legislative committee, to hear witnesses, complaints and to get ideas from all concerned on a possible subject, on particular legislation.

Bill C–80 is no different than any other piece of legislation. In fact, Bill C–80 is a better bill than Bill C–58, which is another one of the member's bills, which is an unmitigated disaster. At least with Bill C–80, we can do something with it. We can make the amendments in the legislative committee.

With Bill C–58, it involves almost rewriting the whole bill.

This is an important subject. On that point, the minister is correct. As an important subject, it should be dealt with as quickly as possible.

I am not going to go into the problems of the 14 innocent women who were killed in Montreal and the problem that that created. That will be dealt with by my colleague from Notre–Dame–de–Grâce. I will say that the person who committed that atrocity was an abused child.

If we are looking to the question of prohibiting and stopping killings of this kind in this country, then we have got to do more. This government has got to do more in addressing the problems of youth who are abused, mistreated and who have not had the benefit that we would not like to see young people in this country receive.

Until the government recognizes the need for treatment and rehabilitation of young people who commit crimes, to take them off the streets, to deal with them, to work with them until they get on the right track, this government is not going to be addressing the problem.

There has been a lot of unanimity on Bill C–80. A lot of the groups which object to some of the control mechanisms in this bill, some of the rifle associations,

some of the people who hunt and some of the people who deal in guns a lot agree that there is a great deal in this bill that should receive complete agreement across this country.

The fact that there should be firearms acquisition certificates is agreed to by all groups, even the supporters of changes to this bill who want to have a more widespread utilization and not as much control of the use of firearms. They agree that this is a good thing.

In fact, gun clubs have been advocating these kinds of courses for years. When the member for Notre–Dame–de–Grâce was in cabinet actually advocated—it is there, it is passed—that firearms acquisition certificates be issued only after a course or an exam.

It has been there. It just has not received Royal Assent. It has never been brought in. All we need to do is to give Royal Assent to that particular provision. It has not been done.

There is also the fact that the firearms acquisition certificates should be preceded by a course or a certified examination. No one disagrees with the minister on that. In fact, everyone agrees that a certificate should have a picture of the person who is licensed on the certificate. There is no disagreement with that whatsoever.

There is no disagreement that a waiting period should exist for the period from the time that the person applies for a firearms acquisition certification until the time the certificate is actually granted.

The minister, in the legislation, recommends 28 days. Maybe it is 28 days. All people who are gun proponents say is: "If it is 28 days, be absolutely sure that you are going to use the 28 days and that you are not just taking an arbitrary figure." A very reasonable request.

I think that is something that will have to be studied and I think perhaps we could fine tune that in a legislative committee, or as the minister suggests, in a special committee.

There is also general agreement that before the certificate be issued, there should also be an inspection of the storage facilities where the guns are going to be located. A very realistic request.

This is advocated by people who are gun users and are hunters. They realize that these safety requirements are very important. In this country, there are approximately 1,400 deaths by firearms a year.

• (1250 )

Of the 1,400, 1,100 are suicides. Approximately 15 per cent of deaths by firearms are actually homicides. The fact that we have a safe place to store guns is very important. It may not mean a lot to some people, but when you look at that statistic, it is very important.

I agree with the minister that our gun control legislation in the past has been helpful because only 15 per cent of our deaths by arms are homicides. It shows that the gun control legislation in the past has been working.

I also agree with the minister that it is time for some changes in this because things have changed dramatically in the last couple of years. For example, in 1989, in one year the total number of violent crimes among adults increased by 7.9 per cent. Among young people, the violent crimes in this country from 1988 to 1989 increased 20 per cent, for an average nationally of 9.3 per cent. That is a significant increase and not a very good indication of where we are going as regard to our attitude toward violence in this country.

This is why we have, particularly with the young people, to be able to deal with this question, to look at treatment. We have to spend money on that. There is no question about that. I ask the minister to come before the committee on Bill C–58 and to discuss this question because it is very important if we are to deal with the whole question of violence in this country.

We are not going to outlaw guns. It is not even feasible to consider that. There are six million guns in Canada, and there are approximately 10,000 outlets where guns are sold, so guns are going to remain.

What we want to do is have a law which will serve the country in the best possible way, taking into consideration people who would abuse gun laws and commit crimes. We must also take into consideration those who use guns for sport and recreation, and who pose no threat, but who through their common sense and stability have actually increased the awareness of good gun control and good gun usage in this country.

We have to be able to restrict guns to people who cannot possibly handle the responsibility. We have to be able to weed out, wherever we possibly can, people who are unable psychologically to deal with the responsibility of having a gun.

We have to deal with the benefit and the over-all responsibility as parliamentarians in bringing before Parliament and into passage gun control laws which are going to be in the best interests of the people of Canada.

People in Canada are just becoming aware of the increase in violent crimes. A recent poll by the government's own pollster, Decima, has stated that people in Canada are becoming more concerned about the increasing rate of violence in this country.

If we are to address that concern, we have to come forward with gun control and we need to have perception. The government has to provide the perception that it is seriously interested in bringing forward good legislation as quickly as possible, and not to delay, as has been the case up until now, when dealing with this very important question.

We have, of course, to fully address the question of fully and semi-automatic automatic weapons, as well as the people who would convert those semi-automatics to fully automatic. I think that Bill C-80 deals with that. It also provides a good penalty for those who would convert the weapons in that way.

Bill C-80 is not perfect, but it is basically on the right track. This is why we, in this party, object to the fact that Bill C-80 may not see the light of day. That is wrong. The minister will have to admit, if she is to be straightforward with this House, that this special committee is going to take a long time. We have lost very valuable time. We cannot continue to lose this valuable time.

We have to look at putting in every possible means of acting in the best interest of the people in this country. I hope that the government will reconsider, proceed with second reading of Bill C-80, withdraw this motion, and we in our party will certainly agree to passage of second reading today. I feel that is in the best interest of everyone.

We can deal with the committee. If the government will give the undertaking not to prorogue until after we deal with the second reading committee stage and perhaps report stage, but certainly third reading, as well as introduction in the Senate, which we hope would give quick passage to the bill, we can have this bill passed into law by the time the government prorogues and starts a second session. It is of vital interest.

Although we disagree with this motion on the basis that I have stated, it being counterproductive to this party's interest in gun control, I would still like to make an amendment to the motion for the consideration by this House. I move:

> That the motion be amended by changing the final period to a semi-colon, and by adding after the semi-colon, the following:
>
> and that the said special committee make its final report to the House no later than February 15, 1991.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** There being no questions or comments, I will recognize the next speaker. I imagine it would be a member from the hon. member's party.

May I call it one o'clock and then allow the hon. member to start after Question Period?

**Mr. Waddell:** Am I allowed to speak now, Madam Speaker?

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** No more.

**Mr. Waddell:** I will just take one minute.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** It is one o'clock p.m.

It being one o'clock, I now leave the chair until two o'clock p.m.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

---

### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*English*]

### NATIONAL DRUG AWARENESS WEEK

**Ms. Catherine Callbeck (Malpeque):** Mr. Speaker, November 18 to November 21 has been proclaimed National Drug Awareness Week.

This week is being used to draw attention to the tragic economic and social costs of alcohol abuse and other drug problems. Organizers also hope to encourage individuals in communities to co-operate to solve these problems.

This kind of individual and community involvement is critical to eliminating drug and alcohol abuse, and it looks as though it may be working.

A recent survey by Addiction Services in Prince Edward Island shows a decrease in drug and alcohol use among Island high school students. We still face significant challenges in this area, but the kind of positive feedback found in this survey shows that we seem to be making progress.

I want to commend all individuals, organizations and communities that are working to make drug awareness a success this week and throughout the year.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## BILL C-80

**Mr. Jacques Tétreault (Laval-Centre):** Among other things, Mr. Speaker, Bill C-80 will provide better control over gun owners and the way firearms are used. This kind of legislation has become imperative.

Indeed another massacre took place earlier this month in a small New Zealand village where a mentally unstable man wielding an AK-47 assault rifle shot and killed 13 people and wounded 16 others.

This tragedy is one more like the incident involving Montreal polytechnical school students or the rampage in Stockton, California, where an individual—again armed with an AK-47 assault rifle—walked into a school yard where he killed six children and injured 30 more. Or again in the village of Hungerford in England where a disturbed man firing an AK-47 assault rifle killed 15 people and wounded 15 others.

Hardly a year ago we thought we were safe from massacres such as these.

As a society we have to pass appropriate legislation to strengthen control over gun ownership and use. We must endeavour as well to educate people on dangers involved in the unchecked firearm proliferation and the attendant violence.

Mr. Speaker, protecting the priceless value of human life is our responsibility.

[*English*]

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. David D. Stupich (Nanaimo—Cowichan):** Mr. Speaker, is the GST credit fairly allocated?

Jean McGrath of Nanaimo has an income of $10,240 and a payment of $68.37. She has friends with higher incomes and higher payments. She says that is not fair.

Mrs. Buckingham of Lantzville writes that her disabled son's income is $8,046 and his payment is $57.40. Another son has an income $10,098 higher and his payment is $15.10 more. She says that is not fair.

It gets better. In each of these cases the payment grows with income up to a total income of $24,355. Then the payments start decreasing. However, a person with an income of $1 per year gets $47.50, exactly the same as one with an income of $26,355.

It is fairness as practised by the Tory government. It is fairness as accepted by the Liberals as they allow the GST legislation to pass through the Senate.

* * *

## RAINY RIVER BAND

**Mr. Robert D. Nault (Kenora—Rainy River):** Mr. Speaker, I rise again today to provide evidence of this government's failure to address its inadequate specific land claims policy properly.

The Rainy River Band located in my riding submitted a Statement of Claim in 1983. The claim seeks damages and land compensation, as well as a declaration that the surrenders by the six reserves involved were illegal.

From 1983 to 1985 the band, Canada, and the province of Ontario held meetings to discuss the land claims process and to review historical evidence. Since 1985 Ontario and the band have continued to hold discussions without Canada's participation.

The Minister of Indian Affairs told me in July 1990 that he was awaiting advice from the Department of Justice on whether the band's response establishes the grounds for entering into negotiations under the specific land claims policy.

More than eight years have elapsed since the Rainy River Band began its work on this claim. How much longer will it have to wait: 10, 20 or 30 years? When will we hear about the details to speed up the process?

I suggest the minister speed up this process before the Human Rights Commission slams him and his government further.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Admitedly, Mr. Speaker, self-imposed budget restraints will create difficulties for me, but I must do my share because the federal government is strongly committed to cut down its own expenditures.

My riding of Abitibi covers 553,837 square kilometres and is located 425 kilometres from Ottawa. Between September 1984 and March 31, 1990 my travel expenses in Abitibi and elsewhere in Canada amounted to $180,804, or $32,382 a year on average.

Mr. Speaker, if I did use the 64 points of my air travel budget—Ottawa to Northern Abitibi round trips, and assuming I had the time to travel that much—I would be spending $2,500 each time, which amounts to $160,000 a year.

* * *

## RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

**Mrs. Suzanne Duplessis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Science and Technology)):** Mr. Speaker, the Fonds Biocapital, offspring of the FTQ's Fonds de solidarité, has appealed to the public to invest $8 million in research and development through a Corporation for the Development of Quebec Business. It is the largest CDQB ever established in Quebec and will finance four companies that are starting out in the biomedical field, namely, Médi-Force-RD, Canaster-RD, Polychol and Lipopharm.

To be successful in these undertakings, the government must be able to count on the full support of the private sector and the general public. This is absolutely essential.

Once again, the FTQ's Fonds de solidarité has shown leadership and demonstrated that it is aware of the need to involve all economic partners in these industries of the future that will ensure that Canada will continue to play a leading role on the international scene in the years to come.

In the past, Quebecers have shown that they can deliver the goods, and I am sure this project will be another brilliant success.

* * *

[*English*]

## GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, arts and cultural organizations across Canada await the grim details from this government regarding yet another round of cuts to their already inadequate budgets.

Even as the CBC, the Canada Council and the Canadian Council of Arts plead for adequate funding, they will now have to pay for this government's foreign policy.

The news comes from a government that did not consult with these agencies about the cuts and did not consult Parliament or the people of Canada about the wisdom of sending Canadian men and women to a potential war.

Arts and culture in Canada are already crippled by a made-in-Canada recession, consistent underfunding, and the proposed GST. Why is this government once again punishing our cultural industries and their important contributions to our Canadian way of life?

The very fabric of this land—our national unity and our cultural identity—is being rent asunder while our Secretary of State for External Affairs, G. I. Joe, dreams of becoming Saddam Hussein's worst nightmare.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## TRIBUTE TO JEAN-CLAUDE MALÉPART

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to commemorate the fact that our former colleague, Jean-Claude Malépart, died nearly a year ago. I wanted to say a few words in his memory today because I know that Jean-Claude and his social conscience, his awareness of the needs of senior citizens and his enormous energy as a member of this House, left a gap on these benches that has proved difficult to fill. I know that his family, his widow and his friends, want to

continue Jean-Claude Malépart's work in the riding and at the centre he founded for the poor and the elderly.

I think it is particularly appropriate to remember him because every day we should be mindful of the fact that the neediest are also those who will probably suffer most as a result of legislation we pass in this House. I think it is also appropriate because it is clear in these eventful times for a Quebecer, Jean-Claude Malépart, who had his heart in the right place, would probably be sitting with us on the Bloc Québécois benches. I also want you to remember him because we all miss Jean-Claude very much.

* * *

[*English*]

## SOCIALIST AWARDS OF EXCELLENCE

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt):** Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of this House and Canadians in general the weekly socialist awards of excellence. The nominees are:

First, in British Columbia it is a standard practice for those following the NDP doctrine always to stand up for the little guy, except of course when the little guy is a small printer who this B.C. resident owes money to.

Second, in Ontario it is a common practice for NDP self-appointed champions of the underprivileged and homeless to continue to live in housing subsidized by the taxpayers of Canada, yet receive a benefits package worth some $100,000 per year.

Third, an NDPer in Alberta who follows the example of the Ontario NDPers and also continues to slurp at the trough of public housing while making four times the average Canadian salary.

And the winner is: The envelope, please.

The person from British Columbia who, when discovering that the shield of special legal privileges would not protect his ample hide, decided finally to pay off his debts so that the tactics that were tried to avoid paying what he owed would not come to light.

• (1410)

## CORPORATE TAXATION

**Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt):** Now, Mr. Speaker, for the real awards.

Today our nominees for corporate welfare bum of the week are: first, Xerox Canada, with $75 million in profits in 1988 and zero taxes paid; second, American Barrick Resources Corporation, with $30.5 million in profits, American dollars, and no taxes paid in Canada; and, last but not least, our new kid on the block is Amex Bank of Canada that went into business on Canada Day in 1990 and had profits in 1989 in the United States of $23 billion.

Now for the winner. The envelope, please.

Thank you very much. The winner is Amex Bank of Canada. Congratulations to this American non-bank bank that has proven once again that it pays to have friends in high places.

In exchange for assisting the Conservatives on the free trade agreement, Amex received its reward in the form of full bank status in Canada, with the privileges of the Schedule I banks.

American Express has proved its motto, that when it comes to getting a good deal and a special deal from Michael Wilson, don't leave home without it.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## GOVERNMENT OF ONTARIO

**Mr. Gabriel Desjardins (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday in Queen's Park, the New Democratic Party once again showed it is tailor-made for the opposition benches where it excels in high-flown speeches and promises of largesse.

Faced with the pressures of government, the NDP has suddenly become vague and evasive about its commitments. Franco-Ontarians will not easily forget last Tuesday's Throne Speech, when Bob Rae's government refused to make Ontario a bilingual province. In addition, this Throne Speech did not contain a single commitment to Franco-Ontarians. What an about-face, what a betrayal of Ontario's Francophones who were promised so much during the last campaign!

And to add insult to injury, Bob Rae argued that the time was not ripe. What lack of leadership, what lack of courage and political will! Franco-Ontarians will not forget this slap in the face, and Bob Rae may rest assured they will keep up the pressure until they get what is rightfully theirs.

**An hon. member:** Hear, hear!

* * *

## BILL C-21

**Mr. Guy H. Arseneault (Restigouche—Chaleur):** Mr. Speaker, more than a year ago, the Minister of Employment and Immigration urged this House to pass Bill C-21. In fact, she warned us that any delay in the passage of this bill would keep in limbo about $800 million that were to be spent on training programs.

[*English*]

In case the minister has yet to notice, the bill has been passed. Why is she not producing the money? When will it be made available? Why the threats? Did the minister not have the time to prepare for the passing of the bill?

Projects and training programs are being held up, not only in my riding of Restigouche—Chaleur, but across the country. Bill C-21 has been passed, but where is the money? The minister should come through on her promise and put the $800 million in the programs today.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Jacques Vien (Laurentides):** Mr. Speaker, early in December the GATT talks will resume, and these talks will be very important for our farmers.

The Canadian position protects supply management programs that control imports and thus support national farm product production and marketing programs. The Canadian position has not changed since the beginning of the GATT talks, and this position will be maintained. Canada intends to pursue its efforts to have article XI clarified and reinforced, and I am convinced that our representatives at the talks will act in the interests of all Canadian farmers.

[*English*]

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Garth Turner (Halton—Peel):** Mr. Speaker, in just over five weeks the GST will come into effect, having a major impact on consumer prices. Some prices will go up. Others will go down. It is important that consumers know in advance what to expect.

The government is playing a role in educating consumers, but what we need is a more co-operative effort between the public and private sectors.

I rise today to congratulate the Retail Council of Canada for developing a series of brochures detailing exactly how the GST will apply to prices in each province. This is an example of responsible corporate citizenry, and every member of the House should congratulate the council for these nine million brochures. They will help make the GST more understandable, and wipe out some of the misinformation and apprehension now in the marketplace.

We all have a role to play; governments, business and consumers, if Canada is to modernize its tax system and build its economy. We have too many walls and not enough bridges between these groups. Today I congratulate the council on helping find a better way.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## THE MEDIA

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert):** Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, November 17, Mediawatch awarded its merit award recognizing improvement in the portrayal of women in the media. This year, the prize was awarded to Raymonde Provencher, a Radio-Québec journalist, for her three-part series entitled "*Femmes en péril*".

Mr. Speaker, it is only too easy sometimes for the media to succumb to the temptation of treating women as objects. Therefore, it is all the more important to recognize media productions that go against the mainstream of portraying women as objects.

I wish also to point out the work of Mediawatch to promote public awareness to the problem of the portrayal of women.

Thanks to such initiatives, it may one day no longer be necessary to praise those who portray women as reasonnable and regular people.

* * *

[*English*]

### PUBLIC SERVICE 2000

**Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, Public Service 2000 would alter the face of an institution which has served Canadians with dedication and excellence for years. While true reform can be healthy, it is unacceptable that the government wants to make sweeping changes without fully consulting those who will be most affected, all Public Service employees.

Public Service unions feel that senior management, Treasury Board, and Privy Council offices are controlling the entire process, and that the concerns and ideas of frontline workers are being ignored. Morale among Public Service employees is low. Why is the government no taking advantage of this invaluable source of experience and innovation if it really wants effective reform?

The government is trying to stifle debate by silencing the potentially powerful voice of frontline Public Service employees. Our Public Service has a history of excellence and dedication to Canadians. To propose any change, much less radical change, to this institution without consulting all Public Service employees is not only a cruel exercise of power, it is counter productive.

---

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

In the United Kingdom, dozens of government MPs have deserted Mrs. Margaret Thatcher because she would not listen to Britons, she would not listen to her



own MPs nor even her own cabinet. She persisted in imposing a devastatingly unfair tax.

Here in Canada, government MPs are quitting or are being forced out of the Conservative government caucus for many of the same reasons. In fact, only 4 per cent of Canadians think that the policies of the government have helped the economy.

When will this government drop the "my way or no way" approach that has brought about the political demise of Mrs. Margaret Thatcher? When will the government drop the GST and bring in new economic and tax policies that will help Canadians get out of the mess created by the economic policies of this government?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, it is rather surprising to hear that question from the Leader of the Opposition. I thought that Canada was an independent, sovereign country with its own political system and its own political institutions. Is he suggesting that we revert back to the old way of doing things? I would have thought that, even in spite of his 30 years' service, he would be more modernistic in his approach than that.

The fact of the matter is that the economic agenda which is enshrined as a part of government policy was articulated in 1984, in the economic statement of 1985 and again in the election campaign of 1988. It clearly outlines the structural changes that need to be implemented. It requires that Canada be competitive in a globalized marketplace. What we are trying to do is put in place the kind of programs and policies that will prepare Canada to be a full participant in a modern globalized economy.

* * *

### GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the policies which the minister talked about have created the first made in Canada recession, according to the Conference Board of Canada. In these times of recession the President of the Treasury Board is about to announce substantial cuts in government assistance, allegedly to finance the military operations of Canada in the Persian Gulf.

• (1420)

Can the President of the Treasury Board assure Canadians today that these cuts will be no more than is actually necessary to finance these military operations. Will he assure Canadians that these cuts will not be carried out at the expense of less advantaged Canadians and regions that, in this time of recession, need the help and the assistance of government, more than ever?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Leader of the Opposition that I will be introducing supplementary estimates tomorrow at 12 o'clock and he will have all the information he wants.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, will the President of the Treasury Board confirm today that the cost of having our forces in the Persian Gulf is $3 million a month and not the $50 million a month which officials have been suggesting is the case to journalists and others in the country?

[*Translation*]

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the President of the Treasury Board refuses to assure Canadians that the cuts he announced will not affect the programs they depend on the most. I ask the minister, the President of the Treasury Board—and I am referring to Health and Welfare Canada—how he can assure the Canadian people that the quality of our health services and medical research will not be affected by those cuts?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat to the opposition leader, in the other official language, that I do intend to table at noon tomorrow Estimates that will reflect the responsible decisions this government always takes.

* * *

[*English*]

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Minister of Finance. He will no doubt be aware that yesterday's bankruptcy figures confirmed Canadians' worst fears: the largest number of bankruptcies in the history of Canada. The government must know that the GST will be the final nail in the Canadian economic coffin. The poll tax crushed the iron lady. The GST will kill this government. Will the Prime Minister not learn from Margaret Thatcher's mistake and today kill the GST?

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, over the past 50 years there have been four royal commissions and numerous committee reports, including one from the Senate of Canada chaired by the Hon. Allan MacEachen, which recommended that this country get rid of the antiquated manufacturers' sales tax and bring in a modern sales tax, a consumption tax, like the goods and services tax. That has been the recommendation for over 50 years.

No other previous government had the guts to do it. We may understand today why they did not have the guts to do it, but they did not have the guts to do it. It is a necessary change. It was campaigned on in the election of 1988. The answer is: "No, we will not stop the goods and services tax. No, it is not going to defeat the government". If the hon. member came to her senses, she would take a walk down the hall and convince her friends to pass the goods and services tax so that business communities of Canada can get on with the job.

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, the minister no doubt will be aware that the current GST bill is so badly drafted that the Department of Finance is already working on retroactive amendments which they intend to introduce shortly after January of next year.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister confirm to the House that there is currently a list of retroactive amendments being drawn up by the Department of Finance and will he in fact table those amendments today so all Canadians can see how flawed this GST bill is and will he withdraw the GST?

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, I guess I did not say it slowly enough the first time. No, we will not withdraw the goods and services tax. It is necessary for the economic well-being of this country. We have not said that. Outside organizations have said that. Any number of them have, including the Retail Council of Canada, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and I can go on and on. As a matter of fact, 17 of them appeared recently before the Senate and made a very strong recommendation that the Senate pass the goods and services tax immediately, so that they can get on with the business of creating employment and wealth in this country. The goods and services tax is going to make it fairer for them to do business in this country and throughout the world. That is what this is all about,

making us more competitive and creating jobs. Let's get on with it.

* * *

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Mr. Speaker, let me just say: first, Margaret Thatcher, next Brian Mulroney.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Langdon:** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. Several departments confirmed that they are required to cut their expenses. The government claims this is made necessary by the additional expenses related to sending troops to the Gulf. Here is my question. How much are the operations in the Persian Gulf costing Canada? The government must be candid about this.

**An hon. member:** Impossible!

[*English*]

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I have always attempted to tell the truth and so has the government, and if the hon. member would do the same, we would get along a lot better. I can confirm for the hon. member that the truth will be out tomorrow when my colleague, the President of the Treasury Board, presents the supplementary estimates.

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians are worried that this government is going to use the gulf crisis as an excuse for damaging cutbacks which will hurt people right across this country. As the CLC has pointed out, the government will gain—

**An hon. member:** The CLC?

**Mr. Langdon:** Yes, the CLC has pointed out that the government will gain at least $1 billion in extra revenue from the gas price increases which the gulf crisis has caused.

I want to ask the government, first, if it is prepared to see that this extra income, which it will receive from these gas price increases, goes to pay for the costs of our action in the gulf and, second, will the government make a commitment to see to it that the Auditor General gives us a fair accounting, as quickly as possible, of what our real expenses in the gulf are for this military intervention?

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I would be more comforted if the member and his party would be supportive of the actions that have been taken by this government to bring about peace and stability in the world.

The actions taken by this government provide for the men and women who serve the people of Canada in the task in which they are involved. If the member and his party would make a commitment to assure us of their support in providing the necessary equipment and the necessary sustainability for those men and women who are serving that member and all members in the House of Commons and the people of Canada.

* * *

## HOUSING

**Mr. Mike Breaugh (Oshawa):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the President of the Treasury Board.

The minister will know that this type of budgetary adjustment has ramifications much closer to home. Many are worried that in the non-profit and co-op housing sector, there will be cuts made. At a time when the metro Toronto Homebuilders' Association is reporting 72 per cent unemployment, more than 55,000 people out of work in the normal course of home construction, which is more than enough to fill the Skydome, is the minister prepared to explain why his choice is to do his budgetary matters in this way, even though it might put more than 55,000 people out of work and deny those who need reasonable, affordable housing a chance to have it?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is getting over-exercised about something which will be made clear tomorrow. I can only repeat that tomorrow, at noon, I will be tabling Supplementary Estimates (B) and he will have all the answers. Then he can possibly discuss them with us.

• (1430 )

## INDIAN AFFAIRS

**Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean):** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister for Indian and Northern Affairs, I will direct my question to the Deputy Prime Minister.

Yesterday, the Canadian Human Rights Commissioner released a scathing condemnation of the government's aboriginal policies. Is the minister prepared to admit the failure of this department and announce new policies to address the serious circumstances facing aboriginal peoples in Canada today?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Shirley Martin (Minister of State (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)):** Mr. Speaker, indeed the points brought forward by Mr. Yalden yesterday were addressed by the Prime Minister in the House on September 25 when he announced the new approach and the new relationship with Indian people in the country.

**An hon. member:** Right on.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean):** Mr. Speaker, I will still address the Deputy Prime Minister. The government has failed in its fiduciary responsibilities to aboriginal Canadians.

Considering that Mr. Yalden recommends that the paternalistic and patronizing Indian Affairs department be dismantled, will the government take his advice and announce plans for a full scale inquiry, totally devoted to aboriginal issues?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Shirley Martin (Minister of State (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to know from the hon. member across whether or not that indeed is her party's position, to abolish the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. The department acknowledged a long time ago the need to change the paternalistic approach of the Indian Act and of the department.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**An hon. member:** Particularly under that government.

**Mrs. Martin:** Yes, under that government.

We have been working towards that. Today, 70 per cent of the funding that goes to our aboriginal peoples in the country is administered by the aboriginal people, not by the Department of Indian Affairs.

**An hon. member:** Right on.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## THE ECONOMY

**Mr. Jerry Pickard (Essex—Kent):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. In the last week in my riding, in one week, one manufacturing plant moved to the United States, one company closed, one plant went into receivership, three companies announced lay-offs, and one company is winding down its operations. That is 330 jobs lost. There are several hundred part-time jobs gone and 120 workers laid off.

Will the minister change the free trade agreement in the agri-food industry? Will he change Tory financial policies and stop punishing Canadians with high interest rates and high dollar?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, the solution probably lies not in changing the free trade agreement, but in changing the member.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Crosbie:** I can get up in the House and read—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Crosbie:** Is this a beer garden or is it the House of Commons?

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Crosbie:** I can get up, Mr. Speaker—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**An hon. member:** Beer gardens are more orderly.

**Mr. Crosbie:** When I look across the aisle I see the answer is obvious. It is a beer garden.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the hon. minister has the answer that is being sought.

**Mr. Crosbie:** Mr. Speaker, I can get up and read a list of expansions of companies. For example, Polysar Rubber Corporation is spending $120 million at Sarnia—not far from the hon. member's area—over three years to modernize and improve environmental standards in its business.

B.F. Goodrich (Canada) Incorporated is expanding its Niagara Falls polyvinyl chloride plant. It is the start of a major capacity expansion which will double its polymerization capacity at the plant cost of $75 million. I could go on and on.

**An hon. member:** Right on.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Jerry Pickard (Essex—Kent):** Mr. Speaker, there is no compassion, no fairness, and no concern for Canadians.

In my riding, Tory policies have hit 600 jobs in one foul swoop this week. There were nine at Heinz Corporation; 20 at Peterson; 95 at Omsteads, with 120 more on December 7; 60 at Hunt Wesson; 87 at Nabisco; and 40 at Allegretti.

When will this meaningful plan come forward, instead of nonsense rhetoric and condemnation put-down? Why will the government not come up with meaningful policies?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, no amount of theatrics proves anything.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Crosbie:** In Cambridge, Ontario, for example, the first production of household trash-compactors rolled off the assembly line at the Inglis plant on September 19. I suggest the hon. member had better watch out or he will be compacted with the rest of the trash.

*Oral Questions*

## THE CONSTITUTION

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice in her capacity as Attorney General for Canada.

She has indicated that she intends to appeal in the case of Elizabeth Weir, the New Brunswick NDP Leader, against the Attorney General of Canada and the judgment of the New Brunswick Court of Queen's Bench which ordered the creation of an extra Commons seat for New Brunswick. The minister will be aware that there will be a long delay in appealing to the New Brunswick Court of Appeal. She will also be aware that under the Supreme Court of Canada Act, with her consent and with consent of the parties, they can go directly to the Supreme Court of Canada.

In view of the fact that I have here a letter from the solicitors for Elizabeth Weir who have agreed to go directly to the Supreme Court of Canada, will the minister, in the interest of justice, fairness and clearing up these matters, agree now to take this case directly to the Supreme Court of Canada?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I will agree to give the case and the issue considerable attention and to make the very best possible decision.

There are the other issues with respect to the appointment of the senators that are before the courts. It is not clear how quickly the Supreme Court of Canada could hear the case and if in fact the procedure outlined by the hon. member would be the most expeditious to get all of the importance elements and issues before the court. But I am giving it careful consideration and will announce my plan of action as soon as possible.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for that. I can tell her that I have checked the docket of the Supreme Court and it is free now. Perhaps she might consider that.

If a higher court upholds the judgment of the trial judge in New Brunswick, would the minister not agree as well that there would be a cloud over all the laws that this very House has passed since the appointment of the GST senators? Would the minister then look at this and

give her commitment that, before the B.C. case goes ahead on December 17 and before the Ontario case is appealed, she takes all three cases, as Mrs. Weir has agreed, directly to the Supreme Court of Canada?

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, one of the things that makes it very difficult to discuss this issue in a sensible, rational way are the death-defying leaps in logic of the hon. member in interpreting the significance of the judgment of the New Brunswick court.

Whatever the ultimate decision with respect to what flows from section 51A of the Constitution Act, there is absolutely no legal basis for suggesting that the decisions either of this House or of the Senate would be under any kind of cloud. I wish the hon. member would do credit to our shared profession and stop making those ridiculous interpretations.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## PERSIAN GULF

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians are worried with regard to resolving the Middle East crisis. Members of the Gulf Western Alliance, such as Germany, France and the Soviet Union, request patience allowing time for UN-supported sanctions to bite. Today, Canada is not seen as a member of this group, nor as actively pursuing our traditional role as a negotiator for a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister tell us today why we are pursuing the war option in the gulf, instead of the peace option?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member obviously has not been following what has been happening both in the United Nations and in the discussions that the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs have had with counterparts while in Europe.

• (1440)

The Government of Canada has been pursuing consistently, through the United Nations and through every other option, a peaceful and diplomatic settlement to the Gulf situation.

As the hon. member referred to the U.S.S.R., I would like to read to her press reports of Mr. Gorbachev's comments while he was in Paris. He said: "The most important thing is we have to act. We have to be resolute and firm. There is a need for a meeting of the Security Council without delay to discuss the situation and take a decision. The situation continues to be dangerous. We cannot just leave things the way it is without giving them closer attention. Therefore, we have concluded that the Security Council should act without delay."

Those are exactly Canada's feelings. I am pleased that they are shared by so many leaders in the world.

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, the perception is not that Canada is pursuing the peace option.

It has been recorded that the Gulf operation is costing $50 million a month and that this figure could quadruple if hostilities break out. In a recessionary period certain cutbacks are not acceptable.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister assure us today that the burden of these costs will not be borne through cutbacks in funding to nationally recognized essential services, such as health and welfare, security, and communications?

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I know the time for the Liberal caucus meeting has passed, but the hon. member should confer with her House leader, the hon. member for Windsor West. She has said there is an allegation of $50 million a month cost. Just prior to her statement, her House leader said $3 million. Maybe they could join and come out with a medium or some balance of the answer.

* * *

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax):** Mr. Speaker, child care is exempt from the GST. However, the centres that offer care are consequently not eligible for GST rebates on, for example, toys, cleaning supplies, and of course books. It is just another example of the insanity of this tax.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister relieve the anxiety of Canadian child care centres, nation wide, and will he today undertake to axe the tax?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should realize that moving to a broader based tax gives benefits to many areas which previously would have been paying the 13.5 per cent manufacturers' sales tax. In the long run, the change from a manufacturers' sales tax to a broader based value-added tax is going to make our industries more competitive.

There are areas for zero rated products that will benefit as well. There are areas where input tax is not included which will release $9 billion of new economic activity and will benefit all Canadians as a result.

On top of that, the change will make Canadian manufacturers, producers, and exporters more competitive, thereby benefitting all Canadians as a result.

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax):** Mr. Speaker, I apologize if the hon. minister did not understand my question.

As bad as the GST is, if child care services were placed—and I will say this very slowly—in the zero per cent category instead of the tax exempt category, the centres could at least get a rebate on their supplies.

If the minister will not axe the tax, will he at least be sensible and change child care status—I will repeat it again—from tax exempt to zero per cent? Clear?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, every time one of the opposition members gets up on the GST, they take out of context one little element of the GST.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Jelinek:** The bottom line in the hon. member's province is that every man, woman and child is paying over $700 per year in federal sales tax. That is true right across the country. On top of that, in her province, once the GST comes in there will be a reduction by some $10 billion of tax being paid by people from her province.

On top of that, low and modest income Canadians are going to be getting GST credits.

The hon. member, if she is honest with herself, knows that this is a long overdue tax which will benefit the people of her province and all people across the country.

* * *

## OKA

**Mr. Ray Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

The Conservative government and the Conservative members of the aboriginal affairs committee have done everything possible to prevent that committee from investigating into the affairs at Oka.

The Conservative member for Delta, on the other hand, has proposed that this matter be investigated by a commission similar to the Dubin commission that investigated into the use of drugs in sports.

Will the Minister of Justice agree that this is an excellent suggestion and order a judicial inquiry into the affairs at Oka this summer, as the NDP has called for time and time again?

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** No, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Ray Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** Mr. Speaker, to the same minister.

Canadian taxpayers have paid $16 million in relation to that crisis at Oka with no debate in this House. The government refuses to co-operate with an inquiry.

Will the minister indicate to this House when the government is going to stop covering up this issue and get on with an effective judicial inquiry into this matter?

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, unless I am gravely mistaken, that issue was in fact debated very fully in front of this House in a motion, which if I am not mistaken is still before this House.

The standing committees of the House of Commons have control over their own agendas. There is enormous leeway and scope for members of this House of Commons to be involved in such a discussion or inquiry, and I invite the hon. member to take that opportunity.

*Oral Questions*

## HOUSING

**Mr. Garth Turner (Halton—Peel):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Housing. It concerns a very tough situation with respect to new housing construction in Canada's most populated city.

As luck would have it, it follows up on the concerns of the hon. member for Oshawa.

The number of housing starts in metropolitan Toronto this year has dropped by more than half. Employment in the industry is down by 71 per cent. The value of building permits has fallen by over $1 billion.

My question to the minister is simply this: How can we house people in the Toronto area when new housing construction has ground to a halt at the same time as 60,000 people a year are flocking to the city? Is the minister concerned about this? What steps would the government contemplate to keep this industry alive?

**Hon. Alan Redway (Minister of State (Housing)):** Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons for the situation with home building in the metropolitan Toronto area.

One of the main reasons is the fact that for the last several years, Toronto home builders have been concentrating on building very expensive homes for the move-up market rather than concentrating on homes for first time home buyers.

Actually, the vice-president of the Toronto Home Builders was quoted last week as saying that new home sales last month hit their highest level in a year. It hit the highest monthly total since last November.

He went on to say that modest detached homes and basic housing with few bells and whistles actually dominated the market in October, and that what the industry needs is municipal help in clearing some of the rezoning hurdles in order to put land on the market.

The federal government's housing agency, CMHC, has a rezoning application currently before the town of Vaughan. I hope it will get on with rezoning the land so that we can help the situation there.

## SOFTWOOD LUMBER INDUSTRY

**Mr. Réginald Bélair (Cochrane—Superior):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Forestry.

A few weeks ago, senior federal officials were successful in reducing Quebec's softwood lumber export surtax from 8 per cent to 6 per cent effective immediately, and subsequently reduced to 3 per cent next year.

Can the minister indicate to this House and to the lumber manufacturers of northern Ontario why he could not negotiate such a deal for the province of Ontario?

**Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of Forestry):** Mr. Speaker, it is true, as my hon. friend points out, that officials of the federal government assisted with an initiative of the province of Quebec to negotiate a reduction in the countervail tax to be self-imposed from 15 per cent to 3 per cent in another year. This is an initiative that was launched by the province of Quebec and provides an avenue that is available to every other province to launch. I would assume that my hon. friend would encourage the province of Ontario to look at a similar initiative.

• (1450)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réginald Bélair (Cochrane—Superior):** Mr. Speaker, considering that two more saw mills shut down because of the softwood lumber surtax and high interest rates which result in thousands of Northern Ontario workers being laid off, it has become imperative that senior federal government officials get together with their Ontario provincial counterparts with a view to developing a strategy and cancelling the agreement.

Can the minister tell the House what representations he made to Cabinet to abolish this tax which is driving the Northern Ontario industry into the ground?

[*English*]

**Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of Forestry):** Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to tell my hon. friend that the revenue from the tax accrues to the province of Ontario, as it does to every province where the product is produced.

The industry, together with the provincial governments, has launched an initiative. It is my understanding that the province of Ontario has reluctantly agreed to participate, which will hopefully result in the termination of the tax altogether.

I would like to tell my hon. friend as well that the difficulties that the industry is facing right now have in the main to do with the decline in our major markets, particularly in the United States. Perhaps the exchange rate is another serious problem. Nevertheless I will take the hon. member's comments into account as will my friend, the Minister for International Trade, and work with the province of Ontario to alleviate the problem.

* * *

## SUPPLY MANAGEMENT

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Minister of State for Agriculture.

The minister has remained on the sidelines while supply management has been attacked by editorial boards, foreign governments and misinformed consumer groups. Why has the minister responsible for consumers and for farmers remained so silent on this issue? Will he tell Canadian consumers today, in this House, that they are not paying too much for the supply managed products?

**Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture)):** Mr. Speaker, it would be very interesting to know where the Liberal Party stands on supply management, if it is in favour of it or if it is against it.

This government supports all Canadian farmers across the country, those who are under supply management and those are working on the export market. That is where the government of Canada stands and will stand for a long time.

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party stands right behind Canadian farmers and supply management.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speller:** This is just the latest attack on supply management in the past few weeks. All the while this minister has done nothing while people take pot-shots at supply management. I ask the minister, is his vow of silence self-imposed or has he been instructed to do so by his Conservative colleagues?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture)):** Mr. Speaker, the record of this government speaks for itself and we need not take lessons from anyone.

This was supposed to be a government which upheld the interests of farm and dairy producers, yet it did not even have the courage to maintain a long-term dairy policy at the time we took office. You had left the issue pending for five years. The first thing we did was to implement a long-term dairy policy to defend Canadians farm producers and consumers. As a matter of record, dairy products rose barely 5 per cent in recent years while the cost of living went up 17 per cent.

I am not worried, Mr. Speaker, and the agricultural producers know this government supports them.

* * *

[*English*]

## NATIONAL UNITY

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. Yesterday at the Belanger-Campeau hearings in Quebec City, a Montreal economist, Pierre Fortin, who has worked for both the federal government and the provincial government in Quebec, said that the Bank of Canada is now working on a possible scenario for monetary union with an independent Quebec and that the Department of Finance is working on scenarios to divide up the debt between Canada and an independent Quebec.

I would have thought the federal government might have found it more worthwhile trying to work on plans that unify this country instead of contemplating separation.

That being the case, can the Deputy Prime Minister confirm that these studies are going on, how extensive they are, and what the role is of the Prime Minister's office.

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, obviously, by the hon. member's question, he has come to a conclusion before he has heard the answer.

If the hon. member remembers back to November 1, the Prime Minister told the House that this government is committed to a strong and united Canada, one which is great enough to ensure Quebec its full place. I can inform the hon. member that no such studies are taking place.

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville):** Mr. Speaker, I spoke with the economist in question, Mr. Pierre Fortin, this morning. He confirmed that indeed those studies are taking place.

In light of that conversation, I ask the Deputy Prime Minister whether he will make a statement in the House to tell us what studies are taking place, what plans the government is now contemplating and why it cannot be more forthright and honest with the people of this country over what is a very sensitive issue about the future of Canada?

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, the last time I checked, Pierre Fortin was a representative of the Association of Quebec Economists. He was not with the Bank of Canada, or working for the Department of Finance.

My answer to the first question sticks. There are no such studies.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## VOCATIONAL TRAINING

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration who confessed this morning being totally helpless on the immigration issue and a possible Canada–Quebec agreement. I wish to touch upon another area of her jurisdiction, namely, that of vocational training. She has received a letter from the Quebec Minister of Manpower to the effect that the $350 million she will be saving through the unemployment insurance tax reform on the backs of the Quebec unemployed should normally be used to support vocational training. Would the minister agree to transfer these $350 million to the Quebec Government which has exclusive jurisdiction in the area of vocational training?

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, it is clear that vocational training is a shared responsibility between the two levels of government. I have indeed received Mr. Bourbeau's letter, but the figures quoted therein pertaining to the amounts involved in vocational training and unemployment insurance benefits respectively are not clear. In Quebec, there are other expenses associated with training and unemployment insurance, and I do not agree with him concerning the payments.

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. In other words, for the second time today, the minister has turned a deaf ear to Quebec's quite legitimate request. Under what constitutional authority can she claim to have legislative power in the area of education, since vocational training and education are one and the same, and on what basis does she feel she is empowered to appoint a national commission on vocational training against the province's will? Under what authority could she use such powers which are beyond the federal government's exclusive powers?

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Last Spring, Mr. Speaker, there were negotiations between the provinces and the federal government concerning bilateral and multilateral agreements in the area of training, and Quebec was one of the provinces which signed the agreement. It was their idea that there should be an agreement to benefit the Province of Quebec. It was the Province of Quebec that was the one at the time which conducted the negotiations for all the provinces and not only for Quebec. The Quebec Government signed it.

* * *

• (1500)

[*English*]

## GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

**Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

Two recent developments have cast doubts on the successful completion of the GATT Uruguay Round. The European Community refuses to lower its massive agricultural subsidies. More recently, the United States has said that with regard to trade in services it prefers to deal outside the GATT.

Will the minister tell the House whether these two developments are linked? Is the Canadian government seeking to encourage concessions from the European Community in agriculture in return for U.S. concessions on trade in services?

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad that we have a serious question at least at the end of Question Period.

The position is that these developments are not linked. As the Cairns Group has made clear again today in a statement just issued in Europe, in Geneva, the European Community offer on agriculture is unacceptable as an outcome of the round.

It has offered only modest and ill-defined reductions in internal subsidies by 1996, from what is an historically high base in 1986. Those reductions would not apply equally across agricultural products.

It is not offering substantial reductions in border protection, nor assured increases in market access. In fact it is seeking increased protection in some levels. Nor is it offering any specific commitments to cut its export subsidies which are today ravaging agricultural markets. Therefore the present European Community offer is not a satisfactory basis for negotiation.

With respect to services, there will be no agreement in services unless the United States proves itself to be more flexible in the services negotiation, but a good result there will be very helpful for all countries, certainly including Canada.

* * *

## POINT OF ORDER

### CORRECTION OF ANSWER

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue):** Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to make a correction to an answer that I gave to a question earlier in Question Period.

In the answer in respect of the change in the tax system across the country from the federal sales tax to the GST, particularly as it relates to the province of Nova Scotia, I pointed out that there would be a savings of $10 billion to the people of Nova Scotia. In fact I meant to say it would be a savings of $10 million.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

### WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** As is customary, Madam Speaker, I should like to ask the Government House Leader as I do every Thursday what legislation he intends to call for consideration by the House over the next few days, namely, Friday, Monday and Tuesday.

While I am on my feet, Madam Speaker—

[*English*]

Given the announcement that the Supplementary Estimates will be tabled tomorrow by the President of the Treasury Board and given that these estimates will be tabled at twelve o'clock, in the interest of open government and in the interest of accountable government, especially, I wonder if we could find, Madam Speaker, unanimous consent to have those estimates tabled at ten o'clock when the House resumes tomorrow morning, instead of at twelve o'clock after Question Period, so that the opposition may have a chance to look at those estimates and maybe question the government on them.

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, in answer to the first question, tomorrow it is my intention to call Bill C-92, having to do with Northwest Territories laws. Hopefully we can pass that in three stages. I understand there is some acceptability to that suggestion on all sides.

On Monday I would propose to call Bill C-91, Financial Administration Act amendments. Perhaps we could finish second reading debate on that.

On Tuesday I would like to continue report stage of Bill C-40, respecting the Broadcasting Act.

I will be discussing with my colleagues in the opposition parties further business for Wednesday and the rest of next week.

In answer to the second question, of course one knows that the information and knowledge that Canadians gain from this institution is enhanced when there is adequate time to understand, to do the research and the proper background studies to pose questions that are sensible and appropriate.

Providing members of the opposition with the weekend to read the estimates allows them to think about the more substantial issues and come forward on Monday with properly posed questions to which answers will be promptly and fully provided. This is serving the people of Canada in a far superior manner than that suggested by my hon. colleague, the leader of the Liberal Party in the House.

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Madam Speaker, I rise on the same point that was raised by the House leader of the Liberal Party and responded to by the government House leader.

I think it is entirely appropriate that this House have the Supplementary Estimates tabled at ten o'clock. As we saw today during Question Period, every question that we asked in relationship to rumours that are out there were answered with: wait till tomorrow. If we do not move the tabling to ten o'clock tomorrow morning, the answer will be: wait till Monday to ask those questions.

I think it is the responsibility of this House to ensure that the information is out there in a timely fashion so that we can question the government and that over the weekend the people of Canada can decide what exactly it is that the government has done.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Madam Speaker, I want to suggest to the government House leader that what we are after tomorrow morning is to be able to analyse the information in question and to hold the government accountable, which is the role of this House. It is our duty as members of Parliament to do that.

What we want from the minister is quite clear. He can, if he would like, with our consent, table those documents at 10 a.m. and give us an advance briefing in the morning. Members of Parliament would be very much prepared to have that kind of briefing if the government would offer it. If not, members will be left to conclude that the government would like for the Canadian public to have the weekend to forget about the issue in part, before being accountable to it late Monday afternoon.

Why not get the information tomorrow morning and have the government stand up and be held to account for the actions that it takes? Surely those cuts are not that offensive that the government does not want us to ask questions about them?

**Mr. Andre:** Madam Speaker, the procedure for handling estimates is laid out in the Standing Orders. It provides that the estimates are tabled in the House and then referred to appropriate committees of the House so that careful, responsible, detailed analysis of each and every item can occur.

What we have here are declarations by the opposition, in essence, that the way in which we have careful, full, detailed analysis of government expenditure plans is through Question Period.

Surely anyone who watches this today or any other day would be horrified by the judgment that Question Period is the appropriate vehicle through which careful, thoughtful analysis of government programs or expenditure plans should be made. It clearly is not.

We discussed, I will concede to the opposition, whether it would be appropriate to bring in the estimates on Monday or bring them in on Friday. In fact some of us, myself included, thought that perhaps as an experiment we would see if providing a weekend for some more thoughtful analysis might result in a little less cheap shots, cheap accusations, and the kind of partisan debate that goes on which distorts what is happening and does not serve the people of Canada well.

Work on it over the weekend. Ask some sensible questions on Monday.

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Madam Speaker, I think the government House leader does himself and the House a disservice. He is fully aware that the Standing Orders have always been changed for such matters as the budget, but the Standing Orders have always required that the House obtain unanimous consent in order that the Minister of Finance can deliver his budget at a time when the government wishes, and we do so.

• (1510 )

The Supplementary Estimates should be treated in the same manner, because what in effect is happening, especially this year, is that the government is altering in a significant way its budgetary appropriations.

In addition—and I wish the government House Leader would stay—he is fully aware that the government is not allowing some of the standing committees to operate. I use the Standing Committee on Transport as an example.

If the Supplementary Estimates are tabled tomorrow and they are automatically referred to the appropriate standing committees, and if the Standing Committee on Transport is not allowed to meet, how does Parliament have any process to review the government's estimates? We are denied the very reason for our existence, because we are here to supervise the estimates of the government.

**Mr. Benjamin:** We do not even have a chairman.

**Mr. Murphy:** Madam Speaker, if the government is unwilling to table the estimates in a manner that the opposition can reply, if the government is unwilling to allow committees to operate in such a way that they can review in detail these estimates, then we have to question the intent of the government.

I would also say, not in the way of a threat but in the way of recognizing the way things happen here, that if the government is not willing to co-operate with the opposition it cannot expect us to co-operate with it on other matters.

**Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke):** Madam Speaker, it is quite clear that by refusing to allow the opposition to raise questions on the tabling of the estimates tomorrow, the government is once again riding roughshod over the opposition in this House.

The Prime Minister and cabinet met and committed Canada to the Persian Gulf without recalling Parliament. Now, when they are bringing in estimates that are supposed to arrange for the payment of that project, they are again refusing this House the right to question the government in Question Period tomorrow.

It is just another example of the dictatorship we are seeing across the floor of the House.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Madam Speaker, my point in connection with the refusal that we are faced with on the part of the government today has to do with the rules under Standing Order 81.

As hon. members know, the final day for dealing with the Supplementary Estimates is December 10. That is the day on which the last supply day of the period must be held. On that day the supply bill will be introduced passing these estimates. They are deemed to be reported at least three days before that day, not less than three sitting days before the final sitting or the last allotted day in the current period.

If the government calls the allotted day of the current period before December 10, three days before that date, whenever that is, these estimates will be deemed back from the committee. They are going to be referred to the committee tomorrow. We know that, but we are not going to be able to ask questions on them tomorrow. They will go to the committees, and sometime next week some of the committees may meet to consider these estimates.

**Mr. Gauthier:** May.

**Mr. Milliken:** May. That is the shocking thing. There will be only two weeks left then effectively for the committees of this House to study these Supplementary Estimates.

We have been asking for these estimates to be tabled in this House for weeks and weeks. The government House leader has twiddled his thumbs and done nothing. Now he will be bringing them in tomorrow and does not have the decency to present them to the House at ten o'clock so that we can ask questions on them at eleven o'clock.

He makes up this phoney excuse that we need time to prepare our questions. We are quite capable of preparing questions in an hour, and very sensible questions. He may not like them. We usually make extremely good questions, and the hon. member knows it. It is the ministers who have difficulty giving the answers in this House. That is the problem. We can make up perfectly proper questions by eleven o'clock and be ready to deal with these estimates tomorrow in a fair and reasonable way.

I ask the government House leader to show some reasonable co-operation on this point.

**Mr. Guy H. Arseneault (Restigouche—Chaleur):** Madam Speaker, I would like to support my colleagues by saying that the estimates should be tabled tomorrow before Question Period and, if not, maybe the government should do what it has done in the past and table them late tonight in the press gallery like it did with a budget not too long ago.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** If I may, the Chair has been quite patient in listening to comments from all sides.

It seems to me that the government House leader has heard what the opposition had to say on the subject, and that the answer which he gave previously is to stand.

I think it would really be better for the House to move on to other business. I notice there is another point of order. I know that the hon. minister has asked to be recognized on a special tribute.

If we want to debate the motion which is now before the House, I think we should proceed.

**Mr. Angus:** Madam Speaker, I listened to your words carefully, and I listened to the words of the minister. He has said no.

The House wants unanimous consent tomorrow to proceed through all three readings of a very important bill. If this government is not prepared to co–operate with the opposition when we want to get information tabled in this House one hour earlier, then Madam Speaker, we will have to consider whether we co–operate to allow legislation to proceed tomorrow through all three readings.

* * *

## POINT OF ORDER

### AIR QUALITY IN WEST BLOCK

**Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary Northeast):** Madam Speaker, my point of order concerns the air quality in the West Block.

I would like to table some documents that I wrote to Mr. Cloutier, the Sergeant–at–Arms in December 1989. I asked for quality control, especially concerning asbestos.

Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Chair to investigate the quality of air in the West Block and in the Wellington Building as well. I am going to table the documents.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I thank the hon. member. This is a question that is being taken very seriously by the Speaker and by members of the House. It will be proceeded with and investigated as it should.

* * *

## THE LATE ROBERT SIMPSON

**Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of Forestry):** Madam Speaker, I beg your indulgence, and that of our colleagues, to say a few words in tribute to a former colleague in the House of Commons whose 15 years of service left an indelible mark on our country.

I speak of Robert (Bud) Simpson, member of Parliament for Churchill from 1957 to 1972, who died last week at the age of 80.

Before his death, he had the satisfaction of seeing much of what he had advocated in this House become reality. After winning six elections, he decided not to run for re–election in 1972, when I was first elected to Parliament.

At that time, the name of Bud Simpson meant something to us freshmen who arrived here, because he had charted a course of parliamentary conduct which all of us would have liked to follow.

Like myself, he represented people of a vast and far flung region of our country, larger than many European countries. He was sent to Parliament in 1957 when travel in the riding and in parts of northern Canada were very difficult and required great sacrifice.

The sacrifice he made and the hardship he endured in his travels were shared by his family. He had a profound sense of duty and commitment. In fact, his daughter followed in his footsteps. She served as my constituency secretary for 15 years.

Bud Simpson was a highly principled man as those who know him would attest. He represented his constituency well. He called for airports and landing strips in The Pas, Thompson and throughout the north.

He never let an opportunity go by in this House to remind decision–makers that Churchill was as much a port on an ocean as those on the Atlantic and on the Pacific. He made us mindful of the vigour and the strength of new Canadians as residents in the northern region.

He insisted Canada should not speak of a national broadcasting system until the people in isolated areas and villages also could be part of it. He thought it was unjust for urban dwellers in our country to have colour TV before his people even had black and white television.

• (1520)

He advanced and defended the Roads to Resources concept for the development of infrastructure which it brought to the north. He called for the decentralization of government to the north.

As we all know, Bud Simpson's riding contained 17 Indian reserves, a significant Métis population, and the Inuit of the territories which was then part of Churchill. He represented their interests with passion and compassion here in Ottawa. He asked that a Claims Commission be established and eventually, it was.

He argued for better education, health care and electric power in native homes. He advocated recognition of treaty rights long before recognition was entrenched in the Canadian Constitution.

Equally ahead of his time, Bud Simpson used his last years in this House on what are now known as environmental issues. He called for a national park at Churchill and wildlife reserves on the Nelson River. Even then he warned about the damage of pesticides, mercury pollution and DDT. That was 30 years ago. Bud Simpson would also like us to remember him as one of western Canada's most avid and active participants in the sport of hockey.

Madam Speaker, I know you will want to join me and our colleagues in this House in celebrating perhaps, the life of Bud Simpson and in expressing to his wife, Phyllis, his daughters Jackie and Geri, our most sincere deep sympathy.

**Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke):** Madam Speaker, I would like to join the hon. minister in paying tribute to Bud Simpson.

He was first elected to this House in 1957, re-elected in 1958, 1962, 1963, 1965 and 1968. That is a very good record.

Coming from the large riding of Churchill, he was often very active in the House of Commons and was obviously a good constituency representative. He also added a great deal to his community. He was president of the Flin Flon Community Club for some time. He was very active in recreation with young people and for some 35 years was very much involved in organized hockey across western Canada.

Today we in the Liberal Party join with others in this House in paying tribute to Bud Simpson. The minister put it very well. It is a time to celebrate his life and to remember that people who go through this House make a great contribution in many different ways to Canada. Bud Simpson was one of those people. We extend sympathy to his wife and four children.

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Madam Speaker, on behalf of the New Democratic Party and as the member from Churchill, I wish to rise and extend my condolences to his family.

I knew Bud Simpson only briefly when he was elected for a number of years and I was still teaching in the community of Thompson. I know that he fought hard for the constituents of the Churchill riding.

As I listened to the issues that were mentioned by the minister I thought, some of those issues are still being fought for today. We are still looking for airports in part of the riding. We still have communities in the remote part of the Churchill riding that Bud Simpson would recognize that still do not have local Manitoba television. They are not in a position to receive television from the province of Manitoba. As a result, they cannot get any local coverage of what is happening in the province in which they live.

The issue of land claims for native people is yet to be resolved. There are still many communities in the riding, especially native communities, and the port of Churchill, that do not have roads going into those communities.

One of the other issues that was raised by the minister is the requirement for adequate hydro service. In many of those communities there is still an ongoing struggle by the people of that region.

Having talked to constituents, they believe that Bud Simpson was a very dedicated man. He worked very hard and he travelled throughout the riding. He was well known, especially in the community of Flin Flon where he resided. He was active in the Community Club, and was a very enthusiastic hockey fan and manager of the Flin Flon Bombers the year they won the Memorial Cup, beating out the community team from Ottawa-Hull in the finals. He will certainly be very much remembered by the people of the Churchill riding.

Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to make a personal plea. I would like to point out that, by the peculiar nature of the pension plan that members of the House of Commons have, his widow, whom he married in 1977, after the death of his first wife and to whom he was married for 13 years, will not receive a pension because he married her after he had ceased to be a member of Parliament. I would hope this House, recognizing the injustice that is being done, would take the appropriate steps to ensure that the survivor's benefit is given to his wife because they were together for many years.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I would ask the House to join me in a moment of silence while we remember our former colleague.

[*Editor's Note: The House stood in silence for one minute.*]

[*Translation*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** 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 Scarborough—Agincourt (Mr. Karygiannis)—Refugees; the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam (Mr. Waddell)—Indian Affairs; the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Milliken)—Bill C-69.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### BILL C-80

REFERENCE OF SUBJECT MATTER TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre) (p. 15566); and the amendment of Mr. MacLellan (p.15584).

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise on behalf of the New Democratic Party to address this motion. Let me just recap where we are on this matter.

You will recall that we were talking about gun control and, as a reaction to the terrible tragedy on December 6, 1989, almost a year ago, and also after some pressure from other sources, the government brought in Bill C-80, to amend the Criminal Code to stiffen the control of guns in Canada.

This bill was given first reading in the House of Commons, and we were waiting to consider it in principle. Normally what happens is that the bill is tabled, then we have a debate at second reading on the principle of the bill, and then it goes to committee. At committee, we hear from numerous witnesses who make suggestions for changes in the bill, amendments are made, the bill is brought back to the House for third reading and then the bill goes to the Senate and, after Royal Assent, it becomes the law of Canada.

What has happened today is really quite extraordinary. The Minister of Justice stood up in the House and said that she was not going to bring in Bill C-80. She said that instead she would bring in a motion stating that the subject matter of this bill be referred to a committee for pre-study. That is extraordinary. I rose, on behalf of my party, and the member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys rose, on behalf of the Liberal party, to say that we were prepared to have a short debate today. We would adopt the government's own bill and send it to committee, but the government refused our offer. The government is in fact filibustering and rejecting its own bill.

• (1530)

Let there be no doubt about it that this represents a major defeat for the new Minister of Justice. She has lost a major battle in cabinet. It means in fact that she has been defeated by the gun lobby.

There is a group of people in Canada that does not like gun control and does not want gun control. They are like the American gun lobby and are now being more and more effective in blocking gun control. That does not include not all people who possess guns. There is also a group—I think the majority—of people in rural areas, in gun clubs and in hunting and fishing clubs, who accept gun control. This is very important. But they want a workable system of gun control that is not too bureaucratic but makes sense, and they have made a number of suggestions as to how that can be done. I will come back to that a little later in my speech.

I found it extraordinary, a sad and humiliating sight, to see this minister rise and in fact filibuster against her own bill by bringing in this ridiculous and farcical motion. What are we doing? We are sending the material to a committee, when we see on the *Order Paper* that we may later debate Bill C-80. If we pass that, it will go to another committee.

I do not know why the minister just did not say that she lost the battle and does not have support among her colleagues for her bill. I half expected the minister to get up and offer her resignation, but she did not do that. As a matter of fact, she did something worse.

The Minister got up and made reference to her meeting with the university students in Montreal. On April 10, 1990, she was at the engineering school at the École Polytechnique, the place where 14 women were gunned down by Marc Lépine last December. She was given 25 boxes of petitions. Here is an article about it by David Johnston in the Montreal *Gazette* and a picture. Those petitions bore the names of 516,487 Canadians calling for tougher gun control laws. It is now up to 700,000 people calling for this law and, as she mentioned in her speech today, she took the petitions and said she sympathized with these people. Such hypocrisy, Madam Speaker. Such hypocrisy on behalf of the minister.

Why did she not just tell the truth? Why did she not just go down to Montreal and to the other parts of the country and tell people the truth? If she had been honest, she would have said: "Look, I lost this battle in cabinet. I cannot get the support of the Conservative back bench on this bill and, therefore. I cannot proceed with the bill."

Instead, the government tried to cover it up to try to make it look like it was making progress in this bill. She said: "I am frustrated by the lack of progress in the bill." Well, the government controls the agenda. It could get a Hibernia bill through like that. It got the GST through—at least the House—like that.

The government controls the agenda and she comes forward saying: "I am frustrated at the lack of progress." The government then takes the bill, rejects our support of the bill, and puts a motion to committee that we will examine the substance of this bill. But we will not have voted in principle on the bill.

It is one pure incompetence on the part of the government, and my friend from Cape Breton—The Sydneys outlined perfectly how there are two motions and another bill on the *Order Paper*. There is incompetence here. But, worse than incompetence, there is a lack of political will.

The minister was faced with her first tough problem and she collapsed. I feel very sad for her. I feel very sad for the people she talked to in Montreal and for the 700,000 people who signed that petition.

I had hoped that this minister would be different and a different sort of person than her mentor, the Prime Minister. I thought she might be somewhat more honest and somewhat more straightforward. The first big test comes and she is just a mini-Mulroney. She has taken after the boss. I guess that is the price one has to pay to be in the Prime Minister's favour.

She says she wants her members to speak on this. Well, bring them in and have them speak. We are waiting. Bring them in. We were prepared to let Bill C-80 go through. I find that extraordinary. The opposition offers that the bill will go through in principle and then the government says: "No, no. We want to bring in our members to filibuster our own bill."

I know it is not an easy problem. The minister said that. It is a difficult issue because rural Canada has some difficulties with gun control, but the answer is not to cave in completely. The answer is to take the bill, the real bill, the real stuff, get it into committee, and amend the bill so that it is workable and so that we can have a workable system of gun control.

I challenge the minister to go back to the engineering students in Montreal and tell them: "I copped out on you. I did not have the guts and the political will when it came down to it to really press for my bill. I put a farcical procedure. I sent this thing off to committee where it will disappear, a special committee hearing on to the infinite future. The House will be prorogued and it will be gone."

The minister seems to think that she can bring it back. She has given her opposition a tremendous victory here and it is a real defeat for the minister. I say that sadly because I had hoped better for this minister and I think the country was expecting better.

I just want to give a little bit of the history of firearms control so that we can put it into context. In 1978 the current gun control law was passed in amendment to the Criminal Code by the House of Commons. There were

provisions enforcing mandatory firearms training in that bill, and the minister mentioned this, but this has never been enacted to this day. The gun clubs and so on, who have legitimate concerns about gun control, have always said we need courses so that people can get properly trained in using guns. They say if people are trained in the guns for hunting, trapping, and for shooting purposes in gun clubs and so on, then there is no danger. They have always been in favour of that.

Has the minister proclaimed it? No, but she wants to speed it along quickly. She wants to get moving. She has not done this. The government's package says that it will have the program in place by April 1991, that is 13 years after the act passed the House of Commons. A snail would make it look fast on this one.

In January 1989, in Stockton, California, a man with a military hang-up, he claimed, was armed with an AK-47 semi-automatic assault rifle and two pistols. He fired 110 rounds from his rifle, killed five children, and injured 29 others. As a result, the state of California responded to the tragedy by banning the sale, possession, or manufacture of some semi-automatic weapons.

On March 14 last, President Bush announced a suspension of the importation of assault weapons. So, even the Americans, who have a stronger gun control lobby than we have, took some action. The incident provided a new impetus for calls for tougher laws in Canada. That was in January, 1989.

In June 1989, the government announced its intent to introduce in the fall legislation controlling the importation, possession, and sale of semi-automatic and automatic weapons. It got an agreement from the federal-provincial ministers, so it was making progress. Of course, it did not introduce it in the fall of last year.

On December 6, 1989, as we know full well, there was the great tragedy at the École Polytechnique in Montreal where 14 women were gunned down.

• (1540 )

On April 19, 1990 a petition was presented to the minister with 516,000 names, and it now has 700,000 names.

On June 27, 1990 the minister introduced Bill C-80. She said: "We're going to push this bill through". She called it a modest proposal. Well, if it is a modest proposal and if she intended to push it through, why is she, in effect, ditching her bill today? Why? It is really incredible. This represents a substantial defeat for the minister. She should consider very seriously whether she can continue being Minister of Justice.

**Mrs. Browes:** That's nonsense!

**Mr. Waddell:** It is not nonsense at all. It is a major piece of legislation, a major constituency, and the Tory back bench revolted.

We have a notion of confidence in this Parliament. What confidence means in Parliament is that the Cabinet has the confidence of the House of Commons and has a majority in the House of Commons. A minister must have confidence behind him or her. This minister got up today to speak on a bill and she does not have the confidence of her own party with respect to her own bill. It is extraordinary. It seems to me that should be grounds for considering a resignation.

Now, I do not want to see that. This is a new minister. As I said, a promising minister. She comes from British Columbia. Vancouver is a good place to come from. There is lots of promise there, but this represents a substantial defeat for that minister. I hope that she can somehow bounce back from that.

The government has lost its political will and has caved in to the gun lobby in Canada. I feel sorry for the minister, but that was her choice.

I want to point out something about Bill C-80. People say that Bill C-80 is too difficult or too controversial, although the minister did not say that it could not be passed. Let me just list the problems with Bill C-80. I have a letter I received from the B.C. Wildlife Federation. From my own riding there is *The Barnet Marksmen*, a publication from Port Moody, B.C. There is a gun range there. There are all kinds of other submissions that have come to MPs. They have seen them all. I have another submission from the Mission and District Rod and Gun Club. Here is a magazine from Alberta, *Fishing and hunting*, in which the complaints were set forward. Let me just go through some of the difficulties.

People say: "We have problems in rural Canada with the cooling off period on every renewal of a firearms' acquisition certificate. Will we need to keep doing that every time it is renewed? Will that not make it more difficult for us to trap and hunt?" Well, yes, but the way

to deal with that is to tighten up the bill and perhaps consider an amendment so that in a renewal there is not a cooling off period by the same person. They could renew it instantly, for example, at the same time that it expires. We could look at better regulations, a better way of dealing with people in rural areas. That is one complaint and one possible amendment or areas of amendment.

Second, they are worried that, under the bill, you have to have guarantors. What is the liability of these guarantors who sign the application form? Well, we could consider that. We could consider some sort of limitation of liability or a better setting of the liability of the guarantors. That could be done by amendment.

Third, people say that five and ten shots in a magazine really limits what they can do. It will be lead to people mutilating their guns. I think we can have a look at that, and if necessary, the government could come up with a program to buy out certain guns. It would cost money, but it could do it if it is really serious about having a workable gun control system.

The fourth area of concern that I have picked out of this is that they are worried about having to get a picture on ID. It is like getting a passport. They have to get people to sign for them and so on. I think we might be able to deal with that in terms of less bureaucratic regulations, less red tape. Maybe there could be different regulations for rural areas as opposed to cities. That would be an intelligent way of dealing with it.

They are worried about the grandfather clause in the bill, that it would not allow the inheritance of some part of a gun collection. Maybe you are to inherit a gun collection, some of which may be semi-automatics and so on. You cannot in fact inherit that. You would have to give that back. There might be ways of dealing with that in the bill.

You will notice that all the legitimate gun clubs and gun people support mandatory firearms training. The Mission people I referred to before clearly set out in their letter to me that they favour a mandatory system and firearms training so that people learn how to use guns.

These are difficulties, but they are not fatal difficulties. A government which really knows how to govern and a minister who really has the political will could have faced this and brought in the bill.

My friend for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce has also met with the people in Montreal. I hope and trust that he will be speaking about that later as well as about this notion of political will. I recall a speech he gave in the House some time ago under his private members' bill in which he dealt with some of the arguments. For example, only criminals have guns.

We should be going after criminals, not people who get guns. In fact, two-thirds of homicides in this country are not committed by professional killers. They are committed in families. They are committed by people who in a rage or who are temporarily or permanently insane—not insane in law—but who are deeply uncontrolled and upset; disturbed like Marc Lépine was and others have been. They grab a gun and they use it.

The intent of Bill C-80, as I see from a realistic reading of it, and which everybody agrees with, is that we need a bill that will make people pause before they buy a gun; that the people who get a gun know how to use a gun and are sane. That is what everyone wants.

I do not want to go into the terms of the bill. I have suggested some amendments. Let me conclude by saying that this is a dishonest, disreputable move by the government. This committee is going to be a farce.

One will have to consider whether one should even sit on the committee. Why did the government not have the political will to proceed with the bill, to listen to people in rural and other areas who have legitimate concerns, and amend the bill properly in committee? That would be the best way to do it and that is how we would get the end that we want. We want a system of gun control, but one that is realistic for everyone in the country.

The government and the minister really copped out on this one. I think this represents a substantial defeat in cabinet for the new Minister of Justice.

**Mrs. Pauline Browes (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State of Canada and Minister of State (Multiculturalism and Citizenship)):** Madam Speaker, I have had an opportunity to listen to some of the comments by the hon. member. I am most concerned about some of them which has really moved me to stand today to ask a few questions and to put a few things on the record.

This is an area of gun control which, when legislation was brought forward in the late 1970s, really stimulated a lot of emotional debate. Bill C–80 has also stimulated a great deal of controversy.

Some months ago I made a recommendation that a firearm manufactured as an automatic weapon, converted to a semi-automatic, brought into the country and then very easily converted back to automatic, should be banned from the country. I am very pleased that in this legislation, Bill C–80, concerning military weapons, that has been included as the major point of this bill.

• (1550 )

I am concerned that the hon. member would say what he has about putting this to a special committee. I happen to think that it is an excellent idea to have this go to a special committee, that we have an opportunity to discuss it now and not wait until it is past second reading because I had a chance to visit with a number of gun clubs this past summer to discuss some of the details of this of concern.

I have spoken to a number of policemen, including the chief of police for metro Toronto, and they are most concerned about the proliferation of guns in the hands of criminals in metro Toronto. I think that it is an excellent idea to have this sent to a special committee now.

I want to know if the member is at the point that he does not want to listen to anybody out there. He just wants to talk about it here. We think it is a good idea to get to a special committee to talk about this now, listen to the people, and if there are some amendments that need to be made, indeed they will be made.

It is an opportunity to discuss it now.

**Mr. Waddell:** Madam Speaker, the member says we do not want to listen to people.

I precisely said that we want to put the government's bill in a committee, listen to witnesses and get evidence. That is the real process.

This is a sham. This is not the real process.

I would like to ask the member: Is she going to tell the chief of police of metropolitan Toronto that she has effectively sabotaged the gun control bill which he favoured? That is exactly what she has done.

What is she going to tell her constituents in Toronto when they ask her why she stopped gun control, even a modest proposal? What is she going to tell them? How does she feel about the first woman Minister of Justice who voted against choice and, second, is unable or unwilling to fulfil her promises to Canadian women who learned last December that it is women who are the greatest victims of lax gun control and violence in our cities in this country?

I would like to know what she is going to say. I think she is going to have a little bit of hard swallowing to do.

Madam Speaker, while I am on my feet, I had inadvertently forgot to introduce this. This sometimes happens when one gets in flight. I forgot to introduce a subamendment to the Liberal amendment. I would ask permission to do that.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I would need unanimous consent for the hon. member to present an amendment to the amendment at this time. Is there unanimous consent?

**An hon. member:** No.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I do not have unanimous consent.

We will continue with questions or comments.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Denis Pronovost (Saint–Maurice):** Madam Speaker, I listened very carefully to the comments made by the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam. Like my colleague, I felt obliged to rise in the House because what the hon. member said was entirely at odds with the practice of his party, the NDP. Our socialist friends are normally terribly keen on all kinds of committees, but now that this government wants to appoint a committee to study all aspects of the question, the hon. member of the New Democratic Party tells us this would be one committee too many and that it would be a waste of time.

Madam Speaker, when the government makes a decision, those same members tell us, now listen, you are making decisions without consulting the people, without consulting Canadians who want to make their views

known. So in the circumstances, it is very difficult to take seriously what was said by the hon. member from Port Moody—Coquitlam because tomorrow he will say the exact opposite about something else.

The Canadian government wishes to consult Canadians because this question is very controversial, for instance, in the riding of Saint-Maurice, and has given rise to three or four different trends. I think it is quite reasonable for the Minister of Justice, who has the full support of members on this side of the House, to proceed in this way.

I cannot say the same for the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam, Madam Speaker, who has been a member of this House since 1979 but failed to receive the confidence of his party colleagues at the NDP convention. He was soundly defeated, despite his experience, by someone who was a newcomer to politics.

So before criticizing our confidence in the Minister of Justice, the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam should consider the total lack of confidence displayed by his colleagues and party militants.

Madam Speaker, I think it is very important for us in this situation to realize that Canadian citizens are very much aware the question is not as straightforward as the hon. member for the NDP would have us believe. In concluding, I would like to say that this kind of legislation is not cut and dried. The situation is complex. Hunters are involved, people who collect firearms and, of course, criminals. And there are also our police forces and the Armed Forces. Firearms exist in this country.

The easiest solution would be to abolish them outright, but I don't think we have reached that point yet. I would ask the hon. member for the NDP to give very serious consideration to being an active participant and to decide not to boycott the committee proposed today.

[*English*]

**Mr. Waddell:** Madam Speaker, that is a bit of a cheap shot. In my election campaign I got more votes for less money than all the other candidates of both leadership contests in the last year. That must be worth something.

The Minister of Justice ran for the leadership of the Social Credit Party in British Columbia. I think she came about where I came on the pecking order, and she went on to become the Minister of Justice. That is not too bad.

[*Translation*]

Furthermore, the hon. member should realize that what we have here is a bill that concerns firearms. Today, we agreed with the Liberal Party to adopt this bill, and it was the government that decided to appoint another committee. I want to ask the hon. member this: What is he going to say to the young women at the École polytechnique in Montreal? He voted against the firearms bill, although he supports the government that tabled the bill. The minister promised students in Montreal a year ago that the government would support this kind of legislation. What is he going to say to the students in Montreal?

[*English*]

Instead we have another committee. They have rejected their own law. It is a victory for the gun lobby. That is pretty sad, is it not? What is he going to say to these students in Montreal about that?

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The period for questions and comments has now expired. Resuming debate.

**Mr. Doug Fee (Red Deer):** Madam Speaker, I could say it goes without saying, but in this House it seems that nothing ever goes without saying. I do not accept the conclusions that were arrived at by my hon. predecessor. However, I was very interested in his comments, as I was interested in the comments by the hon. member for Cape Breton—The Sydneys and the minister earlier this morning.

Every thinking Canadian has to agree with the objective behind this legislation. Every one of us wants a safer, saner society where no one has to fear unduly for their own safety.

I support many of the provisions that are in this bill. I know very well and I have heard first hand that many people have serious concerns.

**Mr. Waddell:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I hesitate to interrupt my hon. friend, but we are not debating the bill. We are debating a motion to refer to committee. If we were debating the bill, the government would have called the bill.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** If the hon. member shows a little bit of patience, I would imagine that his colleague would make this quite relevant to the motion which is before the House.

• (1600 )

**Mr. Fee:** Madam Speaker, my intention will become very clear very quickly. I know very well that people have concerns. They have been expressed to me, as I am sure they have been to every member of this House. Some of the concerns that have been expressed to us are valid. Some might have been exaggerated because of lack of information or perhaps misunderstanding. However, these concerns deserve to be expressed and deserve to be responded to before we proceed any further with this bill.

I am very pleased for the opportunity, on behalf of some of these individuals and myself, to speak today to the bill and to the motion to refer it. I want to encourage this House to allow the establishment of a committee that will hear from concerned Canadians and responsible firearm users before proceeding any further.

I was also encouraged this morning to hear the reply to the question offered by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce by the minister when she said that the committee would not be restricting itself to the narrow confines of what is included in the bill but can look at the regulations in a broader picture. I feel that is important.

There are many responsible firearms users in Canada who can help us. Many of them were solicited for input prior to the drafting of this legislation. I asked the minister for a list of those consulted, and I have been informed that the previous minister had conducted extensive consultations from July through September of last year. Major firearms interest groups had the opportunity at that time to make submissions outlining concerns and suggestions. Meetings were held with representatives of police departments, the Shooting Federation of Canada, the Canadian Wildlife Federation, Canadian Chiefs of Police, Canadian Sporting Arms and Ammunition Association, the National Firearms Association, and the Dominion of Canada Rifle Association. All these groups were consulted.

Now that we have a legislative package together, I feel they deserve the opportunity to respond. They want as much as we do to ensure the safety of Canadians. They have a vested interest in their sport in promoting the safe use of firearms. They deserve to be involved, and they deserve to be listened to again. I am sure that every member of this House who represents a rural riding has already heard from many of their members.

Since the bill was introduced in June, I have received numerous representations from several constituents. My riding includes a large urban area, the city of Red Deer. It is surrounded by hundreds of square miles of open productive farm land which leads into the foothills of the beautiful Rocky Mountains. It is an area of incredible scenery and beauty. It is also an area of good, natural hunting. It would be an exaggeration to say that absolutely everybody hunts and is involved, but it would be quite accurate to say that everyone knows those who do, and there are a lot of them.

I have received some letters from hunters and gun club members who live in the city, but by far the largest proportion of my mail has been from the rural area: from farmers and ranchers who use firearms for predator control, from legitimate hunters who have pursued their sport safely for many years, and from members of gun clubs and people who pride themselves in the safe handling of firearms.

The fact that the bulk of my mail comes from the rural area illustrates a problem. The problem is the same as we have with many other issues in this House. In this large and diverse country of ours perceptions differ between groups, between cultural groups, between regional groups, and sometimes between linguistic groups. Here I see a difference in perception basically between the rural and urban perspective. Legitimate gun owners are not restricted to rural areas, but there are more of them in the rural area. Problems and abuses with firearms are not restricted to the urban areas, but they occur more often there.

When it comes to drafting legislation, the drafters tend to be the urban folk, those who do not always have the experience they need to understand the rural position. Because of the large rural population of my riding, I have received a great deal of mail. Their concerns have been expressed to me, and I feel it is my duty to represent those concerns both to the minister and to this House.

I appreciate being recognized and allowed to express these concerns this early in the debate on the motion today. I should add that the minister is well aware of my concerns. She does not share all of them, but she has been available and she has listened. I am very conscious of the intense feelings that exist toward the abuse of firearms. I am also aware that there are intense feelings toward the abuse of many substances, such as alcohol, drugs, and anything else that could cause potential disruption in our society.

The minister and this House are under intense pressure to legislate on the matter that is before us today. It is important that the legislation accomplish what is intended. It is important that it be understood and accepted by members of the general population. If it is not understood and accepted, they will not respect it. If there is no respect for the law, people will find a way to avoid it and get around it.

We as a country do not have the resources or the inclination to run a police state. We cannot go into every household in the country to enforce the law. Like all other concerned parliamentarians, I have relayed the concerns and questions that have been given to me to the minister. I know she has met with me and several others who like myself have legitimate concerns with the bill. I also know that she has heard from other people who support complete abolition of firearms.

I understand the difficulties and the questions, but we need to have legitimate, honest, law-abiding owners and users of firearms understand and accept the law if it is to work. It is true that some of the concerns they expressed might be exaggerated, but others are real.

In addition to specific items that I will get into in a few minutes, the major concern that I have heard is the amount of power that this act would give to regulation. People want to know who will be writing those regulations.

Those of us in the House who are more involved in this system and have got to know it, who understand how regulations are drafted, would perhaps have confidence that those regulations will be well balanced and well written.

However there is a lot of mistrust of politicians. Many people are resentful of regulations that are imposed on them to address a problem that they do not see as their own. That is what they see us doing in this case. We are regulating good, honest, law-abiding citizens to prevent a problem that they see happening somewhere else.

This gets more complicated when we state that the power of regulation is going to be delegated to another body. Most people have enough trouble with us, and now they are concerned that some nameless, faceless group of well meaning people who will be given the power to set regulations that will affect their hobby, possibly their employment, and definitely their own legally purchased property.

I will get to some specific examples that my constituents have shared with me. In addition to letters from constituents, I am sure we have all received regular mailings from groups like the National Firearms Association. It is quite interesting that although in one of its recent publications the National Firearms Association says that it was not consulted when the act was drafted, the department says that it did meet with the National Firearms Association in August 1989 prior to drafting the legislation. That fact aside, the legislation has now been drafted and presented, and I think the National Firearms Association does represent people who deserve to be heard.

In reading some of its publications, it tends to be what might be called inflammatory. Perhaps it overstates some things and exaggerates its argument in certain cases. Some people seem to think you have to do that to make a point with politicians.

Debate in this House often leads itself to overstatement and occasionally even exaggeration. When dealing in this House, we have learned to look beyond the overstatement, beyond the exaggeration, and occasionally accept that within the rhetoric and overstatement there is often a grain of reason and a valid point. I think that holds for the National Firearms Association. It has some good suggestions. If we can get beyond some of its rather forceful statements, it is worth listening to.

One interesting fact gleaned from its pages is that members of the organization can get $1 million in liability insurance to cover them while shooting for only $4.50. At first it was just to cover them while shooting at ranges, but their positive experience allowed them to extend it to hunting as well. The fact that they can get

that much insurance at that low a premium rate reflects very well on its members as responsible firearms users.

In addition to some of the exaggerated language it uses, I did not like an admonition that it recently gave its members not to write to us as members of Parliaments with comments and suggestions but rather just say that the National Firearms Association spoke for them. I am very thankful that many of my constituents ignored that advice and wrote. After I received the first large batch of letters I, along with several other people, met with the minister to discuss them.

I wrote back to the constituents soliciting some further factual data. I have been very impressed with the response with the exception of one, and I only had one, I guess I would call, belligerent, obnoxious correspondent. The rest replied with very serious, well thought out letters. They gave me specific examples and detailed legitimate concerns.

Included in the consensus I received was one basic one: their concern about the right of Canadians to own and enjoy property. Previously the Government of Canada has legislated rights and freedoms, but we missed what most of my correspondents and I consider to be an essential element.

• (1610)

This Parliament should recognize the right of Canadians to own property. It is not right that a government, or worse yet regulatory body, can declare a legally purchased article restricted and demand that it be surrendered without compensation.

Generally the correspondents all had a problem with the thrust of the bill. Most of them are willing to accept the need for firearms control, but they are not convinced that this bill yet achieves what it is intended to achieve.

One of the people wrote: "Violence and gun control are two separate issues". Several put forth the proposition that the firearms acquisition certificate should be treated like a driver's licence. Safety and competency tests would have to be passed in order to obtain an FAC. We could even have classes of licences.

It was suggested by another that an independent regulatory licence granting body would be better than the present system where it comes down to some arbitrariness on the part of a clerk. This would fit in with the ideas suggested by another writer, that rather than looking at what firearms people should own we should look at who should own firearms.

I rather like the idea of a licence as opposed to the firearms acquisitions certificate. In order to issue a licence, people would have to qualify for it; something similar to a motor vehicle licence today. In this case one would have to qualify for it in order to purchase or handle certain types of firearms. With further experience, one could add on another classification.

I would have no problem with someone retaining a licence unless he or she abused the privilege or there was some reason to revoke it; similar to what happens with our automobile licences. I think it is worth considering and is something, no doubt, that is going to be put forward to the committee.

Just to give a further idea of some of the suggestions that I have received from my constituents, I would like to share a few quotes. One person suggested: "I think you should address in particular areas of compensation for guns that are seized and would suggest that you propose a reinstatement of a collector classification". The minister today commented on that, and I commend her for including a provision to allow genuine gun collectors to keep their collections.

Another one of my writers said: "This bill threatens financially legitimate gun owners. I question whether legislation could deter a determined individual from committing an atrocity".

Another wrote: "Doug, you have to understand that many of us still suffer from the reaction to previous legislation and we fear further firearms legislation. We do not trust any government that tries to limit legitimate freedoms to own and use firearms. It is important that you look not just to complaints, but also at solutions".

Another person wrote: "The key word should be responsibility, not restrictions. Many people today gain their complete knowledge of firearms from televisions and books where guns are depicted as awesome instruments of destruction. Education is a far more progressive approach to take".

Another person wrote: "Range and shooting clubs should be encouraged where new members would be expected to complete an education component before being allowed to participate".

Another one indicated: "My plea is that the government examine the growing roots of violence in all forms in this country and work to minimize it at the starting point".

Among my correspondence there was very little support for limits on magazine capacity. Many felt it would have its greatest effect on antique gun collections, particularly those older models with integral magazines. I had about 12 to 14 different examples of guns that would be restricted or prohibited under the legislation. Many of the correspondents felt that there was no problem putting limits on military, assault or fully automatic weapons. To quote one person: "There is no reason for anyone to own a fully automatic".

There are good features of this bill that will come up in committee discussions, such as a firearms safety course and the national standards that are proposed to ensure that only qualified people can obtain the firearms acquisition certificate.

Most people do not have a problem with a waiting or a cooling off period before getting an FAC. After all, as someone said, the purchase of a firearm should not be a spur of the moment decision.

Other good features that were praised by people in writing is the fact that return of lost firearms could be expedited and the fact that it is going to allow individuals with an FAC to transport a handgun owned by another person, possibly a family member.

I have been critical of the bill. There are things I would like to see improved. I think I am speaking for a large number of legitimate hunters and sport shooters. They understand the problem that we are facing in this country. They understand the concerns, and they understand the objective of the minister and the government. They are even more concerned than many others about the abuse and misuse of firearms.

They have a direct concern with the legislation. They deserve to be heard before we proceed any further. As users, they can offer constructive suggestions. They can help us design training courses.

They can probably suggest better controls for firearms than legislators or bureaucrats. They have expressed concern about what might be lost under the bill. They also have the most to gain by offering constructive suggestions and by helping. By helping, they can enhance their chosen sport and possibly improve our legislation and contribute to a safer country.

Madam Speaker, let's approve this motion. Let's establish the committee and let's listen to Canadians before we proceed any further with this bill.

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Madam Speaker, I want to commend the member for his straightforward remarks on this subject. I found it useful to listen.

Most of us in the House have heard a number of those perspectives earlier. My comment then, going right to the reason for the motion that is in front of the House, is that the government appears to have made an error at some point, likely following the Marc Lépine tragedy in Montreal.

Whatever the reasons, the Minister of Justice appears to have been compelled to come forward with a bill which reflects government policy. It is what the government wants to legislate. Now the government appears to realize that the bill is not a good one, that there are some serious flaws in it.

There is a need for a bill but there are too many flaws in the present one. The bottom line here is if the bill is too bad to continue, and the government does not have the guts to withdraw it, then it must have the need to show that it is taking some action.

Is that not the reason why it is referring the matter to a special committee? Is it not really admitting that it made a mistake here? Is that not why we have to go back to square one and rehash all of these issues? There are many, some addressing the bill and some not addressing the bill.

There is no reference to amnesty here. I just noticed a statistic today from Toronto that this year from January to August 31, the metro Toronto police have seized 1,506 illegal guns. That compares to about 1,200 guns in 1980. That is 6.2 guns per day taken from the streets of Toronto.

There are a lot of issues that are not being addressed by this bill. I would like to ask the member if he would not acknowledge that the government started off on the wrong foot so that we all can start off on the right foot very quickly to address the many needs that this legislation must address.

**Mr. Fee:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for the question.

I do not agree with either of his questions. He said himself that there are a lot of issues that are not addressed by the bill. That was the question raised by his colleague, the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce this morning when he asked the minister if the committee was going to be restricted in its hearings to the narrow confines of what is in the bill.

Her answer was no, that it would be given a broader mandate to hear concerns of Canadians relating to the whole issue of the regulations and the bill.

I think the minister is not backing off. If she wanted to, she could quietly let this bill sit in the back corner and not mention it. It would die on the *Order Paper* eventually. That is not going to happen.

By setting up this committee, Canadians are going to be heard. If the hon. member thinks we are making a mistake by reacting to concerns expressed to the minister, I would suggest that he is wrong. There have been legitimate concerns expressed. There have been questions raised.

In answers to those questions and concerns, the minister and her motion say: "Let's listen to Canadians." I think that is what democracy is all about. Let's hear what Canadians have to say. We are going to end up with a better bill for doing it.

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Madam Speaker, the minister is on the hook because she made a promise to the students at École Polytechnique in April.

She said she would bring forward a bill. She said she would push for extended gun control. December 6 is the anniversary of the massacre, and she knows she will be subject to questions in the House of Commons on why she has not done anything. She is now going to say it was sent for study in committee. It is dishonest and it is pathetic and the students at the École Polytechnique and other Canadians will hold her accountable for that. As I said before, it is the first failure of this minister in her new portfolio.

• (1620)

I want to let the hon. member off the hook by asking him if he would confirm a newspaper report not too long ago which said that 30—I notice the member today said: "Don't take instructions from the parliamentary secretary. He is liable to lead you astray".

**Mr. Karygiannis:** Get your runs in there.

**Mr. Waddell:** Get the runs in there. Would he confirm that 30 Conservative MPs have indicated that they would not support the bill? If he cannot confirm the number, could he tell us how many of his colleagues do not support the bill and could he explain his own position, does he or does he not support Bill C-80?

**Mr. Fee:** Madam Speaker, I am somewhat amused by the question because the most common criticism we are getting at home in the media is that we blindly follow the leader and do not think for ourselves. Now we are being criticized because some other reporter says we are not following blindly.

I cannot confirm how many members over here said they would or would not support it. I said in my speech, if you were listening and I am sure you were, that some serious problems have been expressed to me by a large number of constituents. Yes I have a problem with this bill in its present form. I am very pleased that the minister is going out to listen to Canadians to hear their concerns.

The senseless tragedy that happened last year in Montreal affected all Canadians. It could not help but do so. I am almost tempted to accuse the hon. member of exploiting that but it would be a terrible charge and I do not want to do it. I was going to refer to it in my speech but I do not think we should be drafting regulations and laws specifically as a result of one tragedy. We owe it to those people, and the families of those victims, to come up with a law that is going to be effective in the long term. We would be wrong to push something through hastily rather than make sure it is well thought out and has the support of people who can make sure the law works.

I think it is better to take a couple of extra months, do it properly, and make sure we have support of firearms groups.

There was an amendment introduced today that tried to put a time limit on a committee. I am quite prepared to support that because I do think we have to get ahead with this. We have to get this committee working, we have to get the report in, we have to act on it for the very reasons that have been stated.

**Mr. Geoff Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia):** Madam Speaker, I want to make a brief comment and put a question to my hon. colleague. As a member who, quite frankly, could not support the bill as it is presently drafted, I have no hesitation in putting forward a couple of reasons why.

I wish to point out a couple of fairly straightforward things. First, it is the user and not the weapon that is the cause of the damage. Second, it is the criminal element mainly that has access to weapons and will continue to have, regardless of what the law of the land is.

I am a little tired of these nonsensical references to Montreal. There is nothing in this bill, or in any other bill, that could conceivably be brought forward that could guarantee that an incident such as the one in Montreal would not occur. It is fact, Madam Speaker.

I am glad the member for Red Deer has pointed out the concerns of many citizens, especially in the regions of the country. I do not know if this is a Toronto-type bill or not, Madam Speaker, but certainly there are concerns in the country.

I hope that the reference will include some travel to regions of the country outside the major cities. I want to ask my hon. colleague from Red Deer, while I am thanking him for his outstanding contribution to this debate and for pointing out some of the concerns that I and other Canadians have, if he feels that the special committee ought to solicit the opinion of the people in the rural areas, people who own and use firearms in a very regular and lawful basis and who could be very seriously affected by some of the proposed provisions. I wonder if the hon. member would care to comment on the possibility of such a special group travelling.

**Mr. Fee:** Madam Speaker, as my hon. colleague knows, it is not my decision whether the committee travels or not.

I would certainly encourage this House to make sure that it did. I mentioned in my speech, and my hon. colleague just mentioned that there is a difference in perception between rural and urban areas. That goes both ways. I think the committee should get out into rural Canada. We should talk to legitimate, honest, law-abiding firearms associations in the rural areas so that the urban members who sit on the committee can understand where those people are coming from and what their thoughts and feelings are. It is equally important to go into the urban areas so that the rural members have a chance to understand the concerns that are being expressed by those people.

It is also important that we involve the police associations. They have some very serious and legitimate concerns as well. It is important that this committee talk to as many Canadians in as many different locations as possible.

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce):** Madam Speaker, this Conservative government's actions today to virtually kill their own bill on gun control, that is Bill C-80, is just another example of their excessive weakness and lack of political will. It is also an indication of their extreme incompetency and disorganization.

The government introduced a bill in the month of June to accomplish certain legislative goals. Today it has said that it does not want to proceed with its own bill, but wants to refer the subject matter, that is gun control, to a special committee for study.

Members on the government side have said this is a good thing because we should study the subject. If we had voted on the bill and passed it at second reading, it would have been required to go to a committee where it would have received study. The government could have amended the bill at second reading so it would have gone to the justice committee or a special committee. It need not have gone after the vote on second reading to a legislative committee. That did not happen. The reason it did not happen is because the government has lost the political will to proceed with the bill. It cannot get enough support in its own caucus. It probably cannot get enough support in the cabinet. If it had proceeded with the bill, the bill would have been defeated by their own members perhaps.

People watching this debate today must be very amused. Here we have a bill presented by the Conservative government that has more support from the opposition than it does from the government members. The member from Swift Current who just asked a question admitted that he is opposed to the bill. I know many members on the government side are opposed to their own government's bill. The reason the government is not proceeding with the bill at second reading is because it does not have enough support in its own caucus. The

result is that we are going to refer this matter for study to a special committee. Sooner or later, this session will be prorogued and Bill C-80 will die. We will have no bill on gun control, we will have no government legislation and we will have a committee which will come up with a report.

I have been on so many of these committees that study matters where there has been a Conservative majority, and we have had unanimous reports. We have had them in the justice committee, the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration and we had them on the external affairs committee.

Just the other day we dealt with the unanimous report from the Standing Committee on External Affairs which recommended certain action by the government on international debt. The government did not accept one recommendation of that committee which had a majority of Conservatives on it. Therefore, the whole matter goes nowhere after months and months of study. That is what is going to happen here and it is a disgrace. It is a disgrace because the momentum which led to this bill was the massacre, almost one year ago, of 14 young women engineering students at the École Polytechnique in Montreal. It was found that a deranged young man by the name of Marc Lépine used a Ruger semi-automatic rifle to kill these women.

What was really horrible about this whole case is that he set the men aside and decided to kill only women. He did it with a gun that was too easily available. The Canadian public recognized that and said that there is something missing in our gun laws and they must be tightened up. How is it a young man like this can easily acquire a semi-automatic Ruger weapon? It is not, by the way, an ordinary semi-automatic. This is an assault weapon that has been used by SWAT teams on police forces. It is not a weapon that is usually used for hunting. It has got an extra powerful apparatus and fires a very deadly bullet. It was that incident which led to a campaign to tighten up our gun laws, with a view to preventing this kind of incident.

• (1630)

The minister herself went down to the École Polytechnique in Montreal in April and she met representatives of the students. They presented her with 25 boxes of petitions containing over 500 names of people who wanted a toughening of the gun legislation. On that occasion, and it was reported in the press, she promised to bring in legislation to meet their demands before the end of May. We did not get it before the end of May.

I put questions in the House asking when the legislation was going to be presented several times. Finally, we got the legislation on June 28, I believe, the last day the House sat before the summer recess.

While the legislation was not perfect and it has some weaknesses, it definitely was a step in the right direction. There are many things in Bill C-80 which I myself had in my own Private Member's bills and motions. For example, the minister has accepted the idea that there must be a mandatory delay between the application for the firearms acquisition certificate and the granting of the firearms acquisition certificate. I had suggested two weeks. She went even further and I congratulate her on that. She went to 28 days.

That is very important because we have had incidents in Canada such as the one in Montreal where a young woman went in in the morning to buy a rifle. She was told by the owner of the sporting goods store that she needed a firearms acquisition certificate. She went to the police station, applied for the firearms acquisition certificate, got it the very same day in the afternoon, went back, bought a gun, and shot her boyfriend.

If there had been a mandatory delay in this particular case, and in many other cases, it would have given the police a bit of time to investigate the situation, as they are supposed to do under the legislation. It would have also provided a cooling off period. Very often, individuals in that situation are under an intense emotional pressure and, if given some time, they will cool down or other things might happen which might prevent the killing or the attack with a gun. Bill C-80 had that provision, that there be a mandatory delay of 28 days.

Bill C-80 also provided for a measure that I had in my Private Member's bill, that the application must be accompanied by two references of people in the community, references with respect to the responsibility of the individual applying, and also it required a photograph. All these things I think were improvements with respect to the screening out of dangerous, imbalanced individuals who might apply for a firearms acquisition certificate in order to obtain a gun.

As I said, the momentum for this bill came as a result of the massacre on December 6, 1989, at the University of Montreal. It appeared that we were going to get some legislation, but now we are not going to get any legislation. We are going to have a study. We will not oppose the study, but I must express my extreme disappointment and my extreme regret. I personally know some of the parents whose daughters were killed in that incident and, I will tell you, they are not going to take this lightly. They are going to consider it a betrayal by the government in carrying out what it had promised to do. This is not radical legislation that the government has presented. It is an improvement on what we have now, but it is not a radical departure.

By the way, on this side we agree that the subject matter of the bill should be studied in committee, but we think it should have been done after a vote on second reading. Once the bill was in committee, then, of course, we would hear witnesses. Perhaps the bill could be modified in some way and made better through amendment in committee, and maybe modified in other respects where certain people had concerns. The bill might be improved in the directions of both public safety and bureaucratic red tape, and so on, about which many hunters and sports shooters are concerned about. The bill could have been improved by a good study in committee after second reading. But what is going to happen is that we are just going to get the study and, likely, nothing at all. I hope that is not the case, but I have great fear that that is what we are going to get.

What is the paranoia suffered by the various gun lobbies in respect of gun controls? We have had gun control in the country since 1892 and it has been continually improved upon over the years. The loopholes in the legislation have been closed. That is what we are attempting to do again, but there is a paranoia suffered by some people. They are in the minority because, every time there is a Gallup poll on the subject, the overwhelming majority of Canadians wants the strict control of the acquisition and use of guns. Even in the prairie provinces, the majority wants stricter controls on guns. But, for one reason or another, the minority, the lobbies, are very active. With their flood of letters, they have upset certain members of Parliament who get flaky and back off from what should be good legislation.

What is this paranoia? Nobody, in any political party that I know of, is suggesting that we should ban all rifles, shotguns, and hunting weapons. We have three classes of weapons in this country. We have prohibited weapons. These are weapons that are banned, outright, such as machine-guns and fully automatic weapons permitted to the police and the Armed Forces, but not to ordinary citizens, and sawed-off shotguns. They are prohibited weapons which cannot be obtained by anybody. I think, everybody agrees with that.

There are restricted weapons which are mainly handguns and revolvers. They are only permitted to individuals if they can show cause, in accordance with the legislation. For example, in the case of a private detective or if there has been an attack on a family, a handgun can be applied for and the police have the discretion in giving the permit necessary for a restricted weapon.

All the others, which I would call regulated, are in the third category. Regulated weapons are the customary long guns, rifles, and shotguns. Until 1978, there was no control over those weapons whatsoever. One could walk into any sporting goods or hardware store and buy a rifle or shotgun, without any screening whatsoever. However, in Canada we found that too many murders were taking place with these long guns. In 1978, we said that, in order to buy a long gun, a shotgun or a rifle, one had to get a firearms acquisition certificate. There was to be a screening process in which one was checked for a criminal record, mental stability, any record of violence in the community, and so on. When there was indication that the individual was not responsible, then the police had the right to refuse the firearms acquisition certificate.

Nobody is suggesting that we should ban, outright, ordinary rifles and shotguns which are used for hunting and sporting purposes. Why should Canadians object to a control over a weapon which is manufactured and designed to kill? I am not talking about pop guns, guns which shoot plastic or rubber bullets, or guns which fire tear-gas. I am talking about rifles and shotguns that are manufactured to kill either animals or individuals. Why is there an objection to having at least the same control over these manufactured objects that we have on automobiles? An automobile is manufactured for transportation but, because it proceeds at great speeds, we have the licensing and the testing of people who want to drive. Nobody can just buy an automobile and drive, without taking a test, passing it, and getting a driver's licence. If

someone has a history of reckless and careless driving, their licence is taken away from them. All automobiles must be licensed.

• (1640)

What we are suggesting for guns is not even as serious as with automobiles. Guns are designed and manufactured to kill. Why should people, for their own public safety, object to the simple regulation of these weapons? It is no more complex or bureaucratic than it is for automobiles.

There are other substances that are dangerous as well, which we put controls on. Nobody can sell over the counter certain drugs and pharmaceuticals. They can only be sold by licensed pharmacists in drug stores and a prescription from a doctor is needed to get them.

It is for the public's safety that we are trying to screen out the acquisition of guns by dangerous people.

We hear all the same time-worn arguments against gun control in general. I just heard it expressed on the other side that it is not weapons that kill, it is individuals who kill. Statistics show that it is five times easier to kill with a gun than it is with any other weapon. While it is true that an individual must take the gun and use it, it is much easier to kill with the gun. Again, if one wants to restrict and cut back on the number of murders and homicides with guns, then it should be made more difficult for the irresponsible and those individuals who have criminal backgrounds and so on to get guns.

By the way, there are studies done by the Solicitor General's department which show that in every instance when we have tightened our gun control laws the rate of crime, homicides, and armed robberies with guns has declined. We all know that in the United States there is very little control over guns. If we compare the United States with Canada, in the United States 70 per cent of the homicides are committed with guns. In Canada, only 30 per cent of homicides are committed with guns because it is much more difficult to get a gun in Canada. Furthermore, the rate of murder in the United States is approximately 9 per 100,000, whereas in Canada it is 2.5 per 100,000. We have a much lower rate of crime with guns in Canada because we have tougher gun laws right now. We also have a much lower rate of homicide in Canada than in the United States because guns are difficult to obtain.

We also hear this old argument about banning guns. Nobody is suggesting that we ban guns. We are simply suggesting that we regulate them to make them more difficult to obtain. People argue that if guns are banned then only criminals will have guns. As has already been pointed out in this debate, two-thirds of the homicides in this country are committed by first-time offenders. They are committed by members of the same family or between friends and acquaintances in a state of anxiety, alcoholism, narcotics, or in a severe argument of one kind or another. One party will go out to try to obtain a gun. If he gets it, he kills the other party. Two-thirds of our homicides are that type.

We know that we will not keep guns away from professional killers or organized criminals. They will always be able to get guns, but we can make it more difficult for those husbands who kill their wives, or people like Marc Lépine who are deranged and for some reason or another have a mania against feminism. It is the non-professional killer who commits the majority of the murders in Canada and, if we can make it more difficult for them, we will be doing something. We have accomplished some success in the past by closing some of the gaps in our gun laws, and we can continue to do that.

Before I sit down, I simply want to say that gun laws, of course, are no panacea. They are not going to eliminate totally crimes with guns. They are not going to eliminate totally homicides with guns, but they can substantially reduce crimes with guns, especially with those people who are not professional criminals. That is what we are trying to accomplish. We can do it without unduly interfering with the right of our hunters and sportsmen to carry on their hunting and their sports. It has been done in the past.

I was responsible as Solicitor General for developing and introducing the last gun control legislation in 1978. I switched to another ministry after I prepared the legislation. It was finally passed under a different Solicitor General and Minister of Justice. I can recall at that time all the same arguments that we hear today were thrown up in our face by the different lobby groups in the country, that if we passed the legislation in 1978 it would virtually destroy hunting and sports shooting in the

country. But history has shown that to be complete nonsense. Hunting is still a sport.

I am not a hunter and I am not attracted to it. There is still a lot of hunting in the country, especially in the rural and northern areas where there is a long tradition and it is in the culture of these people to hunt. They have not really been interfered with. As I pointed out, we have had gun control legislation since 1892. It has been consistently toughened and tightened and has been done in a way to allow our legitimate hunters and sport shooters to carry on with their sport. As a matter of fact, many Canadians have won Olympic medals in shooting because they have been able to do that.

Madam Speaker, my time is up. I simply want to say this. We would have supported this legislation. Here we are in the opposition giving more support to a government bill than it is itself. It is backing off it. It is sending the matter to study. We hope the study is a success. But we will push hard for legislation to deal with the matter. We do not want to let down those families in Montreal whose daughters were killed and massacred a year ago.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Denis Pronovost (Saint-Maurice):** Madam Speaker, I listened very carefully to the speech we heard just now by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, the former Solicitor General, who is celebrating his 25th year in Parliament this year. Congratulations are indeed in order, because it is quite an achievement nowadays to have been part of this august assembly for 25 years.

However, I also took this opportunity to rise in the House because there are at least two aspects of the speech made by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce on which I would like to expand because I do not agree with the implications.

First of all, I would say that like my colleague from Port Moody—Coquitlam, the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce was somewhat contradictory in what he said. When the government makes decisions, it is accused of failing to consult the people. When we want to form a special committee to study a question, the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce says: The committee is unnecessary. It is just a waste of time.

If the hon. member is so concerned about the efficiency of the operations of this House, perhaps he could speak to the Liberal senators in the other place who have been holding up several bills and obstructing the parliamentary process for nearly a year now.

I am getting to the second point. Hon. members opposite, both the Liberals and the NDP, often complain that rural residents are overlooked by the government, and they make all kinds of grand speeches and give us a lot of rhetoric on the subject. We now have a wonderful and, in fact, extraordinary opportunity, Madam Speaker, to consult rural residents, whose specific concerns differ from those of city dwellers. Why not take advantage of this opportunity?

My third point and, in fact, the gist of my question is: The hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce referred to Canadian statistics and these will be my concluding remarks that prove that Canada has fewer murders and less violent crime per capita than the United States. However, we must remember that Canada and the United States are two entirely different countries. We cannot compare Los Angeles with Quebec City or New York with Montreal. The bigger the city and the bigger the population, the higher the crime rate, whether or not firearms are allowed. So it is unfair to compare the two.

Whether or not we have legislation—and this is my question—doesn't the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce think we will never be able to prevent people like Marc Lépine from committing this kind of crime, despite the legislation tabled by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce when he was Solicitor General of Canada?

[*English*]

**Mr. Allmand:** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to deal with the three points raised by my hon. colleague. I thank him for his remarks with respect to my 25 years in Parliament.

His first point suggests that we are against consultation because we would prefer to proceed by way of the bill than with this motion. We are not against consultation. I thought I pointed out very clearly in my remarks that we could have debated the bill at second reading, voted on

it, passed it at second reading, and then sent it to committee—which has been done for years and years in this House—to either the justice committee, a special committee, or a legislative committee, and then hold hearings.

• (1650)

I agree with him. We should hold hearings. We should hold hearings with city people and with rural people. I am not in disagreement with him. We could have held the hearings by proceeding with second reading first. By proceeding with second reading first, we could have amended the bill. As he knows, if he has participated in legislative committees, you hold hearings, people suggest you amend this article, or that article, and you make amendments. You come back to the House with an amended bill. That could have been the result of the committee hearings.

By proceeding with the bill, you would have kept faith with all those people in this country who want the government to do something about gun control. The government had responded to that demand in the first place by presenting the bill. It was your government that came forward with Bill C-80. I looked at it and said that on the whole, it was a good bill. Now it is your government, having done that, that decides to proceed in a different way. I believe in consultation. It could have been done by voting on the bill at second reading and then proceeding to the hearings as we have done time and again.

I have been here for 25 years. We have done it over and over again that way. It could have been done again. We could have heard rural people and taken into account their views.

With respect to rural people, as I pointed out, we amended this twice in my time in Parliament, in 1968 with the famous Criminal Code omnibus bill, and again in 1978 when we tightened our gun laws. On each occasion people said: "You are going to destroy hunting. You are going to destroy sports shooting". We did not. We brought in amendments and tightened the law.

Can the hon. member say to me now that there is no hunting going on in rural Canada? Yes, there is hunting. They have to get firearms acquisition certificates, and most responsible hunters get them. I would say that almost 90 or 80 per cent—I do not know what the figures are—get automobile licenses because they show they can responsibly drive automobiles. The great majority of hunters show that they are responsible and get their firearms acquisition certificates.

He says it is not right. He says that Canada and the United States are two different countries and we should not compare them. He is right. They are two different countries for such reasons as our attitude to criminal justice. In Canada we have always had an approach which believed in gun controls, whereas in the United States they did not. That is one of the major differences between us which has led to lower rates of crimes with guns in Canada and which has led to lower murder rates. Canada is a safer society—not safe enough, but away safer than the United States. In the city of Toronto, a city with nearly 3 million people, last year they had 50 murders. In Detroit, a city of the same size, they had about 400 or 500 murders. Everybody is carrying a gun in Cleveland, Detroit, Buffalo and these cities.

I agree there is a difference between Canada and the United States and part of the difference is our whole approach to criminal justice.

**Mr. Ray Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** Madam Speaker, I would like to raise with the hon. member by way of comment the suggestion that this government's bill on gun control simply fails to deal with one of the real issues we are concerned with in this country. It pointed out that in 1988 almost the same number of Canadians were murdered by stabbing as by shooting, 167 for one and 169 for the other. One hundred and thirty-eight people were beaten to death. I think there were 22 strangulations.

In the murder rate in 1959 of 657, 80 per cent of the people were killed by somebody they knew, and in about half the cases it was an immediate family member. Quite often it was women murdered by their husbands or their partners with whom they shared a domestic relationship.

This government has cut the funding for the status of women. It has cut the funding for transition houses. It has cut the funding for women's organizations. It has absolutely ignored the case of violence against women in Canada. We have two very important cases in the riding I represent where RCMP officers, after domestic violence where an individual has been charged, have taken the individual back home the next morning to create further violence against the people they have lived with. It is like

taking the criminal back to the scene of the crime so they can complete the task.

Crown counsels have failed in the area. It is my understanding there have been 200 charges against individuals for family violence and in that case, only 90 convictions. Of those convictions, often there was a suspended sentence with the agreement that the person not beat up or commit violence against their wife.

I might just finish with the question. What is needed is not *per se* gun control. We have to get to the bottom of this issue of family violence and violence against women.

Does the hon. member concur that a major failing on the part of the government on this issue is failure to address one of the real issues in this?

**Mr. Allmand:** Madam Speaker, yes, I do. I think that gun control legislation can be only one element in the prevention of violent crimes in Canada, but we cannot forget about gun control. I pointed out that each time as we tightened out gun laws, we have been able to reduce the rate of crime with guns. So gun laws are important.

The hon. member is absolutely correct that if you stop with simply tightening your gun laws, you are not going to do enough. A lot of the violence is against women by their partners, spouses, or other types of partners, and there are not enough shelters for these women. There are not enough programs to deal with the men who are abusing their wives and their partners. There is a whole realm of social policies that could be advanced and put into operation that would deal with the causes of this violence. We are not doing enough there.

Governments at all levels are not doing enough, so I agree with the hon. member. That having been said, I still believe that we have to do more to control those instruments of violence, the gun, which is used more than any other weapon in killing. Thirty per cent of our homicides in Canada are committed with a gun, but the gun, different than all the others, has as its sole purpose to kill. You can cut bread with a knife, and sometimes it is used for killing, but I would rather have someone chasing me with a knife than with a semi-automatic.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Resuming debate.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Denis Pronovost (Saint-Maurice):** Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity today to speak to a subject that I would say is extremely important.

One of my constituents died last year on December 6, 1989, in the course of events that caused emotions to run high, not only among Quebecers but also among Canadians across the country. The events that occurred at the École polytechnique have made people in this country think about the serious consequences of social disruption and psychological trauma in some individuals. In this respect, I may recall the sad case of a young man in Montreal, Marc Lépine, who achieved his unfortunate notoriety in such sad circumstances, and in doing so shocked us all very deeply. Why, Madam Speaker?

Because we tend to think that most people on this planet are reasonable and normal and act with the judgment instilled in them by their parents from childhood. Unfortunately, our society is evolving very rapidly. Not all students in Canada are successful in their endeavours. Today, 30 per cent of our young men and women are incapable of finishing high school.

Madam Speaker, for many young Canadians, this causes problems when they start looking for a job, and as a result, there may be social and psychological problems may be extremely traumatic.

We all judged Marc Lépine very harshly last year, and this House was unanimous in announcing its awareness of a reality for which no short-term solutions can be found. However, that does not mean we should not be concerned.

Madam Speaker, I have always felt that abolishing firearms outright—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Unfortunately, I will have to interrupt the hon. member for Saint-Maurice who, I am sure, would wish to continue his speech at some other time.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's *Order Paper*.

*Private Members' Business*

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—MOTIONS

[*Translation*]

### THE ELDERLY AND THE HANDICAPPED

ACCESS TO PUBLIC FACILITIES

**Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should take steps to convince the provinces and municipalities to encourage owners of reception halls to provide washrooms on the same floor as the reception facility for the use of the handicapped and the elderly.

He said: Madam Speaker, I rise to speak to a motion that was suggested by my constituents. Because of our system, it took several months before we could discuss the motion this evening. Although my riding covers a residential area, I believe it has the largest number of reception halls of any riding in the Montreal area.

On various occasions, when I attended certain events, a number of senior citizens and disabled persons drew my attention to the inconvenience they were exposed to in certain establishments. Some of these have a banquet or reception hall on the second floor, while the washrooms are on the first floor, with no elevator or escalator between the two floors. This creates a serious problem for the elderly and disabled persons who have to go down to the first floor during the event. That is why they asked me to make representations to persuade provincial or municipal governments to adopt regulations that would require these establishments, when construction permits are issued, to provide washrooms and bathrooms on the same floor as the reception hall, or else have an elevator or escalator accessible for the disabled.

Madam Speaker, at the federal level we have the National Building Code, published by the National Research Council, and I have a copy here of certain sections of the latest version, printed in 1990. I noticed that they mention designing barrier-free access, to enable disabled persons to enter a building. They refer to entrances and routes, floors serviced by escalators, equipment controls, areas where a barrier-free route is required, and parking areas for the disabled. There are special provisions for washrooms, for instance. The number of toilets depends on the number of people. The code also specifies the size of rooms, windows, ventilation and plumbing. There are various sections in the National Building Code, but to my knowledge there is nothing in the Code or in our provincial and municipal regulations that could be used to deal with a situation I find unacceptable.

I realize that the owners of these establishments, because of relatively high costs and limited space, have to make the best possible use of the space available, but I feel this is an absolute necessity.

Imagine elderly people who during a banquet or reception have to go downstairs for quite some distance to go to the washroom, and imagine the kind of situation this creates for people in wheelchairs!

I think our National Building Code should be amended accordingly and that the provinces and municipalities should follow suit. Madam Speaker, I hope hon. members will be able to support the motion this evening so that the government can take the necessary action.

I know that my colleague from Winnipeg-North, who is very familiar with this issue, intends to stand up and speak on this motion. If there are others who wish to take part in the debate, they are all welcome to do so. I hope that once the time comes to vote, this motion we will be adopted.

Before concluding and giving the chance to others to speak, I want to add that a recent report—it was tabled in June 1990; as a matter of fact this second report of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons was one of the last ones to be tabled—makes six recommendations to make life easier for disabled people. One of them, goes along the same line as my motion. It is recommendation number 5 at page 35 of the report, which reads:

> 5. That the Government of Canada undertake, in cooperation with provincial, territorial and municipal governments, to develop a federal-provincial-municipal plan of action for disabled persons that will ensure ongoing consultations, cooperation and coordinated action. This plan of action should be initiated at the forthcoming meeting of federal and provincial first ministers on the economy.

In closing, Madam Speaker, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, my constituents in Saint-Léonard, especially the elderly and the disabled, have requested on a number of occasions that this issue be resolved. I raise it in this House on their behalf and as the member of Parliament for Saint-Léonard, so that we can take the necessary steps.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all my colleagues who will speak on this subject today and give me their support so that this motion is passed.

[*English*]

**Ms. Barbara Greene (Don Valley North):** Madam Speaker, I wish to respond to the hon. member's motion that the government persuade provincial and municipal governments to encourage reception hall owners to provide more accessible washroom facilities for persons with disabilities.

I can heartily support this motion because I believe it is something that fits in with government policy. This government is constantly striving to improve access for disabled persons to all facilities. I quote the Prime Minister:

> Individuals with disabilities shall be assured access to fundamental elements of daily life that are generally available in the community.

This principle, taken from the Prime Minister's *Declaration on the Decade of Disabled Persons*, is the principle that guides the Department of Public Works in its continued effort to make barrier–free design a reality in all buildings under its custody.

Madam Speaker, allow me to tell my hon. colleague and other members of the House some of the things Public Works is already doing in this regard. It is the department's policy to ensure that all its facilities are accessible to people who have disabilities. All new buildings are designed so as to be accessible to disabled people. Information and standards on barrier–free design are regularly updated.

This government is committed to improving accessibility. The aim is to make facilities usable by a wide range of people, and we most certainly welcome input from the disabled community to guide us in this endeavour.

In accordance with Treasury Board's revised accessibility policy, Public Works is currently undertaking a five–year plan for making improvements to accessibility. Treasury Board policy on accessibility is unequivocal. Its policy objective clearly states that it will ensure that people with disabilities can gain access to facilities throughout the federal government.

All new government buildings are designed to be accessible to people in wheelchairs. Public Works' barrier–free design standard sets out requirements for door widths, ramp slopes, handrails, and washrooms, among other things.

Of course I realize the hon. member's motion addressed the question of access outside federal responsibility. Nonetheless, this government is not reluctant to confront the matter just because it does not have direct control over access standards outside federal jurisdiction. We are working with other organizations in their efforts to improve accessibility for the disabled.

• (1710)

For example, the government has helped the Canadian Standards Association produce a 13–volume catalogue of building products useful in making buildings accessible. It has supported the CSA in developing a national standard that was published only two months ago in a document entitled *Barrier–Free Design*. My hon. friend will be pleased to know that *Barrier–Free Design* is an excellent resource for governments at all levels. It will assist them in creating environments that will meet the needs of all individuals, including persons of disabilities. Yes, in reference to the hon. member's motion, the *Barrier–Free Design* document includes a section on washrooms. In fact the publication contains 13 pages on these facilities.

Governments at all levels, as well as the private sector, are strongly encouraged to adopt the national standard found in the CSA publication. With that in mind, the National Building Code has been revised to reflect the new CSA standards. Just think, Madam Speaker, how much better it will be if across the country one standard is used by architects, engineers, and others involved in building design.

It would give all of us, and especially persons with disabilities, increased access to a wide range of facilities. This government is determined to see that happen. It is really what National Access Awareness Week is all about.

Madam Speaker, 1990 marked the third year for this grassroots project. It is a most successful partnership. National Access Awareness Week brings together governments at all levels, as well as educators, business, labour, volunteer groups, and organizations of people with disabilities.

We come together and, thanks to the co-ordination, funding and support of the Department of the Secretary of State, we are attracting more community involvement and media attention each year. The week's basic goal remains the same. That goal is to change not only physical barriers but attitudinal barriers as well. That goal is to make Canada accessible to all its citizens.

We are forging partnerships that will do just that. The National Access Awareness Week committee includes 23 national groups and organizations working in every part of Canada on behalf of persons with disabilities. Thousands of Canadians help to plan the innovative activity that made the week such a resounding success.

Hon. members will know that one of the key areas on which the National Access Awareness Week focuses is transportation. Canada has had international recognition for its leadership in transportation.

That global profile is the result of new provisions in the government's 1987 National Transportation Act, which requires carriers and terminal operators for air, rail and ferry services to provide access to travellers with disabilities. As well, the special report on intercity bus accessibility commits the federal, provincial and territorial governments to develop an implementation strategy to increase access in that area.

We are already making progress. Hon. members will know that Transport Canada has funded development of a mechanized lift for intercity buses at a cost of $250,000. The department has also agreed to provide $1.2 million toward purchasing six lift equipped buses. They will be used in a three-year demonstration project in the corridor that takes in Kitchener, Hamilton, Niagara Falls, and Buffalo.

I know that hon. members will be pleased to know that the government is making every effort to ensure that persons with disabilities will not be subjected to an embarrassing loss of dignity when travelling. In that regard, between 1980 and 1988 Transport Canada spent approximately $17 million to improve accessibility at airports.

Parking, curb cuts, washrooms, and water fountains have been improved so they are more easily accessible. Other improvements have included everything from talking signs to aid people with visual impairment, to handrails and access ramps for travellers who have difficulty moving about. Transport Canada has contributed $145,000 toward a joint program with the Ontario government to operate four mini-vans in the Ottawa area. The vans which are operated by two taxi companies, are easily accessible to disabled passengers. This experiment is evaluating the potential of a taxi company as a viable alternative to para-transit services or perhaps as a complementary service.

This government has not overlooked the needs of disabled persons in small urban and rural areas. More than $3 million in grants have been put toward retrofitting 130 vehicles to transport people in smaller communities.

I am sure my hon. colleagues will agree that many persons with disabilities are perfectly capable of driving their own vehicles. This government certainly believes that. Transport Canada will spend nearly $675,000 testing vehicles adapted for drivers with disabilities and will assist them in driver training. This is definitely an appealing option in a disabled person's goal for greater autonomy.

After soliciting the views of more than 1,200 parties with an interest in transportation services for the disabled, the National Transportation Agency has submitted regulations for approval by Governor in Council, which will abolish additional fares for disabled persons travelling by air in Canada.

The agency has determined that some persons with disabilities have no choice but to travel with an assistant. Also, some disabled people require additional seats to accommodate their disability. Initially, the proposed regulations will only apply to aircraft with 30 or more seats.

To measure the impact of these regulations, the agency will review data filed by the carriers annually. At a later date the agency will develop regulations for carriers with fewer than 30 seats. I am sure hon. members will agree that the proposed regulations will make it easier for persons with disabilities to travel throughout Canada.

So, as I am sure my hon. colleagues can see, this government is doing everything in its power to give an equal opportunity to give full access and equal opportunity to persons with disabilities. After all, these are fundamental rights of Canadian citizenship, not privileges to be enjoyed only by the majority. We all experi-

ence difficulties in life but Canadians with disabilities are often faced with additional hurdles. We have the power to remove these hurdles and we are committed to removing them.

Governments, industry, community groups and disabled persons' organizations will continue to work together to enable people with disabilities to fully enjoy their rights as citizens. Considerable progress has been made, but there is still much to be done. Together we will do it. We are very pleased to support the motion.

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** I am certainly delighted to speak to this Motion 526:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the government should take steps to convince the provinces and municipalities to encourage owners of reception halls to provide washrooms on the same floor as the reception facility for the use of the handicapped and the elderly.

The motion sounds very simple in its request but is very profound in its implications. I congratulate my Liberal colleague, the hon. member for Saint-Leonard for introducing this motion. This is a very important initiative for it addresses a very important group in our society.

Thirteen to fourteen per cent of Canadians do not enjoy the same kind of mobility that most citizens are blessed with. Our society has been designed for the able-bodied.

*The Ottawa Citizen* recently reported on a project called "Trying on Disability". The project was aimed to raise awareness of what it is like to live in a world built for people who have no trouble getting around. Volunteers in the project who were sent to do their grocery shopping wore yellow swimming goggles with black specks on the glass to see how it felt to have cataracts. They wore slippery surgery gloves on their hands and put diving weights on their arms and legs to experience arthritis. They wore ear plugs to learn what it was like to be hearing impaired.

The reporter, Mr. Jeff Heinrich, wrote on their vivid and revealing experience, and I quote:

> We may look have looked comical, but our impersonations were deadly serious—and what we got was a vision of ourselves in old age, a sobering vision of a difficult life deprived of our basic senses and skills.

• (1720 )

The project illustrated a significant point. Many of our senior citizens face a lot of problems doing ordinary things in our fast-paced society.

It is clear that our population is growing older. It is also clear that we are going to have to take a good look at how we are servicing our senior citizens. I believe that our disabled elderly citizens face too many barriers in our society, and are denied access to essential services and amenities of life.

One important place where disabled seniors face problems is at recreation halls that do not have washroom facilities on the same floor as the reception facility. Seniors who have arthritis in their knees see the stairway as a daunting hurdle. Eventually, these seniors will avoid going to places where they have to climb up the stairs to access the washroom facilities. This means the elderly will miss out on important social and recreational activities.

This is simply unfair. Why should they, in effect, be denied access to a building only because of their disability? Our Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees each of us freedom of movement, freedom of association and many other freedoms that are infringed upon when disabled people cannot attend functions in reception halls that do not have accessible washrooms.

In total, there are 3.2 million disabled people in our country, people who have reduced basic senses and skills. This statistic includes young people who do not have the use of most of their bodies, but who are able to get around in wheelchairs. Again, one of the problems is the stairs.

Reception halls must be equipped with elevators or ramps in order for a person in a wheelchair to get from one floor to the next with dignity and without having to suffer the inconvenience and embarrassment of having to ask others to lift them up and down the stairs.

Disabled people have the same rights as able-bodied people do. They should be able to attend the same functions as we able-bodied can. We should, therefore, strive to encourage that all buildings be made accessible to them by having, at the very least, wheelchair accessible washrooms on every floor.

The government has established explicit guidelines about how to modify buildings to make them accessible to physically handicapped people, but there is no mechanism to ensure the rights of disabled citizens are honoured. There are no sanctions.

When a disabled person's rights are infringed, one recourse is to take the complaint to the Human Rights Commission. But this process is time consuming and emotionally draining. It can be very expensive.

These people do not have to face yet another inconvenience. We should be ensuring that their rights are protected and respected at all times.

I have seen one positive step recently. The committee on human rights and the status of disabled persons recently released a report on the plight of the disabled. I am glad that the Secretary of State accepted the whole report in principle. It supposedly will be used to amend acts like the Canadian Human Rights Act and design federal programs for disabled people.

We should not forget that this government must admit it has also failed in the very issue of accessibility. For example, the Canadian Human Rights Commission examined 32 federal programs this summer around the country to see if they meet barrier free design standards. Very sadly, all 32 failed.

Disabled people do not only face barriers in privately owned reception halls. They face it everywhere, including in federal buildings, buildings that are paid for by our tax money. The government must learn how to act on the issue of accessibility and encourage the private sector to do the same.

This past spring, the United States enacted a very important piece of legislation for its disabled citizens, the Americans with Disabilities Act, which forces employers to accommodate disabled employees unless the employer can prove physical changes to his or her operation would be too expensive or disruptive. Madam Speaker, we should adopt this type of program. There needs to be regulations on the construction of new buildings in Canada.

I realize that modifying buildings to make them accessible is a very costly venture, especially for owners of older, and smaller reception halls. But we must do it.

The government declared its intentions to make Canada accessible to all Canadians a long time ago. It is time to deliver on those promises. An excellent way to start is to convince provinces and municipalities to encourage private owners of reception halls to provide washroom facilities on the same floor.

At the same time, the government must seriously consider the recommendations of the committee on human rights and the status of disabled persons. We must develop goals and effective strategies to make all buildings accessible to everyone. We must enforce these standards.

Many other rights depend on them, including the right to have a reasonable employment.

In conclusion, I would like to say that indeed the hon. member for Saint-Léonard has the foresight and sensitivity in caring for the needs of the disabled and the elderly. He introduced his private member's motion a year ago and the standing committee of our House did present its report this June and in essence supported the intention of my hon. colleague.

I now challenge fellow members to support this particular motion as an important first step to achieving our goal of equality for all Canadians, including the disabled and the elderly.

**Hon. Alan Redway (Minister of State (Housing)):** Madam Speaker, last week I received a letter from friend of mine who is in Vancouver. He is a handicapped man. He is in a wheelchair. But he is also the Social Credit member of the legislature from Vancouver—Little Mountain. His name is Doug Mowat. That letter reads as follows. It is addressed to myself and it says:

> Your indication that the entrance to one bathroom in all future social housing will be accessible for persons in wheelchairs as well as walkers is a major breakthrough and demonstrates the strong commitment of your Ministry and the Government of Canada to physically disabled persons.
>
> Every time you see a person in a wheelchair, you'll know that you made it possible for them to use the bathrooms in C.M.H.C. sponsored buildings! Seriously, we highly commend you for this step. It will not be a costly modification, but one that will mean so very much to both disabled and elderly citizens.

It is signed by Doug Mowat, the member of the Legislative Assembly in British Columbia for Vancouver—Little Mountain.

The modifying of entrances to bathrooms in social housing projects is certainly one way in which we can break down the physical barriers which keep handi-

capped people and frail, elderly people, for that matter, fully participating in Canadian society.

The motion that was put forward by the hon. member outlines another way in which this can occur, to ensure that the handicapped and elderly people are able to fully participate in social events, family events, community events and all kinds of events and activities.

[*Translation*]

In the 1990s there is no reason why people should be denied access to these events or feel ill at ease because such facilities are lacking.

[*English*]

I am very pleased to be able to advise the hon. member that the National Building Code for 1990 has provided significant improvements to ensure that future construction of buildings designed for public events meet the basic needs of those who have mobility problems.

Approximately 300 people, including representatives from the disabled, industry, governments, and of course, users devote their time, free of charge, to this kind of a consultation exercise involving updating the National Building Code.

• (1730 )

My own department, the federal housing agency, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, is a part of this process. This year this group, devoting its time free of charge, has seen to it that the National Building Code has been revised so that all regular washrooms in a building to which a barrier-free path of travel is required will be barrier-free to all persons with disabilities. Buildings equipped with elevators must be barrier-free and all washroom facilities in these buildings will be barrier-free. Where several washrooms are provided on a large floor area, not all washrooms need to be barrier-free, provided that a barrier-free washroom is available within 45 meters and the location of that barrier-free washroom is clearly indicated.

A barrier-free washroom is required on the entrance level in buildings less than four storeys which are not equipped with elevators. This requirement will avoid situations where washrooms are located in the basement or on the second floor of a small building which is otherwise accessible.

It is my hope that the provinces and the municipalities will readily adopt these sections of the National Building Code. They are well aware of the changing mix of the population and that governments at all levels must move to meet the increasing demand of a rapidly aging population.

As a society, we have to be very sensitive to the fact that at the moment 10 per cent of the population is 65 years of age or older. By the end of the century, the percentage will have climbed to 13 per cent and, by the year 2031, seniors will account for an estimated 25 per cent, a full one-quarter of the Canadian population. This is a phenomenon that we never faced before and we have got to begin to deal with it now.

Almost one-half, or in fact 46 per cent, of Canadians over the age of 65, 1.2 million people, have some form of either mental or physical disability. That compares with about 13 per cent in the general population. More than 80 per cent of disabled seniors have a mobility or agility disability and a great many of these Canadians are on fixed or low incomes.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member is right, Madam Speaker. We have to find every possible means to open the doors of community living to seniors and handicapped persons. But it is just as important to redesign their living accommodations.

[*English*]

You are aware, Madam Speaker, that in 1985 the federal government undertook some consultations with respect to housing policy. At that time the government announced its new directions in housing. There was a complete review of the housing policies and programs. They involved extensive consultations with the provinces with a full range of groups that were active in housing. Among the groups that were consulted at that time included the Canadian Rehabilitation Council for the Disabled and the Coalition of Provincial Organizations of the Handicapped. Their input at that time was very valuable in the development of the government's new directions in housing. As a result, at least 5 per cent of the units in non-profit and urban native housing programs must be accessible and designed as mobility units.

A mobility unit is one in which space is provided for manoeuvring wheelchairs. The actual number of mobility units in each project is determined by demand. Further adaptations of mobility units can be included in the project costs that are eligible for assistance. Up to 12

per cent additional to the maximum unit price which governs the cost of units in assisted housing is provided for adaptations in the case of non-profit and co-operative housing programs.

Since the changes were made in 1985 in the non-profit and co-operative housing programs, of the 65,400 housing units that have been built since that time, some 9,300 have been designed for the disabled. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation subscribes, of course, to the independent living concept and one of the major steps, during the International Year of the Disabled, in 1981, was to ensure that existing housing becomes more accessible to disabled persons.

During the consultation process, which took place in 1985, groups representing disabled persons criticized the inadequacy of the limited assistance of the $1,500 that was available at that time to make barrier-free, liveability modifications, under the existing Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program, or RRAP as we call it. These groups suggested that a separate program for disabled persons should be put into effect.

In response to that, the government introduced a new program to meet the needs of disabled persons who were occupying existing housing, not just for new housing projects. The RRAP for the disabled was first implemented in 1986. It provides financial assistance to the owners of housing accommodation to improve the accessibility of rental and ownership units, occupied or intended for occupancy by disabled persons. The program is geographically universal and there is no age limit on the properties involved.

For home owners, the assistance is in the form of a loan of $10,000, of which $5,000 may be forgiven depending on the income of the applicant. There is full forgiveness at $23,000 of adjusted income, reducing to zero at $33,000. For landlords, as well, there are forgivable loans that are equal to the cost of the modifications, up to a maximum of some $5,000 for each self-contained unit and $25,000 for each bed unit, but the landlord has to enter into a rental agreement and that limits rent increases for five years.

I see, Madam Speaker, that you are giving me the high sign. I want to close by indicating that I applaud the hon. member's motion. I think it reinforces actions that the government has been taking in the last five or six years. I want to assure the hon. member that he has my full support and the government's full support for going forward with more improvements to help disabled, handicapped, elderly or frail people.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gabriel Fontaine (Lévis):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to the motion introduced on September 27, 1989 by the hon. member for Saint-Léonard concerning easier access for the handicapped.

Ever since it came into office this government has shown outstanding leadership with respect to the integration of handicapped people. It has made concerted efforts to promote the unrestricted participation of disabled Canadians in every activity in the life of our society.

As early as 1985 the Prime Minister made a statement marking the Decade of Disabled Persons and announced a series of principles which were to be the mainstay of his government's policy.

With a view to making all federal buildings readily accessible, the government steers and supports all such initiatives taken by the Department of Public Works.

DPW officials have taken steps to make sure that federal buildings are easily accessible. Indeed all new construction must be in accordance with public works architectural standards.

In addition, specifications on unobstructed structures are updated on a regular basis. Structures specifically mentioned in these regulations include doors, access ramps, ramps generally and washroom facilities.

A visit to Canada's Museum of Fine Arts and to the Canadian Museum of Civilizations will convince you that the standards are respected. Disabled persons experience no problems at all when going through these magnificent buildings which have been adapted to their needs.

But the federal government has gone one step further, acknowledging that we have to help disabled persons to lead a more satisfactory and more productive life within our society.

This is why the government has spared no efforts to make Canadians more aware of the physical obstacles standing in the way of the handicapped. It has been seeking the active co-operation of others—provinces and municipalities especially—to promote similar initiatives from coast to coast.

The Secretary of State was among the many organizations which responded favourably to the call to action. In 1988, the department launched the National Access Awareness Week, a golden opportunity to make Canadians appreciate the kind of obstacles a disabled person faces every day and to urge them to do something to facilitate the active participation of their less fortunate fellow citizens.

• (1740)

The result of co-operation by federal-provincial governments, municipalities, unions, agencies that support the disabled and the private sector, this initiative has also helped spotlight the needs and expectations of these Canadians in the five main areas that are the focus of the week: transportation, housing, the workplace, recreation and education.

This week also initiated the Five-Star Community Award Program, whose purpose is to give Canadian communities an opportunity to show their commitment to integration of the disabled. The program also pays tribute to achievements by municipalities in this area.

The quality of facilities and services made available to persons with a disability in Canada depends largely on municipalities and communities, and the Five-Star Community Award, sponsored by the National Access Awareness Week Committee, the Canadian Federation of Municipalities and the Department of the Secretary of State, offers an incentive to consider how they can improve the quality of life of disabled members of their communities and take the necessary action to achieve that objective.

From year to year, this program has become increasingly popular. In 1990, about 15 municipalities across the country received Star Awards, and for the first time since the program started in 1988, a Five-Star Community Award, the highest award for access awareness, was given to the municipality of Redvers in Saskatchewan, and to Ottawa and Kitchener in Ontario.

In Quebec, a Star Award went to the municipality of Saint-Louis-de-France, which organized a special transportation service covering ten neighbouring municipalities.

Calgary, Alberta, has also received a Star Award. The city has taken a number of steps to guarantee access to its buildings and facilities. In fact, the city has had a parallel transportation system for 19 years.

Actually, the Five-Star Community Award Program is only one of many initiatives taken by this government, in conjunction with its partners, to make this country more accessible to all citizens.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to draw the attention of hon. members to the government's response to the report of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons which was tabled not long ago.

In line with its commitment to promoting full and complete integration of disabled persons, the present government intends to act on the committee's recommendations to a very considerable extent.

It will undertake a detailed analysis of federal legislation as it relates to disabled persons; it will conduct a post-censal survey in 1991, to update the national data bank on the disabled; and it will establish a committee of deputy ministers that will be asked to improve co-ordination of federal activities in this area.

Every citizen has a contribution to make to its community and the right to participate in its life. So, whenever we remove obstacles for the handicapped, we increase their potential to make such a contribution and we build up a pool of skills for the benefit of our communities and the general wealth of the nation.

We have recognized that reality, Madam Speaker and that is why this government is determined to pursue its goals with the co-operation of his partners, the provinces and municipalities, in every area under its jurisdiction so as to allow the handicapped the opportunity to become full-fledged citizens.

In conlusion, Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for Saint-Léonard who raised this issue which will continue to be a priority for Canadians as a whole and particularly for this government.

[*English*]

**Mr. J.W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury):** Madam Speaker, I compliment the hon. member for Saint-Leonard on the resolution he has placed before the House this afternoon and to say to him that the spirit of his resolution is one which we all support. It gives us an opportunity to speak once again about the plight of the handicapped and the disabled in our society and of the steps that we must take to accommodate and help them.

Every member of this House recognizes that the 13 per cent of our population with disabilities, some 3.2 million Canadians, have a long way yet to go before they achieve the same rights to access and participation in the life of our society and country that most of us take for granted.

Nowhere is that more evident than when it comes to the question of economic integration. Persons with disabilities are among the poorest members of our society. Sixty per cent of the disabled in the 1986 census reported incomes under $10,000 per year. Their participation rate in the paid labour force is only slightly above half that of adult Canadians without a disability.

Without economic integration, very few Canadians with disabilities will ever know economic independence. Without that independence, participation in our society or in any society will seldom be realized.

Not so long ago the traditional attitude toward persons with disabilities was to exclude them from the productive sectors of our society because they were thought capable only of dependence. Our laws and our policies were directed in effect to limiting their self reliance with the result that regardless of abilities, they were effectively isolated from the mainstream.

Today, we know better. We know that within the disabled community of Canada, there is a resource of talent and ability that, given the opportunity, can not only improve the lives of persons with disabilities themselves, but also contribute significantly to society's growth and to society's prosperity.

These are the beliefs reflected in the recommendations of the standing committee's report. When the government tabled its response to that response on November 8, my colleague, the Secretary of State wrote in his letter to the chairperson of the committee, the hon. member for Oxford, the government's clear and emphatic acceptance of the committee's recommendations.

Let us look at the standing committee's recommendations and the government's response to them. Recommendation one of the standing committee calls for the Government of Canada to work with the committee, the voluntary sector, the private sector, labour, and with the disabled community itself, to bring forward a national strategy to achieve the economic integration of persons with disabilities.

What was the government's response? In no uncertain terms, the government pledged itself to the objective of economic integration. It pledged that not only would the minister responsible for the disabled work in partnership toward this goal, but that the Ministers of Health and Welfare, Employment and Immigration and Finance would be partners in that work.

Going beyond that, Public Works Canada is another major government department which makes a commitment almost daily on behalf of the disabled. The decade 1983 to 1992 has been termed the decade of disabled persons, so declared by the Prime Minister. We participate the first week of June each year in National Access Awareness Week to underline that commitment. This participation is particularly important, as I have said, to Public Works Canada.

Those of us who are fortunate enough not to be disabled do not usually appreciate the barriers faced by others. We do not have to phone a restaurant beforehand to find out if the door is wide enough for our wheelchair. However, most of us have, at one time or another, tried to find an office hidden in a poorly designed maze of corridors. Laden down with packages or a briefcase, we have tried to open heavy doors. Those occasions should help us to understand the plight of disabled persons.

• (1750)

All of us have a stake in barrier-free design. The rate of disability increases with age, to the point that today two out of every five Canadians aged 65 or more will live to be disabled in some way or another.

It is not only physical barriers that must come down. Ramps are being built, doorways are being widened and employment equity is moving ahead. But there are many other invisible barriers which Public Works Canada and all Canadians are endeavouring to address. These include inadequate understanding of what disabled people can do.

There is a myth that society has an obligation to take care of disabled people. Too often we remain ignorant about their capabilities and hence think only in terms of caring for them. Rather than providing them with opportunities to live their lives in dignity and to fully contribute their skills to society, we make them dependent upon others.

It might be useful for employers to realize that 79 per cent of disabled workers have attendance records equal to, or better than, those of non-disabled employees, or that disabled people have greater job stability and less turnover than non-disabled workers.

We should also remember that a disability does not always present a handicap. Often it means that a disabled person may do something a little differently than a non-disabled person, but with equal success.

We have had some great champions in Canada for the disabled. People like Terry Fox, Steve Fonyo and Rick Hansen have demonstrated that in the Canadian spirit, there are champions, disabled or not.

Public Works Canada, as the nation's largest construction agency, is concerned in that spirit with removing physical barriers to the free movement of persons with disabilities. Indeed, the department has been actively involved in barrier-free design since the 1970s. Since 1982, all new federal government buildings must comply with Public Works Canada's barrier-free design standard. Our newest museums—air, art and civilization—were built according to this standard. Another major program is to make existing buildings accessible. That program is nearly complete.

Items in this standard will include maximum permissible slopes for wheelchair ramps, the prohibition of projections in passageways which would be dangerous to people with visual problems, the development of specifications for accessible parking spaces to be used by disabled persons, and specifications for telephones to be used by hearing-impaired persons.

Recently, Treasury Board revised its policy on accessibility by calling for improvements to be made over the next five years at other federal government facilities besides offices, such as laboratories, hospitals and our national parks. Public Works Canada will be called on to respond to the challenge of making these significant changes and improvements across the country.

The Canadian Standards Association was contracted by Public Works Canada to develop a national building standard for accessibility which we hope will be used by governments and private organizations across the country to accomplish some of the objectives described in the motion of the hon. member for Saint-Léonard.

This standard is very important. It is easy enough to design a doorway wide enough for a wheelchair before a building is built, but not so easy once the building has been constructed. The point is that if a consistent national design standard is in place which recognizes the importance of accessibility, we could eliminate the extra construction costs of having to go back to renovate structures for accessibility afterward.

In closing, Public Works Canada initiatives include the provision of way-finding tools to help people, including the visually impaired, find their way around federal facilities, to construct meeting rooms with specially-designed acoustics for those who cannot hear so well, and especially measures to assist disabled people during an emergency, such as the outbreak of fire.

Public Works Canada has a proud record, not only in barrier-free design but in developing procedures that ensure the security of disabled persons and eliminate barriers to employment.

I believe that Public Works Canada set a standard and an example that speak well and fully to the spirit and to the objectives of this motion.

**Mr. Dave Worthy (Cariboo—Chilcotin):** Madam Speaker, how could you forget the riding I come from, Cariboo-Chilcotin. It is the home of Rick Hansen, who comes from my home town of Williams Lake. He attended school with my daughters. He grew up as a normal, healthy, fairly athletic young man. He, of course, did not know what was going to happen to him. In his late teens he was in a tragic automobile accident and became paralysed from his waist down. That young man took a totally new situation and transformed it from one that could have been so tragic into one where he is just starting to build a life with much meaning.

Obviously he is well known now around the world, not just across Canada. Every time I meet him and talk to him, I am thrilled with what he has shown, not only to the handicapped but to the rest of us, can be done when a person either grabs the opportunity or, as in many cases needs to be done when he is offered the opportunity.

I tend to look on people with a handicap in a different way because of my association with Rick Hansen. I do not think of it so much as what we can do for the handicapped. It is a tragedy of the resource that is there, a Canadian resource that we are not fully utilizing.

Everyone recognizes that in many cases there are special efforts that have to be taken if we are going to be using this special resource. It may require modifications to facilities, obviously access to buildings and washroom facilities. Those have to be done. They take money, some thought and consideration.

There are other factors, for example, the normal equipment in a place of work. Let us take the example of an office. One business in my riding in 100 Mile House is quite small but it was determined that it was going to take advantage of this resource and do what it could to fit them into the work scheme. Not only did it have to modify the facilities as I described, but obviously the normal office equipment had to be modified. It took pains to do this on its own.

In many cases special training is required. For example, people without full utilization of their limbs are able with proper training and proper facilities to take advantage of and use computer equipment as effectively as the rest of us.

The office I refer to in 100 Mile House actually has handicapped people using typesetting equipment. After a short period of time they were able not only to do the job as well as someone we think of as not handicapped, but the employers valued them as being superior.

I have been impressed by only a few examples I have seen in my riding, which is a rural riding. We do not tend to have as much exposure to handicapped people as in a larger riding. Therefore, it requires more effort on the part of citizens, businesses, and everyone who lives in these centres to make sure we are taking the effort, that we are opening our eyes to the opportunities that these Canadians deserve, and the resource they provide to our businesses and communities that should be taken advantage of.

• (1800 )

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business is now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1), the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

I do want to apologize to the hon. member for Cariboo—Chilcotin. It is the end of a long day, and I drew a blank when it came to remembering his beautiful riding in British Columbia.

---

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

### REFUGEES

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt):** Madam Speaker, I am rising today on a very important issue, especially for the greater metropolitan area of Toronto and for Ontario.

We have a backlog of over 80,000 refugees who have come seeking refuge in our country. Most of them are here because they could not have peace in their own countries. We have close to 44,220 English speaking refugees who we categorize as group four. They arrived before December 31, 1988.

For those members who do not know, the government has four offices in Ontario: Ottawa, London, Toronto, and Mississauga. The workload is extremely heavy, especially in two offices: the one in Toronto, which is called Davisville, and the other in Mississauga. At present the government is trying to find a solution to this problem and it is failing completely. Like I said, there are 44,220 English speaking refugees waiting to be processed. In the Toronto office alone there are 22,000 such cases that the government will have to deal with before September 1991.

I telephoned the department and spoke to department officials. I asked them: "What are you doing?" They said: "We are dealing with English speaking cases. The other ones, we are putting on the back-burner". It is tough luck for someone who has been waiting for four to six years, does not speak English and is not in the group four

category, which is mainly people from the Caribbean Islands. Someone from Pakistan, South Africa, South America or the Middle East who does not speak English is going to have to wait.

I have people coming to my office who have been waiting to be reunited with their families for four, six, and eight years. Yet this government is doing nothing else but saying: "Tough luck. We are going to put you on the back-burner".

The Toronto office will be able to handle 7,000 hearings over the next year. That is working full tilt every day, working straight ahead and that is dealing only with English speaking cases.

The minister's officials are overworked. They work late in the evening, on weekends, on long weekend and on holidays. They say: "We are trying to do whatever we can in order to cope." They are human beings and they can see clearly that these other human beings have to be united with their family. They have within them some humanity, but the humanity should be with the minister and her officials.

Clearly the department has failed. It has failed Canadians and it has failed these people who are coming to Canada seeking refuge.

In the summer of 1987, when a boatload of Sikhs landed on the coast, the Prime Minister declared it an emergency and recalled Parliament. These people were doing nothing else but seeking refuge in Canada. We have 80,000 of them in Canada right now. Departmental officials scrapped the old legislation. They said that it was not working. They introduced new legislation which was supposed to clear this backlog by September 1991. Then they extended it to January 1992. This practice or what this department is grossly unfair, especially to the people who do not speak English, the non-English speaking refugees. A lot of them have taken up different methods. They are depressed. They have contemplated committing suicide. A lot of them are saying: "I cannot stand it any more. I am going to go back home." I know cases of Ahmadis refugees from Pakistan who came to this country. I spoke to the minister's officials and warned them that a man was going to leave and go back to Pakistan. Do you believe, Madam Speaker, that they did not react? They could not care less if somebody was going to go back and face uncertainty or prosecution. Clearly they could have moved up his hearing. This man was at his wit's end. He was ready to commit suicide. He had not seen his family for eight years, and he went back. I found out that he ended up in jail as soon as he went back.

• (1805)

It is not only that, but we clearly see from the Auditor General that this department is abysmal. I quote:

> The system was extremely prone to large-scale abuses and became overloaded by a growing number of claims that compounded existing delays.

It continues:

> Changes had either not been implemented or were not operating as intended. The number of claims greatly surpassed the capacity of the system.

The Auditor General clearly states:

> The backlog clearance program will cost more than estimated.

When will this minister finally realize that the system has failed? When will she do something about it? We need results, and we need them today.

**Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to expand on the reply given by the Minister of State for Employment and Immigration to the member for Scarborough—Agincourt on October 12, 1990.

As of October 26, more than 54 per cent of the backlog of 85,000 cases had been opened and 31 per cent had been decided. The time has now arrived, as everyone knew it would, to begin processing claimants from Caribbean countries. Any suggestion that this or any other group has been singled out for special attention is simply wrong.

Any grouping of claimants from a single language group is made purely for reasons of efficiency. It is not a departure from the principles guiding the backlog process. For example, to maximize operational efficiency, sometimes panel hearings are scheduled according to language based upon the availability of interpreters. If the hon. member wants us to forget about efficiency, he should say so. His party has had a long history in that regard.

Employment and Immigration Canada has given a mandate to clear the refugee claimant backlog within two years. Immigration officials are administering the backlog clearance program in co-operation with independent adjudicators and members of the Immigration and Refugee Board.

These officials must cope with constraints such as adjournments, scheduling problems related to panel hearings, and clients who do not attend scheduled interviews.

Program officials have been making and will continue to make every effort to streamline operations to maximize operational efficiency.

One thing that is being done by these officials is voluntary overtime. They are working very hard to do this. The hon. member and all other members of the House should be joining with me in congratulating them on their good work.

## INDIAN AFFAIRS

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak on this adjournment debate in reference to the question I put in the House on November 8, 1990 concerning the Oka crisis. I have been badgering away, trying to get the government to reveal what it knows happened in the Oka crisis last summer.

As a country we have become sort of like Bourbon kings were. The Bourbon kings in history were known for people who learn nothing from history. A smart country learns from its past and from its mistakes.

Let's go back to 1970 when the army was called into Quebec. It was under the War Measures Act and the National Defence Act of Canada. I think in retrospect historians are saying now that using the War Measures Act was an over-reaction. In fact having the federal arm lock up innocent Quebec nationalists increased Quebec nationalism rather than decrease it.

• (1810)

What did Parliament do? Parliament came back with a new government, and the government got rid of the War Measures Act, the old Liberal act, and passed a very progressive emergencies act. The emergencies act had provisions for Parliament being consulted when there is a crisis, controls on the armies called out, full reports, debate and so on.

It happened again. It happened in Oka in 1990, 20 years later. What did the government do? It forgot about the Emergency Measures Act. It used the National Defence Act and called in the army.

Right now under the National Defence Act of Canada—and this is what happened last summer—a provincial premier can unilaterally call in the Canadian Army for as long as he wants the army there, and the federal government pays the whole shot: $60 million.

**Mr. Milliken:** No, no.

**Mr. Waddell:** Yes, that is right, my friend. The act has been amended. The federal government pays it.

In this case we should go to Quebec and we should say we want $30 million of that back. Better still, we should look at what has happened and what should we be looking for. We need, as I suggested in my question a full inquiry into the Oka matter, not just to make cheap political points but to really learn something from this crisis.

First of all, let me refer to the Sûreté du Québec. Claude Ryan, a Quebec minister, submitted a report to Ottawa. I have a copy of it here. it was two pages and it said nothing really of the breakdown in control over the Sûreté that led to the causes of Oka.

Why did the Sûreté du Québec storm the roadblocks in Oka that caused the death of one officer? Who gave the order? It was tragic circumstances, but we really need to know what happened. This could be important for the future. What if there is another confrontation at James Bay, for example, in the big hydro project that is going to be developed there? We could learn with a full inquiry as to why the Sûreté was called out and why it really messed up.

We also want to know how the federal government was involved? Did it know about this beforehand? Why didn't it take steps to solve this land claim instead of allowing the municipal council to make a golf course when Indians claimed it was their land? Apparently they have a good claim. It is so good the federal government has paid $3 million or $4 million to deal with it. It could have saved $60 million had it done that before.

Finally, turning to the native people as well, where did the warriors get all those guns? How did the warriors get control in Kahnawake and Kanesatake? Maybe we should look into that so that it does not happen again, so that we have a fair and full land claims process in

Canada, and so that we can have real justice and democracy for native people in the country.

I think these are lessons that we could learn from Oka. The government has stonewalled mostly all our attempts to have a full inquiry, so much so that in the Indian affairs committee the other day it was blocking out an inquiry. I suggested it in my question that we need a full public inquiry into the affairs at Oka. Why? Because we can learn something as a country from that and we may not make the same mistakes again.

**Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member has raised this issue of a further inquiry into the stand-off at Oka on a number of occasions, but this issue has been referred to the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs. The committee should be allowed to do its work and reach its own decision in its terms of reference.

The need for the type of inquiry called for by the hon. member requires careful consideration. There is no question but that the actions of the Canadian Armed Forces at Oka were in conformity with the law and in conformity with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The chief of the defence staff responded to a lawful requisition from the Attorney General pursuant to Part XI of the National Defence Act. The army units involved acted throughout with a commendable degree of professionalism. The inquiry called for under the Act was undertaken by the province, and the resulting report was recently made public by the Secretary of State. In this regard it is also worth noting the Federal Court on two separate occasions has concluded that the actions of the Canadian Armed Forces did not result in any violations of the Charter. In my view it is important to look forward rather than back with regard to the government's relationship with aboriginal people. The events at Oka ended with a minimum of violence.

• (1815)

Rather than examining every detail of these events, we should move forward, building on the agenda outlined by the Prime Minister in his speech to the House on September 25, 1990. In that speech the Prime Minister set out an agenda with four main pillars: land claims, economic and social conditions on reserves, the relationship between aboriginal peoples and governments and concerns of Canada's aboriginal peoples in contemporary Canadian life.

The goal for this agenda is to create a new relationship between aboriginal and non-aboriginal Canadians. Its purpose, in my view, is to create a relationship with aboriginal people where Oka-type confrontations will not only be irrelevant but also unthinkable. Much can be achieved by focusing our efforts and energies in proceeding with the government's agenda. Little will be achieved by continuing to look back at the events that are passed and given the government's agenda, need not be repeated.

## BILL C-69

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Madam Speaker, I rise on the third of the brief debates this evening to expand on a question I put to the Minister of Justice last June. It has taken awhile to get on the Adjournment Debate. In fact, when I got the call that it might come up, I had forgotten the question, but I have reviewed it and I now recall the question and the most unsatisfactory answer the government gave on this occasion, which is not unusual.

The question that I put to the minister was, what was the Minister of Justice going to do now that the Court of Appeal of British Columbia had decided that the government had no authority to cap its obligations under the Canada Assistance Plan, as proposed in Bill C-69, which I believe is still before the other place.

The minister indicated that she was just going to appeal this decision. She did not like it and so she was going to appeal it. I submit that what we have here is the government acting in considerable contempt of the law of the country in tearing up and avoiding its obligations with the provinces. These are solemn obligations.

The government has certain taxation powers conceded by the provinces in exchange for payment of certain programs. The Canada Assistance Plan is one of those programs. What the government is seeking to do by Bill C-69—we have had this argument in the House before—is change those programs to the detriment of Canadians

and particularly those in three provinces: Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia.

The effect of Bill C-69 is to restrict the rate of growth of federal payments under the Canada Assistance Plan to 5 per cent for both 1991 and 1992 and the restriction applies only to those three provinces.

I may say that I believe this is the first time in Canadian history that the federal government has acted in a discriminatory way in the administration of cost-shared programs with the provinces. Instead of allowing provinces to participate if they choose to do so, it has said that certain provinces will only be allowed to participate so much, or at least to a certain extent. The government will decide which provinces will be the ones that it thinks have too much money and might be able to get a larger share of the pot if they are able to participate in these programs.

In other words, the poorer provinces can have what they want and the judgment as to who is poor and who is rich will rest with the federal government. The others will have to either pay for the program themselves or make do with less if they proceed with it with federal involvement.

I submit that is a bad principle for us to be involved in in federal-provincial relations. This government has claimed consistently that it was out to solve federal-provincial relations in Canada. I submit that it is painfully obvious on all the evidence that it has not only botched that but it has driven wedges into the relations between the provinces and the federal government in this country such as we have never seen in the past.

What is the effect of these cuts?

• (1820 )

The two most devastating cuts affect shelters for battered women, which are partly funded through the Canada Assistance Plan, and the 5 per cent ceiling applied in the three provinces. They will probably result, depending on the province's own financial circumstances, in fewer shelters being built and a freeze on existing services. Child care programs are also funded through the Canada Assistance Plan. This restriction will ensure that fewer child care facilities are built and existing services are frozen or expanded at a less rapid rate. That is a very serious problem particularly when the government pledged child care as one of its principal planks in the 1988 election campaign.

**Mr. Nicholson:** Ask your friends in the Senate.

**Mr. Milliken:** The parliamentary secretary says to ask my friends in the Senate. The nerve of him, making a comment like that.

The Senate got that bill about a week before Parliament was dissolved and the bill was not passed in that place. The Prime Minister ranted and raved, as the parliamentary secretary is probably going to do, all across the country and said that the Senate had blocked child care in Canada and that if it was not for the Senate, we would have child care.

That election was two years ago. The Prime Minister could have introduced and had passed a child care bill in the House. He has used closure on almost everything else, and he could have easily had a bill through the House by now, or even a year ago. But, has there been any move by the government to introduce child care into the House? No, all we have had is a cut and the cut is right here in Bill C-69. That is how the government keeps its promises.

Instead of introducing a bill to do what it said it was going to do, and what it said was so vital all through the campaign in 1988, it has introduced a bill that reduces child care in Canada. There is no other explanation for this bill. This is not just a breach of promise. This is not just a case of not fulfilling a promise. This is actually going back on a promise and making conditions worse than they were when it was making the promises of pie in the sky.

The government deceived Canadians. It was one of the many frauds perpetrated on Canadians during the 1988 election. We are now seeing the government's true colours. It wants to slash, slash, slash. It wants to cut programs for Canadians. This is an indication of its desire to reduce Canada's social programs. If this bill is allowed to remain in place, it is known and it is stated by economists that, by the year 2000 or shortly thereafter, there will be no money available under EPF transfers.

That is the other thing Bill C-69 does. It blocks and reduces EPF transfers. By the year 2000, there will be none of these available. Funding for education and health care in Canada will have been abandoned to the provinces insofar as the federal government is concerned. The attitude will be, if the province wants to have these programs in place, the province is going to have to pay. There will no national standards, no national programs.

This is an abandonment and dereliction of duty and I call on the government to respond to the Court of Appeal by agreeing with it and withdrawing this bill before the other place at once.

**Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, I would like to place this matter in context. It is useful to restate two questions that the government of British Columbia placed before the Court of Appeal.

The first question was this. Has the Government of Canada any statutory prerogative or contractual authority to limit its obligation under the Canada Assistance Plan and its agreement with the government of British Columbia, dated March 23, 1967, to contribute 50 per cent of the cost to British Columbia of assistance and welfare services? That was the first question.

The second question was this. Do the terms of the agreement of March 23, 1967, between the two governments, the subsequent conduct of the Government of Canada pursuant to the agreement and the provisions of the Canada Assistance Plan give rise to a legitimate expectation that the Government of Canada would introduce no bill into Parliament to limit its obligations under the agreement or the act without the consent of British Columbia?

The Court of Appeal answered the first question in the affirmative. The Government of Canada agrees, of course, that its obligations under the Canada Assistance Plan may be altered in the manner proposed in the February budget only by an amendment to the plan. That, of course, is the purpose of clause 2 of Bill C–69.

With respect to the majority opinion of the Court of Appeal in response to question number two, that the consent of British Columbia to an amendment of the plan was required, the Minister of Justice indicated to the House last June 18 that the government would be appealing this decision to the Supreme Court of Canada. I am pleased that that appeal has now been commenced. It will be heard December 11 and 12.

The Minister of Justice also indicated on June 18 that, pending the review and decision by the Supreme Court of Canada, the views of the court of appeal on the Canada Assistance Plan legislation would be respected. That remains the position of the government.

It is evident that the appropriate course of action is not, as the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands suggested, to withdraw this bill. On the contrary, it is clearly in the interests of controlling the federal budgetary deficit that these portions of Bill C–69, unrelated to the Canada Assistance Plan litigation, be proceeded with expeditiously. That is the course of action that the government will be pursuing. It is wholly consistent with the position announced by the Minister of Justice on June 18.

[*Translation*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** A motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been moved. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned, pursuant to Standing Order 24(1), until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The House adjourned at 6.26 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Friday, November 23, 1990**

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

[*English*]

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions on both sides of the House, and I believe you will find that there is consent for the following motion:

That, immediately following the adoption of this motion, these provisions be in force for proceedings in the House this day, notwithstanding any Standing Order:

1. Supplementary Estimates (B) be tabled and referred to various Standing Committees as in the motion of the President of the Treasury Board, without question being put;

2. Orders of the Day be called immediately thereafter, until Statements by Members at 11 o'clock a.m., followed by Oral Questions at 11.15 o'clock a.m.;

3. All Routine Proceedings be called at noon in the usual manner, followed by Government Orders until 2 o'clock p.m., during which time

a) Bill C-92, an act to amend the Northwest Territories Act, shall be disposed of at all stages, on division, and

b) Government Business No. 23 respecting the appointment of a Special Committee to study the subject-matter of Bill C-80, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Customs Tariff in consequence thereof, and any amendments thereto, shall be disposed of on division;

4. Private Members' Business be called at the usual time;

5. At the completion of the time provided for consideration of Private Members' Business the House suspend to the call of the Chair, for the sole purpose of receiving a message respecting the giving of Royal Assent to Bill C-87, an act to amend the statue law in relation to war veterans, later this day, and that following such Royal Assent, upon return to this Chamber, the Speaker shall adjourn the House until 1 o'clock p.m. Monday, November 26, 1990.

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to confirm that there have been discussions. I just wanted to make a couple of observations on this motion.

If we accept this motion, we will be forgoing the opportunity to demand that the House divide on the question of referring the estimates to committees. We do this because we are very anxious that committees review these estimates.

Second, we are very concerned about the rejigging of the government's spending plan and want a very thorough and complete committee review of the major elements contained in the supplementary estimates.

Before giving our final consent to this motion, I seek the government's assurance that it will not play games or impede the committees from doing the important work that we will be sending them.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I want you and this house to know that there have been no discussions with the group I represent and other independent members. We are anxious to hear the figures the Minister of State (Finance) has for us, but I would not want the Government Leader to construe this as a precedent. If the government Leader and the leader of the Liberal Party think that they can take us for granted, let me tell them this. We will grant consent this once, but next time, please consult. Otherwise, you will not have consent.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the hon. Government Leader have the unanimous consent of the House to present his motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

*Estimates*

• (1010)

[*English*]

## SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B), 1990-91

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting Supplementary Estimates (B) for the financial year ending March 31, 1991, was presented by Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board) and read by Mr. Speaker to the House.

[*Translation*]

### REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEES

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Pursuant to Standing Orders 81(5) and 81(6), I move:

That the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, laid upon the Table earlier today, be referred to the several standing committees of the House as follows:

[*English*]

Since there is a detailed allocation of the estimates to various committees and since the list is lengthy, if it is agreeable to the House, I would ask that the list be printed in *Hansard* as if it had been read.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

Pursuant to Order made earlier this day and pursuant to Standing Orders 81(5) and 81(6), it was ordered,

—That the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, laid upon the table earlier this day, be referred to the several Standing Committees of the House as follows:

To the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs

Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Votes 15b and L20b.

To the Standing Committee on Agriculture

Agriculture, Votes 5b, 10b, 15b, 20b, 30b and 50b.

To the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture

Communications, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b, 30b, 55b, 60b and 72b.
Secretary of State, Votes 1b, 5b and 30b.

To the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism and Citizenship

Secretary of State, Vote 20b.

To the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations

Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Votes 1b, 5b, 17b and 25b.
Industry, Science and Technology, Votes 90b, 95b and 102b.
Privy Council, Vote 1b.
Public Works, Votes 5b, 15b, 16b, 25b and 30b.
Secretary of State, Vote 25b.
Supply and Services, Votes 1b, 5b and L15b.

To the Standing Committee on Energy, Mines and Resources

Energy, Mines and Resources, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b, 25b and 30b.

To the Standing Committee on Environment

Environment, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b, 15b, 20b, 25b and 30b.

To the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade

External Affairs, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b, 20b, 30b, 35b and L46b.

To the Standing Committee on Finance

Finance, Votes 1b and 12b.
National Revenue, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b and 15b.

To the Standing Committee on Forestry and Fisheries

Forestry, Vote 1b.

To the Standing Committee on Human Rights and Status of Disabled Persons

Justice, Vote 10b.

To the Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General

Justice, Votes 1b, 5b, 15b, 25b and 45b.
Solicitor General, Votes 5b, 10b, 20b and 35b.

To the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration

Employment and Immigration, Votes 1b, 5b, 10b, 15b, 20b and 30b.
Labour, Votes 1b, 5b and 10b.

To the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs

National Defence, Votes 1b, 5b, 15b and 20b.
Veterans Affairs, Vote 5b.

To the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare, Social Affairs, Seniors and the Status of Women

Employment and Immigration, Vote 35b.
National Health and Welfare, Votes 5b, 10b, 15b, 30b and 35b.

To the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology, Regional and Northern Development

Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Votes 45b and 50b.
Industry, Science and Technology, Votes 1b, 5b, 25b, 30b, 35b, 40b, 60b, 65b, 70b, 75b and 80b.

To the Standing Committee on Transport

Privy Council, Vote 10b.
Transport, Votes 1b and 10b.

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, given the exceptional co-operation and our

agreement to this process, I wonder if the minister could guarantee that the estimates are available to members of Parliament now and that distribution downstairs has copies of those documents.

**Mr. Loiselle:** Mr. Speaker, I understand that copies will be made available immediately to the House leaders of the various parties and to the spokesmen for the Treasury Board. At the same time 1,000 copies are available for members, and I understand that some of them will be brought to the opposition lobby as of now.

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I just want to comment on the editorial comment of my friend, the House leader of the Liberal Party.

The co-operation exhibited is as a result of yesterday's plaintive pleas by members of the opposition that the estimates be provided at ten o'clock so that they would have fodder for Question Period, rather than at twelve o'clock as we planned.

Being always reasonable and co-operative we have accommodated, at great personal effort on the part of my colleague, the President of the Treasury Board. When we are taking credit for co-operation, I know it slipped the hon. House leader's mind that he did not acknowledge the co-operation he received from this side of the House to the request they made yesterday.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but rise to this great statement. You would not know this, but we just adopted an order of this House in which the opposition gave its undertaking that it would pass Bill C-92 at all stages today and also pass resolution No. 23 today. I think this is exceptional—and I underline exceptional—co-operation with this government that refused yesterday to give us the estimates.

It was in exchange for that, Mr. Speaker, that we got this little bit of concession at 10.15 in the morning.

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Mr. Speaker, I will not participate in the cross-fire, but I think the record is clear as to who did what and when.

I have not had a chance to look at the list of the committees to which the estimates will be referred, but one can only assume that the Standing Committee on Transport and the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations are two such committees.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, you are seized with a question of privilege from myself of some time standing, dealing with the fact that these two committees are not able to meet. Because these committees are not currently functioning, I fail to see how, under the circumstances, they can discharge their responsibilities to scrutinize these estimates. I wonder if that may not put in jeopardy the supply process provided for in our Standing Orders.

I would like at this time to give notice that my caucus has concerns about this important issue. We will be seeking an opportunity next week to raise this issue in the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** Pursuant to the order adopted earlier this day, the motion of the President of the Treasury Board is deemed adopted.

Motion agreed to.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (for the Minister of Justice)** moved that Bill C-92, an act to amend the Northwest Territories Act, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

**Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, Bill C-92 is a proposed amendment to the Northwest Territories Act to approve an amendment by the territorial government to its Official Languages Act, to extend the delay for the translation and bilingual printing and publishing of territorial laws.

In 1984 the government of the Northwest Territories reached an agreement with the federal government to make French an official language of territorial legislative and governmental institutions and to provide for government services in French.

The agreement provided that the territorial government would adopt a law on official languages that would be entrenched by federal legislation so that any amendment by the territorial government which would affect

rights or services provided therein would require the approval of Parliament.

Under the agreement, the costs of implementing French as an official language have been borne by the federal government. As well, the agreement provided for federal funding of $16 million to the territories for preservation and enhancement of aboriginal languages and services in those languages.

In 1988, Parliament passed the new federal Official Languages Act. The act specifically excluded legislative and governmental institutions of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon from the definition of federal institutions. It also excluded the laws of the territories and the Yukon from the bilingual requirements applying to federal laws.

As contemplated by the 1984 agreement, the act also entrenched in the Northwest Territories Act and the Yukon Act, the respective language ordinances of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon.

Section 45.1 of the Northwest Territories Act, and its counterpart in the Yukon Act require the approval of Parliament for any amendment to the territorial law, except where it provides for additional rights and services in English and in French or the aboriginal languages.

Since January 19, 1990 all new territorial legislation has been introduced and passed in the Territorial Assembly in both English and French. In April 1990 the territorial government amended its official languages ordinance to make six aboriginal languages the official languages of the territories, along with French and English.

The amendment also provided for a number of additional rights and government services in the aboriginal languages.

The April amendment provides, for instance, that the government may prescribe the translation and publication of ordinances in one or more of the aboriginal languages after their enactment in English and French.

As well, by January 1, 1993 territorial government services will be provided in each of the official aboriginal languages where there is significant demand in those languages.

In August 1990 the Minister of Justice of the Northwest Territories wrote to the federal Minister of Justice to seek agreement on an amendment to the Northwest Territories Act to concur in a territorial amendment to the official languages ordinance to extend the time limit for the translation into French and bilingual printing and publishing of previously enacted laws to March 31, 1992. In the letter and in subsequent meetings, Mr. Ballantyne and his officials explained that the need to extend the delay resulted from technical problems in reprinting the revised ordinances and adjusting the regulations accordingly.

• (1020)

I understand a further factor in meeting the deadline has been the difficulty in attracting and keeping qualified legal translators, who are in very short supply in Canada.

The revised ordinances are in final revision and are being sent to the printers, but they cannot be brought into force until the regulations are also ready. Experts from the translation bureau of the Department of the Secretary of State have verified this. They agree that the delay period requested is an appropriate one, in view of the remaining work to be done.

The Minister of Justice of the Northwest Territories has assured us, and other ministers of the territorial government have confirmed, that the delay in bringing their laws into effect in both English and French will not have any impact on the requirement of the territorial law that services in both languages will be available from the territorial government as of January 1, 1991. That was an important factor in the government's decision to seek concurrence by Parliament.

If the concurring amendment to the Northwest Territories is not made, the amendment to the territorial official languages ordinance would be ineffective in extending the delay. By virtue of the official languages ordinance, the consequence would be that virtually all territorial laws would become of no force or effect as of January 1, 1991.

The operation and enforcement of law would be seriously compromised in the territories. We cannot accept responsibility for such a result.

The government of the territories is well on its way to meeting its obligations under the territorial official languages ordinance. It needs a further period to finish

the work it has undertaken in revising its laws and regulations, and printing and publishing them in both official languages.

On October 29, 1990 the territorial legislature and the commissioner in council, passed an act to amend the Official Languages Act to extend the deadline for bilingual printing and publishing of previous legislation until March 31, 1992.

Bill C-92, an act to amend the Northwest Territories Act, would simply demonstrate Parliament's concurrence in that amendment and prevent a potentially serious gap in the operation and the validity of the laws of the Northwest Territories. To avoid such a result, Parliament's concurring, through this amendment, will be required prior to December 31.

I hope all members will recognize the need to act quickly in a non-partisan spirit to meet our responsibilities to the people of the north.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak to Bill C-92, whose purpose is to grant the Northwest Territories an extension of the agreement by which all legislative documents, assembly proceedings and other documents shall be available in both official languages, that is, English and French, by April 1991.

Madam Speaker, we are all familiar with the situation concerning official languages in the Territories, a situation that was described quite satisfactorily by the parliamentary secretary. Section 9 of the Territories' Official Languages Act reads as follows:

[*English*]

It reads as follows, Madam Speaker: "English and French are the official languages of the Territories and have equality of status and equal rights and privileges as to their use in all institutions of the Legislative Assembly and Government of the Territories".

Article 10 of that same Official Languages Act reads as follows: "Everyone has the right to use English or French in any debates or other proceedings of the Legislative Assembly".

What we are dealing with today is an act to amend the Northwest Territories Act and allow for a second extension to the commitments made by the Northwest Territories to translate and make available legislative documents to the people of the Northwest Territories.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, I would like to provide some historical background. In 1984, the Government of Canada, represented by Liberal Minister Serge Joyal at the time, and the Government of the Northwest Territories signed an agreement under which the latter undertook to pass legislation making French one of the official languages of the Territories, I repeat, *one* of the official languages. The Government of Canada promised to pay all costs of establishing and providing French services.

That same month, inspired by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the Legislative Assembly of the Territories passed Bill 9, which I just quoted, establishing the official languages of the Northwest Territories. The purpose of this legislation was to make institutional bilingualism—I repeat, *institutional*—official. For the benefit of those who still have trouble understanding the difference between institutional and individual bilingualism, I may recall that institutional bilingualism means giving Canadians access to institutions in the official language of their choice, either French or English. This applies not only to the legislative body but also to the courts. It is also true—this is very important and I will get back to it later on—that there is some concern about the government services that communities are entitled to receive. That is another matter, but I want to make sure the government understands that, when we agree to a second extension, we also want some firm commitments from this government regarding services in French for the Territories' French-speaking communities.

Madam Speaker, the bill that was intended to make NWT government institutions bilingual by January 1, 1988—and I am still referring to the original legislation passed in 1984—extended the deadline until December 31, 1990, following a number of technical difficulties the NWT government encountered with the translation of acts, ordinances, and so forth.

The deadline was extended to December 31, 1990, and now, a month before the extension expires, we are again asked to extend or postpone the deadline, if you prefer, until April 1, 1992. That is the purpose of Bill C-92.

Madam Speaker, as far as translation is concerned, the NWT government has made considerable progress. I am told all its laws have been translated. The ordinances must now be revised, in French and in English, and printed, while regulations adopted pursuant to these ordinances must be updated.

• (1030)

The Liberal caucus, whose spokesman I am today, acknowledges the good will of the Government of the Northwest Territories and appreciates the request made in its ordinance. Given this request, we support the adoption of this bill at all stages today.

Madam Speaker, naive though I may appear, I should like to comment briefly on the situation in the Northwest Territories as it relates to the official languages.

The legislation adoption process and the implementation of such legislation concerning services to the public at large, particularly to the communities, is essential. For too long now the francophone residents of the Northwest Territories have been completely ignored with respect to dealings which concern them, especially the strong impact on the future of their community, its laws, and government services. For too long now, Madam Speaker, their needs have been decided for them without consultation. The message I would convey to the federal government, responsible as it is for protecting, supporting and promoting national unity, is to act as defender and representative of these minorities before the governments of the Territories so that these governments understand that the francophone communities of the Northwest Territories now ask nothing more than to be consulted and involved when governments open up new services, when governments willingly agree to meet the major needs of the residents of the Northwest Territories, one of our country's main regions.

Madam Speaker, when the House passed the Official Languages Act in June 1988, the government was committed to promote the growth of francophone and anglophone minorities. Again I say francophones and anglophones because they do exist. Some minorities are constantly under the threat of assimilation, and I am referring to francophones outside Quebec. But then again Quebec has an anglophone minority that has the right to be there and to enjoy the services to which it is entitled under the Constitution and the law.

As full-fledged citizens of this country which has two official languages we make the following argument, namely that the existence and survival of these francophone groups in the various provinces and in the Territories are linked to the survival of our country itself, and that we have to protect and support these groups to ensure equality and respect between Canada's two linguistic communities.

If we lose our francophone communities outside Quebec, Madam Speaker, what is the point in having bilingual Territories if no one is there to use the law, if no one is there to benefit from government services? What will be the use of balkanizing into two entities, one speaking only French in Quebec and the other speaking only English outside Quebec? This is why it has become imperative for governments, particularly those which have not progressed as much as the Northwest Territories or New Brunswick, for example, or the federal government, to consider the importance of catching up with others. A year or so ago Alberta and Saskatchewan were the scene of rather trying times when their parliaments or legislative assemblies denied the traditional and constitutional rights of people to have laws in French. Following what I would call very regrettable incidents, we came to realize that certain governments remain quite indifferent to these provisions.

Madam Speaker, bearing this in mind, the Liberal caucus, in addition to expressing its support for the Territories and commending them for the gains made by the francophone community so far, would also remind the federal government of the importance of its commitment to promote and support these communities. To a number of people in the north, and to the NWT francophone community as a whole, services are far more important. The need for services is far more pressing. Services are their main priority.

Translations are fine. To have laws and ordinances translated into French is excellent. However, if there are no services to help these communities live in French in the north, all this won't be much use. It will be a purely symbolic gesture.

That is why we want this government to keep its promise to the NWT francophone community and give it the support it needs, so that it can obtain health and education services from the Territorial government—I won't give the whole list, because hon. members know

what I am talking about. I am referring to Section 23 of the Constitution which gives Canadians the right to send their children to the school of their choice, either in English or in French. That is not yet the case everywhere in Canada, and it is now eight years since the Constitution was ratified. There are still a number of provinces where it is impossible for a child to be educated in its mother tongue.

We must make up for lost time, Madam Speaker. In three of our provinces, Canadians still cannot speak before a criminal court in the language of their choice. Three provinces have yet to grant this fundamental right of every Canadian to be able to defend himself in the language of his choice. We still have a long way to go, and I think it is incumbent on these provinces to catch up with the rest of the country.

Madam Speaker, as the parliamentary secretary pointed out, in January 1991, the Government of the Northwest Territories will be under a legal obligation to provide government or institutional services in French and English. It will be under the obligation to provide for the use of both official languages in territorial courts, starting January 1991. But will the NWT Government be able to provide those services by that time? I am told that not everything is in place yet, despite this deadline.

Will this government have the technical capacity to meet these legal requirements? Or will we again have a situation where francophone minorities must resort to court challenges in order to defend their rights?

Madam Speaker, I hope we will not always be in a situation where the minority, which sometimes happens to be the weaker party, has to resort to legal remedies to protect its rights.

I make this point for the benefit of the federal government, because it has the resources. It has the money to assist these groups. As for the political will, as I said before, it is there, in the Northwest Territories. So in fact, the Secretary of State merely has to conclude agreements with the Northwest Territories that would ensure the availability of certain services in French, without putting an additional burden on NWT residents.

Madam Speaker, these are matters that are of considerable concern to NWT francophones. It asked me to beg the government, in the course of this debate, to act on a firm commitment, made when the Official Languages Act was passed nearly two years ago, to help these communities defend their language rights.

• (1040)

Finally, Madam Speaker—and I will try to be brief—like all hon. members I realize that the NWT government had to overcome considerable technical difficulties when faced with the enormous task of having all its statutes translated. As I said earlier, I am told that all the statutes have been translated and all that remains are the ordinances and a few regulations.

We are aware that there are a few problems, despite all the good will. For instance, it is not easy to find translators who are familiar with the requirements of legal and legislative translation. We also realize that funding made available by the federal government should continue to be made available to these communities.

Madam Speaker, considering the good faith shown by the territorial government, we are prepared to give our consent to this provision. In concluding, I would like to say, to the people who think this is a waste of time and money, that we feel this provision for the translation of laws, ordinances, regulations and other texts into French is important if we want this country to remain united.

I deplore the attitude of some people in this country, of the authors and writers and groups that say it is a waste of time. If it is worth having two official languages, as we do, it is worth protecting them across this country to achieve language equity. It is also worthwhile to ensure that these groups, these French or English-speaking communities, wherever they happen to live in this country, have access to government services, laws and ordinances in their own language. As I said earlier, I deplore the negative approach taken by some people to this question. The game is not over yet, however. I can assure you, Madam Speaker, that unlike what was said by Mr. Yves Beauchemin, a writer, when he appeared recently before the Commission—

**An hon. member:** The Bélanger-Campeau Commission.

**Mr. Gauthier:** I was looking for the quote. In any case, Mr. Beauchemin said recently before the Bélanger–Campeau Commission in Quebec that minorities, that francophones outside Quebec were like a corpse that is still warm.

I would urge Mr. Beauchemin and others of the same persuasion to look beyond their immediate horizons and visit Canada. There are still large groups in this country that want to survive and want this country to survive, and that simply want the majority to give them a measure of equity and exercise some generosity so that we can continue to defend and preserve this country, Canada, that some day, I hope, will be respectful and supportive of both official language groups.

Finally, I would like to say that today, we are prepared to adopt all stages of the bill, including committee of the whole and third reading.

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Madam Speaker, on behalf of the New Democratic Party, I wish to speak today on this bill. I know that the hon. member for Ottawa–Vanier is particularly fond of this subject and that he could speak about it for an hour or two even. I heard his speech.

So, as a gesture of goodwill, we are not going to delay the passing of Bill C–92, an Act to amend the Northwest Territories Act, in order to allow more time for the statutes and orders to be translated into French.

[*English*]

As I said, Madam Speaker, the bill will provide bilingual services in the north and will extend the time that the federal government has given to the Northwest Territorial government, which is its creature. It is still a territory really. It is really still a creature of the federal government, although some day I hope it will be independent in the sense of being a province.

[*Translation*]

I am saying this for my friend from the Bloc Québécois who is going to speak after me. I am anxious to hear his speech.

[*English*]

The original commitment to bilingual services was made in 1985. Given the recent tensions in this country and the Belanger–Campeau commission that my friend from Vanier spoke about, we do not want the federal government to drag its heels in providing minimal services for the francophone community, *francophones hors Québec*, especially the francophone community where the federal government has jurisdiction and where this Parliament has a special responsibility, and that is in the Northwest Territories.

The federation of NWT francophones wrote to the Secretary of State in late October expressing some serious concern about the fact that promises made about services in the French language were not being kept. We would like to see these technical delays overcome and the promises kept. We do not want any excuses. We want the government to provide these minimum services.

Article 23 of the Constitution provides for parent–controlled schooling to the francophone community in the territories where numbers warrant. It is essential that francophones in the territories now be closely consulted in the implementation of this right in the near future. It is also essential that francophones in the territories now be consulted about government services that must be made available to them in their own language.

It is all very well to translate laws, but you need medical services, legal services and so on. Although I am from British Columbia, I have lived in the east for 11 years. I travel back and forth really, bi–coastal if you like. I have found that just across the river in Quebec, I can get health services, legal services and so on in the English language.

Having said that, I want to point out that French is only 3 per cent of the Northwest Territories. I am proud that I worked for the Berger commission there about 15 years ago. We did the commission then in English and in French. We had hearings all across the country in English, French, Dene, Loucheux, Slavey, Dog Rib and Inuktitut. If I might be permitted to speak a little Inuktitut, I remember when I was a much younger man, I had a beard and they used to call—

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut*]

—which means sick, sick, the little guy with the beard. Those were great days. I remember the territories and I remember the effort to have other languages.

I see my friend from the bloc Quebecois about to speak, and I will end now. I want to tell him and other people, it is with some difficulty that anglophone mem-

bers of Parliament from western Canada and other places stand up in this House and advocate francophone rights outside of Quebec. I am sure he realizes that if we adopt his position, and Quebec becomes sovereign, there would not be any anglophone rights outside of Quebec and the new English Canada would be unilingual. I am not saying I would want to see that. I am just saying the reality of it would be that we would be looking at a Quebec which is French and the rest of Canada which is English. There would be no effort like there is here to try to translate laws. That is not a threat. That is a just a statement of reality.

• (1050)

I point out to him—

[*Translation*]

I point out to my friend that he may perceive things differently, but that this is how Laurier perceived them. So did Henri Bourassa and Pierre Trudeau. He was a member of Trudeau's government. They envisaged a bilingual Canada.

[*English*]

I will say this in English. It is not so much bilingual, but to respect French and English rights throughout Canada. That is what this is about, and that is why we in the New Democratic Party support it. That means to extend francophone rights, even in this case when it is only 3 per cent of the population, where it is a majority native people.

We see it as a society where we respect language rights. We respect the rights of the two founding people because the way in which this country was created—I like to think of it as a cake, with the bottom being the native people, the base, French and English, and then the new multicultural reality of the present. I am sure he has a different view of a different sort of country. I think what we have fought for for almost 150 years is still worth fighting for. I hope that the translators will get going and the government in the Northwest Territories can provide those services in French.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Madam Speaker, after listening to my colleagues' comments on Bill C-62, I must share a few thoughts with you. We are hearing today speeches on what I would call equal Canada. There are speeches on the principles of bilingualism, and generosity. For years, I believed in that legal fiction. I thought that it could become a reality. However, after all those years and after travelling all over the country, we must come to the conclusion that we are deluding ourselves if we think that Canada is bilingual. In everyday life, bilingualism is a reality only for a small elite in Canada, especially in the National Capital Region.

Madam Speaker, I know that you had the opportunity to travel across the country. I heard Premier Clyde Wells give speeches on our bilingual country. Well, I visited bilingual Newfoundland. The truth is that bilingualism is totally non-existant in that part of Canada.

Madam Speaker, I travelled extensively across Canada and I would say that, all in all, one of the few places in which I found bilingual services was airports. That is to say when you do not arrive late, after the bilingual attendant has left. But, in everyday life, there is no bilingualism.

When I hear my colleague from Ottawa—Vanier tell English Canada that to allow laws to be published in bilingual format in the Northwest Territories is a token of unity, I want to warn English Candians that this is a mirage. Indeed, translating the laws of the Northwest Territories will do nothing for promoting the economic, social and cultural development of Quebec.

Of course, we have always been under the impression that it was normal for governments to provide bilingual services, that it was a vested right in a supposedly bilingual country.

But trying to make English Canada believe that bilingualism is the mainstay of national unity and that it will keep this country whole and united is tantamount to perpetuating a monumental fraud! Bilingualism is there only to respect individual rights, not to convey to Quebecers the message that everything is just fine, see how generous we are, doing you this kind of favour! Madam Speaker, that is an optical illusion in the reality of day-to-day life.

It does hurt at times. I went to Winnipeg earlier this week to adress the Federation of Manitoba Municipalities. A man walked up to the microphone and, referring to bilingualism and the official languages legislation, he asked: "My grandson is learning French, why are you giving up?" I replied: "My dear man, I hope your grandson is learning French for his own cultural better-

ment. I hope your grandson is not learning French just to please me!"

I was not posing as Canada's saviour when I learned English, Madam Speaker, I just wanted to be able to communicate with my English-speaking colleagues, to understand both this country and the United States. I find it very hard to remain still every time I see someone trying to hoodwink the public.

In English Canada we often have the impression that they consider bilingual programs to be a major concession to Quebecers. I say to them: Do not look at it that way! Quebecers who have chosen to be bilingual did so for their own personal enrichment, they wanted to learn someting about another culture, and we hope you take a similar approach. We hope that access to the French language—which is considered as being a privilege—will prove to be the long-sought opportunity to open up onto the rest of the world, for we are all citizens of the international community. But do not delude yourselves into interpreting that as a contribution to national unity.

Madam Speaker, let me tell you that when bilingualism becomes the motive for promoting the principle of nation, we cannot get away from the fact that there are two nations in this country, perhaps even three if we include native people. Therefore we have unilingual nations within a supposedly bilingual judicial structure, and bilingual individuals within a minority. But again I emphasize that we cannot equate granting these services with promoting national unity, and that is because people have been fooling themselves for years and years thinking that this kind of gesture has to be a big favour to francophones. If they believe in bilingual institutions, it is not a favour but a right.

Be that as it may, Madam Speaker, you cannot expect Quebecers to haul down their sovereignty banners simply because there is one more translator in the Northwest Territories! That would be creating an illusion, and then some!

All I can say to our francophone friends outside Quebec is that the best anchor they can have is a sovereign and francophone Quebec which will then be a vibrant society of French language and culture. We will always be open and friendly to those who want to live in French, to those who want to raise and educate their children in French and give them the opportunity to grow up and work in French. When we talk about bilingualism, Madam Speaker, the only truly bilingual city in Canada is Montreal.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I will have to interrupt the hon. member, who may wish to continue his speech after Oral Question Period.

It being eleven o'clock, pursuant to Standing Order 35 the House will now proceed to Members' Statements pursuant to Standing Order 31.

---

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*Translation*]

### HOUSEHOLDERS

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Madam Speaker, in his Budget on February 20, 1990, the Minister of Finance asked Canadians to tighten their belts. I immediately decided to reduce mailings of parliamentary news letters to my constituents from four to one annually, and I will no longer send 2,000 cards with Christmas and New Year's greetings.

Since September 1984, I have sent 26 householders, which means 822,615 copies, for a total cost of $155,260.45, not including photographic reproduction and mailing costs.

Madam Speaker, I went along with the system at the time, but today, considering the recession, I do not regret my decision to stop sending my constituents their calendars which were usually my last householder of the year.

* * *

[*English*]

### THE SENATE

**Mr. Robert D. Nault (Kenora—Rainy River):** Madam Speaker, the Speaker in the other place is at it again. Yesterday, after the Liberals were narrowly defeated by the Tories on their eighth amendment, the Speaker refused to allow an independent senator from Alberta the right, the democratic right to introduce an amendment of his own to the GST legislation.

When will the Prime Minister come to his senses and realize that allowing a complete breakdown in the rules is a very dangerous precedent and must not be allowed to continue?

When will the Prime Minister realize that total anarchy can take place when rules in this place and the other place are not followed?

When will the Prime Minister realize that our institutions cannot take this abuse on the one hand and on the other hand be respected by Canadians?

I say to the Prime Minister that this trampling of our democracy has to stop in the other place now.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## HOUSING

**Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec Est):** Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to respond to allegations made by the Canadian co-operative housing federation and set the record straight.

The Co-operative Housing Program is an experimental program covering a period of five years ending on December 31 this year. It was designed by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, in co-operation with the Canadian co-operative housing federation. Initially, the federal government, through CMHC, injected $5 million annually—in addition to an additional budget of $5 million—totalling $30 million over a period of five years. The Minister of State (Housing) has fully honoured his commitments.

The Canadian co-operative housing federation had suggested that CMHC use the indexed mortgage loan formula to finance the projects. However, the federation's forecasts did not materialize, which consequently had a negative impact on the number of housing units delivered. We have tried in every way to help the federation reduce unit construction costs, which would have made it possible to build more housing units, but to no avail. Furthermore, we had to raise the annual subsidy cost to $3,000 per unit because of increased operating and capital costs.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

*S. O. 31*

## CANADA POST CORPORATION

**Mr. Réginald Bélair (Cochrane—Superior):** Madam Speaker, last week, I attended a meeting in Moonbeam, in my riding. Over 150 people took the time to come to that meeting to get some information about the rumors concerning the closing of their post office which has been in existence for 30 years.

Last year, Canada Post could report $149 million in profits which was made at the expenses of small communities. The people at that meeting sent a clear message to the government: Its postal services privatization, or should I say dehumanization, policy is hurting rural Canada. Post offices are the heart of small communities and closing them is an attack against all the traditions attached to them, not to mention the elimination of many jobs. Canadians, wherever they live, have a right to centralized and humanized postal services like those provided in urban communities.

This government left the isolated communities to fend for themselves. Just think of the cuts in transportation.

**Mrs. Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time is up.

* * *

[*English*]

## CHILD POVERTY

**Mr. Mike Breaugh (Oshawa):** Madam Speaker, tomorrow marks the first anniversary of the unanimous passage of Ed Broadbent's motion calling on Parliament to eradicate child poverty in Canada by the year 2000. Sadly there is no cause for celebration.

In the last year the government has rammed through laws clawing back family allowances and decimating the unemployment insurance system. In the last year it tried to cap federal funds for social services, health care, and education.

Liberals should not sit smugly by. Canadians remember it was the Liberals who imposed the dreaded six and five caps on family allowance. It was the Liberals who froze the child tax exemption for years before the Tories reduced it to a $65 tax credit.

Despite calls for government support for child care in the 1970s, it was the Liberals who did nothing. It was their twins, the Tories, who have failed to bring in a plan.

If the government would expend the same energy it is using to ram through the GST, which will hurt poor children and their families, on providing solutions to poverty, Canadian children might be living better lives.

In the midst of plant closures, lay-offs and a recession—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry, but the hon. member's time has now expired.

* * *

## NATIONAL UNITY

**Mr. Patrick Boyer (Etobicoke—Lakeshore):** Madam Speaker, perhaps the country has never been as highly politicized as it is at the present time. I have been receiving a lot of letters, as I am sure have other members have, that begin by saying: "This is the first time I have every written to my MP". It is as if we are getting into the bedrock of the Canadian nation.

I think there is reason for this: the protracted free trade debate and the divisiveness of that, the three-year discussions over Meech Lake, the current and continuing debate over the GST, and the changes on the international level, with all their promise and the challenges associated with them.

There is a mood in the country that portends some kind of political realignment. This is very much exacerbated by the emphasis that we continue to place on the things that divide us. We are grinding sand into the gears that make this country work.

I think the time has come for Canadians to begin to emphasize the one thing that does unite all of us in this country, that is, our country and pride in calling ourselves Canadians.

* * *

## HUNT-WESSON

**Mr. Rex Crawford (Kent):** Madam Speaker, yesterday, we heard the Minister for International Trade give the latest example of Tory government policy on agriculture: throw our farmers to the wolves.

Hunt-Wesson in Kent county is eliminating 60 jobs, but there is the added snowball effect on our farmers.

A tomato farmer from my riding called me. His contracts to sell tomatoes now do not exist. He has no one to sell them to. He has hundreds of thousands of dollars tied up in land and equipment, and now he has nothing.

What is the reason for Hunt-Wesson closing? It is the free trade agreement. The company president says that. Not unions, not politicians.

The parent company will now sell its products from California and Ohio.

This plant has been located in Tilbury since 1956, making it through the tough times before, but not the Tory free trade or their made-in-Canada recession.

This government cannot continue to turn a blind eye to the devastation. On job losses and plant closings, this government cannot say don't worry, that's progress.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry, but the hon. member's time has expired.

* * *

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake):** Madam Speaker, is it any wonder that 60 per cent of Canadians do not believe Jean Chrétien when he says that a Liberal government would kill the goods and services tax? Barely a majority of Liberals, declining group that they are, feel that their leader is being honest when he says he will axe the tax.

Why should they believe him? Mr. Chrétien's colleagues in the Senate did not axe the tax or kill the bill this spring when they had numerous opportunities to do so. They even endorsed the bill in principle.

After all, the GST does benefit big business, including the big businesses that backed Mr. Chrétien's leadership and appointed him to their boards of directors. Jean Chrétien sat on those boards, not the boards of the anti-poverty groups but of companies like Consolidated Bathurst, the Toronto-Dominion Bank and B.C. Forest Products.

Canadians have lost faith in the old style politics represented by Jean Chrétien. They do not believe that a

man who benefited so much from the corporate sector will not do the corporate bidding and implement the tax.

On the other hand, I have faith that Canadians—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry, but the hon. member's time has expired.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## COLLEGE WEEK

**Mr. Marc Ferland (Portneuf):** Madam Speaker, I rise to remind my colleagues that this is College Week. Post-secondary education is more important today than ever before in our history. Rapid changes in the field of knowledge nowadays impose tremendous challenges for Canadian men and women throughout their entire working life. Our colleges and vocational training institutes give them the skills that enable them to meet those challenges and provide them with numerous career opportunities.

Madam Speaker, post-secondary education is an important investment for the individual and for the entire nation. Colleges and vocational training institutes increase our capacity to meet our common concerns, for instance, in areas such as the environment. Furthermore, they help Canadian men and women acquire the skills that will enable our country to sustain wold competition.

With market globalization, our country's future prosperity depends on our capacity to remain competitive. Therefore, it must promote and make the best of knowledges and skills it provides to our citizens. And in order to achieve that goal, we need a solid post-secondary education system.

Madam Speaker, I know that my colleagues recognize, as I do, the contribution of our colleges and vocational training institutes to the quality—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I regret to inform the hon. member that his time has now expired. The hon. member for Carleton—Gloucester.

* * *

• (1110)

## FRENCH-SPEAKING CANADIANS OUTSIDE QUEBEC

**Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester):** Madam Speaker, writer Yves Beauchemin pronouced an indictment against French-speaking communities outside Quebec. Before the Bélanger-Campeau Commission, he referred to French-speaking Canadians outside Quebec as "still warm corpses".

The rest of Canada cannot let this go unchallenged, because French-speaking Canadians outside Quebec do not deserve to be put aside, certainly not by a fellow-Canadians-basher. It is sad to see someone, through ignorance or meanness, attempt to belittle people of his own country in promoting his own political beliefs.

I praise editorial writer Adrien Cantin of *Le Droit* for having set matters straight in his November 22 article.

A word of advice to the Bélanger-Campeau Commission: It would be better to focus on briefs that assert the need to harmonize the efforts of French-speaking minorities of Canada as a whole, Quebec included, in the face of the realities of America.

* * *

[*English*]

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Dave Worthy (Cariboo—Chilcotin):** Madam Speaker, this week I received a number of phone calls from business people in my riding of Cariboo—Chilcotin. All of them had one thing on their mind: "Let's put an end to uncertainty."

Along with over 700,000 other Canadian businesses, they have made the decision to prepare for the GST, small but real life decisions like employee training, providing customers with sound advice, changing business forms, equipment and supplies, and making strategic inventory decisions.

These are the decisions that must be made in the real world where the uncertainty caused by political games is the deadliest of enemies.

The message is clear: "The impact of a delay in the implementation of the GST is devastating—we strongly urge you to do all in your power to see that the GST is implemented by January 1, 1991."

These people have made business decisions for the future. They need political ones to be made now, not December 31.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Unfortunately the hon. member's time has expired.

* * *

## CONSERVATIVE PARTY

**Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain):** Madam Speaker, I rise today to draw, with some enthusiasm, a comparison between the Conservative Parties of Britain and Canada.

As hon. members will know, earlier this week Margaret Thatcher's leadership was challenged. Just yesterday, the Iron Lady realized that her policies and waning popularity in the polls would preclude her party from winning the next general election. She did the honourable thing and resigned.

Perhaps the chief thorn in her side is her new poll tax. This tax has Britons up in arms and protesting in the streets, not too unlike the Canadian reaction to the Conservative's GST.

When a government introduces a tax that has the disapproval of over 80 per cent of the population at the same time as it forces the nation into an economic downturn, it is time to reconsider seriously its leadership and ability to govern.

If only the leadership selection process were the same in Canada, I am certain we would see members opposite lining up for the Prime Minister's job.

Given the incredible similarity, perhaps the Prime Minister should follow the lead of his British counterpart and resign.

* * *

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Madam Speaker, this Sunday has been called the international day to end violence against women. This is a timely reminder to our government for three reasons.

First, following the second anniversary of this government's re-election, publicizing the violence issue shows what little, if anything, six years of Tory rule have done to improve the quality of life for Canadian women.

Second, approaching the first anniversary of the Montreal students' massacre, publicizing the violence issue shows how hard this social disease can hit if we do not address it sincerely.

There was much hope when a woman was appointed as Minister of Justice. It is now clear with her mishandling of Bill C-80 that she is giving in to the gun lobby.

Third, coinciding with the 20th anniversary of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women, publicizing the violence issue, which the commission did not even touch, shows how far we have come, yet how far we must still go.

Until this government ceases to believe that all women need is a few appointments to high places in Canada, a woman's work will never be done.

---

# ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

## GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, I will pose my question to the President of the Treasury Board.

The supplementary estimates tabled today by the President of the Treasury Board show the depth of the incompetence of this government when it comes to managing the economic affairs of this country and the price Canadians are paying for this incompetence. The supplementary estimates show that this government will be spending $2.5 billion to cover the additional costs of its borrowing due to its own high interest rate policies. I ask the President of the Treasury Board, is it not true that this $2.5 billion would not have to be spent if the government had not persisted with this high interest rate policy, which has been doing so much damage to the economy of this country?

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I will tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the supplementary estimates I tabled this morning indicate, contrary to what he just affirmed, that this government is committed to staying the course.

**Mr. Gauthier:** High interest rates.

**Mr. Loiselle:** We have within these estimates $2.5 billion for high interest rates. The Minister of Finance—

and this is not new—indicated in September that we were off course. He also indicated that because the economy performed better at the end of last year and early this year, we have additional income. Therefore there is a charge against the deficit of between $1 billion and $1.5 billion.

As for program spending, the hon. Leader of the Opposition forgets to say that we have encountered additional pressures during this year, particularly with the job situation. Instead of passing it on to the deficit, as the Liberals have done over a period of years, putting the finances of this country in jeopardy, we have decided to tighten our belts once more and we have balanced program spending.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the President of the Treasury Board knows that if this government had allowed interest rates to be lowered by only a point and one-half this year, this $2.5 billion could have been saved and there also could have been saved thousands of Canadian jobs, homes, farms and businesses.

**Mr. Dick:** Inflation would be higher.

**Mr. Gray (Windsor West):** All the President of the Treasury Board has to say to these people who have lost their jobs, farms, homes and businesses, is that they have to stay the course. That is like the Minister of Finance saying that he wants Canadians to die before they go to heaven. People do not want to stay this course.

**Mr. Dick:** We're doing better than the Liberals.

**Mr. Gray (Windsor West):** I ask the President of the Treasury Board, will the government bring about a lowering of interest rates today to save this expenditure of $2.5 billion and save the thousands and thousands of Canadian jobs, homes, farms and businesses that will be lost if this government persists with its misguided economic policies?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Madam Speaker, unfortunately, it seems that the Liberals are not learning.

**An hon. member:** They will never learn.

**Mr. Loiselle:** They failed to stay the course when they were in power and it led to interest rates of above 20 per cent and very high inflation rates.

He wants interest rates to come down. I would ask him to look at the results of our policy. Interest rates are coming down week after week, and we are very pleased with that. It shows that our policy is working. There is no mystery, and it is not by artificially claiming that one can press a button and interest rates will come down. It is by maintaining the course and preventing the inflationary pressures from being unleashed. This is what we are doing.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians have had a look at the results of this government's policies and they have said that these policies are wrong. They want these policies stopped before they bring about a total disruption of the Canadian economy.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, I ask the President of Treasury Board the same question: When will the government recognize that its own policies and very high interest rates are responsible for the deterioration of our economy over the past few months? When will the minister recognize that his own policies will cost Canadian men and women hundreds of thousands of jobs? Is the government willing now to change its policies?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Madam Speaker, the government is not willing to change its policies, because it feels that they are the right ones, although it knows it will have to pay the price for them. I am sure the Canadian people realize that it is not because the government wants to be popular that it is making these difficult decisions, but because it feels that in the end they will benefit Canada. On the other hand, if there ever was a government in this country which managed to create jobs, it is this one. Following seven years of continuing growth, we want a new growth. At the end of these six years of continuing growth, we were faced with very real inflationary pressures. We must rid the system of these pressures, and the current exchange rates show that we are about to win the war.

• (1120)

[*English*]

**Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale):** Madam Speaker, under the pretext of financing the war in the Persian Gulf, today this government is asking Canadians to dip into their pockets for $4.8 billion.

Ninety-three per cent of that money is not going to finance the war. It is going to pay for the fiscal incompetence and the made-in-Canada recession promoted by this government.

Will the government admit its own fiscal incompetence is making Canadians pay so much more money?

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Madam Speaker, we will not admit that.

The hon. member should make a comparison of interest rates. On August 6, 1981 the Bank of Canada rate was 21.24 per cent. That is when the Liberals were in power; 21.24 per cent. Today they are 12.25 per cent, and they have dropped steadily since May. The prime rate has dropped dramatically in that period of time.

The House leader said that they should drop a point and a half. They have dropped more than a point and a half since May, almost two points since May.

As the inflationary pressures go down, the interest rates will drop. Inflation has been the enemy. The inflationary pressures have eased somewhat, allowing interest rates to fall. They will continue to fall as the inflation pressures ease.

**Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale):** If the minister wants a lesson in history, he does not have to go back nine or ten years. Let him go back three years when the interest rates in Canada were 7.5 per cent. They are now over 12 per cent. That is as a result of your policies.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, if the government had listened to us and reduced the interest rates, we could have been spared the recession and we would have saved what it is now asking us to pay for the national debt. Is the government prepared to recognize the failure of its high interest rate policy?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, we certainly do not accept the statement my hon. friend has just made. I am quite surprised that the official opposition critic should make such a statement as though the government was some sort of a magician which, just by pushing a button, could cause the interest rates to fall.

Interest rates reflect certain demands and realities of the marketplace, and Liberal members are certainly not helping the investment situation by saying constantly that things are going awfully bad. I wish to warn him against constantly making negative and pessimistic statements which do not reflect the reality.

It is true and regrettable that there should be a slowing down, and we must act quickly to help the economy make a fresh start.

[*English*]

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. The government has just tabled its supplementary estimates and we are looking at $350 million worth of cuts. Who gets cut? Farmers, fishermen, immigrants, the unemployed, environment, aboriginal people, workers, the ill and veterans. Once again, it is those who can afford it the least that pay for the bungling of this government.

In addition, in these supplementary estimates what we see is an expense of $350 million for a war in the gulf, but we see $379 million to implement the GST. Where are the priorities of this government? Why does the government not withdraw the GST and bring back some estimates that help average Canadians?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the socialist party is wrong when she singles out farmers, because under the estimates tabled today the agriculture estimates are increasing by $316.6 million. There is some reprofiling of certain programs and projects that can be carried over into the next year, but that should not be seen as a reduction in agriculture expenditures.

We have acknowledged that we will have to support agriculture more, particularly in the grains and oilseeds sector. We are currently working with the provinces in designing a long-term safety net. As well, we are looking at the need for additional income support, which is

triggered by the third level of the committee that has been established through federal-provincial co-operation, so I would ask the hon. member to reconsider her allegation that farmers are being cut.

With respect to the GST, we hear constantly from the New Democratic Party the need for a fair and equitable tax system, a tax system that will encourage productivity, enterprise, and competitiveness. That is precisely what the GST is all about. It is about jobs, competitiveness, confidence restoring the economy. That is what we intend to do with the passage of this piece of legislation.

**Ms. McLaughlin (Yukon):** Madam Speaker, I am sure Canadians are going to wonder why it costs more to implement this so-called fair GST than it does to have a war in the gulf.

I would like to ask—

[*Translation*]

We saw just this morning, with the supplementary estimates, that this government's priorities are absurd. It cuts social services to pay for a tax nobody wants, to pay for a military intervention nobody wants. Why is it always the middle class and the poor who must pay for the errors of this government?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** I think that the New Democratic Party leader is wrong when she states such things, since the government has always been very careful in its operations. She must understand that if we really want to protect those who need protection, if we really want to protect our programs, we have to make sure that the country's finances are in good shape. By avoiding to add to the deficit supplementary expenses that Canada must make and by trying to cut operating expenditures instead of program expenditures, we believe we are on the right track. Indeed, that makes the difference between this government and the socialist one opposite which simply wants to keep on adding indefinitely to the deficit without accepting the ultimate responsibility, which is to maintain our programs in the long term.

[*English*]

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Madam Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Deputy Prime Minister. Almost a year ago this government, along with the other parties in this House, voted unanimously on a motion to end child poverty in Canada by the year 2000. There is no sign in these estimates of what this government plans to do on child poverty. Instead the government plans to spend over $350 million to implement a goods and services tax which is going to hurt those very families, those very children. Yet this government had the nerve to stand up in this House a year ago and say that they would eradicate poverty.

What are the priorities of this government? Instead of declaring war on Canadian taxpayers, why not declare war on poverty? Why not bring in supplements now that will lead to a war to end poverty in this country, as this government promised to do a year ago.

• (1130 )

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue):** Madam Speaker, first, the leader of the New Democratic Party knows very well that over 800,000 people came off the poverty role in the last few years.

I know that the leader is inadvertently misleading the House when she says that it costs some $365 million to implement the GST. She is wrong. A great bulk of that is for social benefits accrued from the GST for GST credits to low and modest-income Canadians. Is the leader of the New Democratic Party saying that we should not be sending out GST credits to low and modest-income Canadians? If she believes in that, she should stand up and say so.

If she wants the credits to go to the low and modest-income Canadians, she should walk across to the other chamber and make sure it passes through the Senate so that we can proceed with the mailing of GST credits to some 8 million low and modest-income Canadians.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Defence.

When the Conservatives came to power, the first thing they said was that they were not going to follow the policy of the bad old Liberals. They were going to be champions of National defence. The present Minister of National Health and Welfare, then Minister of National Defence, rode across Canada on his tricycle buying nuclear submarines, *Polar 8*'s, and every other form of technology you can imagine. What did the Conservatives do? They cut the defence budget by $2.7 billion, the most savage attack on defence in Canadian history. Now faced with a crisis, the Conservatives are scrambling to fund programs that they should have had in place for which they promised and raised expectations.

Is it the policy of the Minister of National Defence that the new defence policy in the country is going to be funded by savaging health and welfare and Indian affairs which lost $6 million today?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** Madam Speaker, I find that strange coming from a member of the Liberal Party who was present in the government some few years ago when the Liberal government of the day froze the budget of the Department of National Defence when inflation in Canada was at 14 per cent and when military inflation was about 18 per cent. I find that strange.

The member is asking if the Government of Canada prepared to sustain the men and women who are serving in the Persian Gulf and sustain the military preparedness of Canada at an acceptable level. Yes, the government is. Yes, that is why we have had to bring in supplementary estimates.

The hon. member must know that the additional costs which have been assumed by the department, and for which we have had to come forward with supplementary estimates, could not be planned in any policy. The government did not plan for aid to the civil power this summer. The government could not plan for the Persian Gulf crisis. The hon. member knows that and I am sure he accepts it.

**Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador):** Madam Speaker, there is a complete absence of planning altogether. That is the problem. There is no defence policy in the country.

I would like to ask the minister a supplementary question. Assuming that $350 million covers our costs in the gulf to the end of March, what happens if Canada has to go to war? What happens if Canada is asked to send more planes and more ships to the Persian Gulf? What preparations has the Government of Canada made for that? And, in April, what other social security programs does the Government of Canada intend to cut to pay for its defence program? That is planning.

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** I find it strange that one member of the Official Opposition argues that we should not be making these expenditures in support of the men and women who are serving and in support of the military preparedness of Canada, while that member argues that we should be doing more.

What I can inform the hon. member, if he reviews the supplementary estimates, he will find that there is $17 million in these estimates to allow us now to start the contingency planning which may be necessary to sustain the Canadian men and women who are serving their country in the gulf beyond April 1 into the next fiscal year.

I can assure the hon. member that after that, we will have to discuss with colleagues how that will be done. I can assure him that what is necessary to sustain the men and women who are serving Canada and all Canadians will be done. If it is necessary, we will address them.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment.

The President of the Treasury Board announced today direct cuts of $14 million and $24 million on postponed programs, for a total of 38 million dollars to the environment. Furthermore, he announced, within five months,

direct cuts in departments, such as National Health and Welfare, Energy, Fisheries and Oceans, Agriculture, which directly affect the environment.

So here is my question: can the minister tell us what these $38 million represent? Can he assure us, which is equally important, or guarantee us that the other $100 million will not negatively impact on the quality of the environment in Canada?

[*English*]

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to put the picture in some sort of historical perspective. I would remind the House of Commons and those who are watching that, first, the Department of the Environment received larger than average increases in both of the last two years when it came the time for fiscal funding. In fact, the increases for each of those years were increases of approximately 10 per cent.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Peterson:** Peanuts.

**Mr. Clark (Brandon—Souris):** The hon. member across who speaks of peanuts when he is spending the taxpayers' money is simply displaying that same kind of callous disregard for the Canadian taxpayers now that his party showed in the past when the debt rose far beyond what it had ever been in the country.

In addition, as members will know, the supplementary estimates which are tabled here as well indicated additional support for the Department of the Environment, some $78.3 million. In addition to that, the Minister of the Environment will be announcing early in December to the House and to the country the green plan, which will also provide additional resources to the environment throughout Canada.

**Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard):** Madam Speaker, I cannot believe that the hon. parliamentary secretary would raise the green plan, when we all know what is happening to it. The government has shown confusion and terrible weakness in environmental concerns. Rumours abound about the cuts.

Can the minister assure that the green plan is not about to drown in the government's red ink? Can the government assure us that the green plan, as established in the first draft of September, has not suffered dramatic cuts and that they are not reflected here? Will the government assure us that the consultation process will be honoured with the environmental community?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** I can assure you, Madam Speaker, and all interested Canadians, that when it is announced in December the green plan will reflect at that particular time the result of consultations which have taken place across Canada, a process of consultations which was never attempted by any other government in Canadian history.

I will also assure you, Madam Speaker, and the hon. member, that there will be before Canada a long-range systematic plan to address the problems of the environment such that his party and his government never even contemplated when they were in office.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## PERSIAN GULF

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. Canadians were told that figures tabled today in the House would clarify the costs associated with the Canadian presence in the Gulf. The supplementary estimates, however, only add to the confusion and contradict other reports.

Can the minister assure Canadians that these costs do not represent an escalation of the Canadian role in the Gulf? Will he further agree, in light of the contradictory information, to request that the Auditor General conduct an immediate and independent review of the cost of our participation in the Gulf?

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** Madam Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that, not only are the numbers accurate to the best of our ability, but also that the total cost figures that have been requested for maintaining our presence in the Gulf and for aid to the civil power to the Government of Quebec this summer, has been absorbed within the departmental budget. It is a considerable amount of money.

We have reassigned ship days. We have reassigned flying hours because at this time there is real time training taking place. We have adjusted exercises. At the same time, through the budgets of 1989 and 1990, we

have reduced some $820 million of expenditures this year in the Department of National Defence.

We were very close to the line when these two unexpected crises occurred. Because we were not able to meet our defence budget, we had to approach central agencies due to the unanticipated or unbudgeted expenditures. I am sure that he agrees that this is a very logical and reasonable way to assess the problem of today.

• (1140 )

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Madam Speaker, Canadians are spending $1.2 billion to maintain our forces in Europe to support a cold war that officially, and practically speaking, no longer exists.

Why is the government forcing Canadians to cut back in spending on necessary domestic programs? Why has the government not reallocated spending from Europe, instead of forcing Canadians here to bear the burden of the Gulf?

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member should be aware when he talks about Europe that we are part of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We have made adjustments and he asks why we do not make more.

I bring to his attention that the NATO Alliance over the last 40 years has been responsible for the most creative and the most assured way to have a peaceful world by signing the CSCE and the CFE which took place just this weekend in Paris. East and west sat down and came to an agreement to have a more peaceful and more secure world. That, I say to him, is because the NATO Alliance has held firm and strong for the last 40 years.

* * *

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Treasury Board.

The tabling of these documents in the House today proves to everyone that there is a total lack of financial management in the government.

**Some hon. members:** Right on.

**Mr. Hopkins:** The Prime Minister and his Cabinet met without consultation with Parliament and made the decision to go into the Persian Gulf without knowing how they were going to pay for it. Surely, one goes hand in hand with the other.

Why was the government not as dedicated about providing a financial plan for the Department of National Defence to do its job, as they were to provide for $257 million to prepare for the collection of the most hated tax in Canadian history, the GST?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I draw to the hon. member's attention once again that the Persian Gulf crisis and the aid to the civil power for the Government of Quebec were not able to be planned for.

**Mr. Rompkey:** That is your first responsibility.

**Mr. McKnight:** The member from Labrador suggests that is one of our first responsibilities. I suggest to him that no government plans for the additional costs of a crisis which could lead to war.

Responsible governments and democracies, when they make a commitment to bring about a more peaceful and secure world, call upon the people and the government to provide the resources so there will be a more peaceful and secure world.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke):** Madam Speaker, the government is demonstrating that it has no plan at all. Ever since the government was elected to power in Canada six years ago, the Prime Minister and a series of defence ministers have been standing up in the House and saying, with great rhetoric, that they are going to provide the money for the Department of National Defence so that our Canadian military personnel can do their job. Instead, the government has cut the budgets of the defence department and left it with an empty cupboard. Now they are robbing other departments to pay for the sins of the financial mismanagement of the government.

Why did the government not keep its commitments to Canada's military forces, to Parliament, and to the people of Canada, instead of once again proving that their promises are not worth the paper they are written on? You let the department down. You know it.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** Madam Speaker, I cannot help but smile. I am not sure if the hon. member and his party supports the effort of the Canadian government in providing, along with some 28 other nations, a force in the Persian Gulf area. I know that his leader draws upon that. He says it is not something in which we should be involved. I suggest to him that he knows in his heart that it is something in which we should be involved. He knows full well the difference between capital expenditures and operational requirements. If he does not, I would be pleased to provide him a briefing at the Department of National Defence.

* * *

## GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax):** Madam Speaker, Canadians woke up this morning to find that their government was $4.8 billion short. At the same time that this government is cutting $10,100,000 from the communications budget, it is adding $14,305,000 to advertise and communicate its GST. They are robbing Marcel to pay Mike. Why is the government crippling the CBC and the National Archives, among others, to sell Canadians a tax that they despise?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** I am afraid, Madam Speaker, that the hon. member suffers from an acute attack of misunderstanding. I am explaining through supplementary estimates how the money that has already been voted in the budget is going to be spent. I hope she understands that. This is not an increase. This is a method by which I explain to the House, and I ask authority of the House to spend the money that was already voted upon.

If you take the GST, for example, my colleague can explain and I can explain that in front of the committee we explained that there would be transitional costs. Now we have put the numbers together and we have come to the House at the first opportunity to explain them. This is what it is about. It is not additional funds.

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax):** Madam Speaker, you and I understand that sometimes perhaps the government feels that women have difficulty understanding this, but $257 million extra. That seems extra to me. Mind you, it would take an economist, a mathematician and a wizard to follow the estimates that the hon. minister tabled.

Radio Canada International, for example, does its job of connecting Canada to the international community, connecting Canada to its nationals abroad and in particular, connecting Canadians to their loved ones on duty in the Persian Gulf. In this cut to communications, is Radio Canada International the next to go? Will our military soon have no radio link to those at home because of the minister's mismanagement?

**Hon. Gerry Weiner (Secretary of State of Canada and Minister of State (Multiculturalism and Citizenship)):** Madam Speaker, all government departments and agencies have been called upon to reduce their budgetary requirements for this fiscal year. The communications and culture portfolio's contribution represents the equitable share of these costs and that is what has happened.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## RAILWAY TRANSPORTATION

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Madam Speaker, on October 29, the National Transport Agency of Canada decided to remove the requirements relating to requests affecting the frequency, the routes and the cuts in VIA Rail services, these requirements being no longer necessary.

Even if some submissions asked that these requirements be maintained in the case of services in isolated areas, the Agency believes that the minister of Transport has exclusive responsibility over that matter. Here is my question: Will the minister have the last word on the issue of VIA Rail, a Crown corporation, cutting passenger services in isolated areas?

**Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Transport):** Madam Speaker, I can assure my honourable colleague that I will have the last word. It is my responsibility and not the National Transport Agency's, to make the decision about isolated areas.

[*English*]

## GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. I would like to ask the Deputy Prime Minister to justify why in the estimates under the Department of Finance the government is planning to spend an extra $14.3 million on advertising the GST and why in the estimates under the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs they are going to top up expenditures in the GST information office by an additional $6.5 million.

I want to ask the Deputy Prime Minister, as leader of the government in the House today how he can justify spending almost $21 million extra to advertise the GST in this country? How can he justify that?

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member was a member of the finance committee at the time the GST was being studied. One of the recommendations was to ensure that the people of Canada were well informed on the goods and services tax. That is exactly what we are doing.

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville):** Madam Speaker, it was not our recommendation. It was Blenkarn's recommendation. The minister knows that. I want to ask the Deputy Prime Minister this. The government is asking the Canadian people to cut back on all kinds of programs, when it is cutting $25 million out of the department of employment budget to look after the unemployed in this country. How can he justify spending an extra $21 million to advertise the goods and services tax? What are we going to see? More ads on geese flying around this country? The Prime Minister wrapping himself in the Canadian flag? How can he justify that?

• (1150)

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Madam Speaker, the answer is exactly the same. The President of the Treasury Board made it very clear that we have committed certain funds to promote the goods and services tax. We always said we were going to do that. Now we are showing an explanation of that expenditure, that is all. We are showing the Canadian people the expenditures of advertising the goods and services tax, providing accurate information to the Canadian people, which the hon. member does not do.

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Madam Speaker, the government in its news release today announcing total cuts of $350 million worth of essential services to Canadians said: "Adjustments were made to minimize any adverse impact on such things as health and safety".

My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. Can he truly and honestly say that $9.89 million cuts to the health and welfare budget are safe for the poor, the sick, the elderly and disabled Canadians?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Monique Vézina (Minister of State (Employment and Immigration) and Minister of State (Seniors)):** Madam Speaker, I can give the assurance that all essential services will be maintained. What we are trying to do with the bill this morning, Supplementary Estimates, is to ensure program delivery is cost effective. The health and safety of Canadians continues to be our main concern. Social programs will be maintained as announced. Programs for seniors will be maintained. In short, people who need additional assistance from the government will continue to get it today and tomorrow, as they did yesterday.

[*English*]

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Madam Speaker, how can you maintain that when you have cut $9.89 million?

The government plans to ask for an additional $250 million to help spread informational propaganda for the goods and services tax, yet has the gall to cut the budget for food inspection systems. Which is more important, I ask the Deputy Prime Minister, the health and safety of the GST, or the health and safety of Canadians?

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member should know that we are not cutting spending for programs. We are not cutting essential services. What we are cutting into—

**Mr. Rompkey:** You're cutting Indian Affairs by $6 million.

**Mr. Jelinek:** —is government expenditures and government operations which are not going to affect the people of this country.

He refers to a figure for advertising the GST. Let me tell him that a large chunk of the money tabled today goes toward social elements of the changed tax from the federal sales tax to the GST by sending out GST credits to over 8 million low and modest income Canadians. This government cares about people. That is why this government is cutting government operations in order to assist Canadian people, particularly those with low and modest incomes.

* * *

## AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Madam Speaker, I want to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. With net farm incomes in the prairies slated to drop to almost zero in the next two years and world grain prices at such an incredibly low rate, the lowest in history, and government cut-backs of some 40 per cent on farm support programs during the last two years, I wonder why the minister is cutting $10 million out of the Western Grain Stabilization Fund. Surely with the price of grain on the world markets and the cut-backs that have already taken place it was not necessary to cut this additional $10 million out of the Western Grain Stabilization Fund.

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Madam Speaker, I share the member's concern about the very difficult situation in which the grains and oilseeds producers find themselves. As he knows, this year we have provided emergency assistance. We have provided for a cash flow enhancement program. We are hopefully in the final stages of negotiating an appropriate agreement with the provinces that will bring about a long-term safety net and stabilization program. With the Western Grain Stabilization Act, it is a statutory piece of legislation. It is based upon that. When less money is contributed by farmers, it automatically reduces the level of exposure by the federal government. It is for that reason that it is included in the estimates. It is really a reflection of the way the legislation works. The hon. member should support that because it was legislation that was originally brought in by the Liberal government.

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Madam Speaker, it seems to me that if funds are removed from the stabilization fund, there is less money to be paid out during the next two desperate years when net farm income on the prairies is slated to go to zero. It is an incredible time to be cutting support programs.

Since the minister raised the issue of the safety net program, there is great concern in the agriculture community as to whether the government is willing to fund that in a proper way so that the premiums paid by the three participants, the federal government, the provincial governments and the agriculture producers, will be shared on an equal basis.

Is the minister prepared to give a commitment today that when that program is implemented that the federal government is prepared to pay its full 33 per cent and not welsh, as it did on the crop insurance program, where it cut back to only 25 per cent?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I would hope that that could be achieved. That is the position that the federal government has taken in going into these negotiations. I think that has broad-based support from the producers. Unfortunately, some provinces do not support that proposal quite as enthusiastically as I am sure the hon. member does.

To refer back to his question with respect to the WGSA, the hon. member should know and should understand that the government has to conform to the legislation. That is precisely what it is doing.

If there are shortfalls, as I have indicated publicly and in the House today, we are triggering the third level of defence mechanism which will analyse the income shortfalls while at the same time moving the income safety net and stabilization program forward. In the process of this, we will take a look at the income situation and try to respond in an appropriate fashion, as we have before.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** There will be one question for the hon. member for Oshawa and one question for the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell.

## CHILD POVERTY

**Mr. Mike Breaugh (Oshawa):** Madam Speaker, almost to the day one year ago, this House unanimously passed a motion expressing concerns about child poverty and attempting to eradicate it.

I would like to ask the Deputy Prime Minister how he reconciles the support that was shown for that motion less than a year ago today with the continuing cuts that were made in estimates this morning on social programs for Canadian families, the rise in the use of food banks, the lack of child care facilities for young people across Canada and, perhaps the most disturbing estimation that has been made. In *The Toronto Star* article of September 21, 1990, and I would like to ask the minister to very simply respond to this: "Native Canadian babies have about as much chance of living beyond their first birthdays as do those in Jamaica and Costa Rica, and are at higher risk than babies in Cuba and Singapore." How does he reconcile that?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, that question was answered by the Minister of National Revenue. I would ask the hon. member to refer to what he has indicated.

With the passage of the GST, some 8 million low-income families will receive tax credits. I am sure the hon. member would welcome that. That would certainly help alleviate the kind of situation to which the hon. member has referred.

Cognizance should be taken of the fact that something like 800,000 people have been taken off the poverty roll since this government came into office.

* * *

## GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Madam Speaker, my question is to the President of the Treasury Board.

In today's press release, the President of the Treasury Board said that he would cut $250 million in various programs and services to Canadians in order to get $257 million to "prepare and plan for the goods and services tax."

• (1200 )

What does the minister think is more important, collecting more goods and services tax for the Minister of Finance or delivering services to Canadians?

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue):** Madam Speaker, at the outset, the hon. member should know that in order to pay for services one has to have a reliable tax system, a fairer and more open tax system, and that is the reason for tax reform.

Second, the hon. member should recall as well that it was the Auditor General, in his 1989 report, who said that this government must prepare—and that was a year and a half ago—for the implementation of the GST and that we had to have new systems, new technology, and newly trained personnel.

That is what we have done, and that is what is reflected in the estimates today.

---

# ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

## PETITIONS

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

**Mr. Jean-Guy Hudon (Parliamentary Secretary 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 five petitions.

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

* * *

## PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

### PRESENTATION OF NINETEENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the nineteenth report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections on the production of information video documents pertaining to the procedure of the House.

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

## PETITIONS

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Madam Speaker, it is my duty to table again today petitions that are in accordance with the rules and convey to the government and this House that a tax applied on books is bad and regressive. The petitioners maintain that free dissemination of the printed word is the cornerstone of our democracy, our culture and our education. They point out a literate and productive society must not be unjustly submitted to such taxation.

The petitioners humbly call upon Parliament to reaffirm the principes long embodied in the tax-free status of the printed word and to retain the zero rate in the GST legislation and regulations.

Madam Speaker, to tax books is to impose ignorance.

[*English*]

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by numerous residents of the city of Toronto.

These Canadians are opposed to the imposition of the goods and services tax, in particular the tax on books and the printed word. I am sure they are aware that the Liberal members of the Senate moved an amendment to the bill at third reading to eliminate the tax on these items, but that the greedy Tory majority voted the amendment down and is apparently willing to leave this bill unchanged and tax Canadians in this most unfair and regressive way. This is typical of the government's attitude toward Canadians.

These petitioners call upon Parliament to reject the goods and services tax.

**Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Madam Speaker, it is my honour to present a petition, pursuant to Standing Order 36, in opposition to the goods and services tax. This petition is signed by a number of residents from Saltspring Island, Galiano Island, and the Saanich peninsula.

These people are well aware that the goods and services tax is a regressive form of taxation and that real tax reform is much more comprehensive and would include the taxation of wealthy individuals and corporations.

They do not agree with the government's assessment that the goods and services tax is the way to address child poverty, as was stated in the House today.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I rise to present to the House a petition on behalf of constituents from my riding of Ottawa Centre and from other places in the city of Ottawa. These petitioners are against applying the GST on books and magazines. They call upon this Parliament to vote against the proposal to tax books and magazines.

[*English*]

### RAIL PASSENGER SERVICES

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour and the privilege to table a petition signed by thousands of residents of this country from one end of Canada to the other.

They are supporters of rail passenger services. They believe that what the government did nearly a year ago was a step backward when every other country in the world was moving forward on rail passenger services.

They call upon Parliament to reinstate the services immediately. Quite frankly, they want Canada to be put back on track.

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition with several dozen names of Canadian citizens who complain that the government is imposing a goods and services tax on books, magazines, newspapers, and other printed matter.

They point out that the dissemination of the printed word is a cornerstone of democracy, culture and education in a literate and productive society, and that the goods and services tax will have a very negative impact on the Canadian citizens in this regard.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is my duty and. privilege to present a petition on behalf of many Canadians from Vars and Orleans, in my riding,

who call humbly upon this government and this House to rescind immediately the tax on goods and services. I support entirely this excellent petition.

* * *

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**Mr. Jean-Guy Hudon (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 337 and 338.

[*Text*]

EXPENDITURES FOR THE DECORATING OF THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Question No. 337—**Mr. Boudria:**

During 1989 and 1990, did the National Research Council incur any expenditures for the decorating of the office of its President, Dr. Pierre Perron and, if so (a) what did the work consist of (b) what were the total costs of (i) new furniture (ii) redecoration?

**Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology):** Yes.

(a) The work consisted of repairs and renovations to office space in the north east wing of the National Research Council's administration building and the purchase of office furniture and vertical blinds.

(b) (i) The cost of renovations and repairs was $7,743.25 and the cost of vertical blinds was $1,600.00, and

(ii) The cost of desks, chairs, tables, bookcases and other furnishings was $25,413.59.

PURCHASE OF VEHICLE

Question No. 338—**Mr. Boudria:**

1. During 1989 and 1990, did the National Research Council purchase a new vehicle for the use of its President, Dr. Pierre Perron and, if so, what was the (a) make (b) model (c) price?

2. What automobile dealership was the vehicle purchased from and was it purchased by public tender?

**Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology):** 1. The National Research Council vehicle used by NRC's President is an Oldsmobile Cutlass Ciera SL purchased in 1990 for $17,987.00.

2. The car was purchased under Department of Supply and Services contract from the manufacturer, General Motors of Canada Limited, Oshawa, Ontario.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Hudon:** I ask, Madam Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The questions as enumerated by the hon. parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

## NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre) that Bill C-92, an act respecting the Northwest Territories Act, be read the second time and, by unanimous consent, referred to Committee of the Whole.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**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.

**An hon. member:** On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and, by unanimous consent, the House went into committee thereon, Mrs. Champagne in the chair.

• (1210 )

**The Chairman:** Order. House in Committee of the Whole on Bill C-92, an act respecting the Northwest Territories Act.

Shall Clause 1 carry?

On Clause 1—

**Mr. Angus:** Madam Chairman, I wonder if I might be permitted to put a couple of questions to the parliamen-

tary secretary. We have given notice to the parliamentary secretary of the questions we want to raise with him in order to get a commitment from the government.

Just to point out initially, we believe that there can be no further delay in implementing bilingualism in the Northwest Territories Legislature. This is the second extension, and there will be no further extensions.

The federal government strongly urges the Government of the Northwest Territories to undertake to consult closely with the Northwest Territories francophone community on the question of government services in French, the more important concern at the end of the day than translated laws. There is a good deal of concern among Northwest Territories francophones that this deadline extension is the opening wedge in the retrenchment of bilingualism across the board. The minister should assure the House that all that is happening here is technical problems relating to translation.

Finally, I have another point. I would like the parliamentary secretary to respond to them. The federal government expects the Northwest Territories government to undertake to consult closely with the Northwest Territories francophones on the question of implementing Article 23 of the 1982 Constitution which provides for parent controlled French language schools where numbers warrant.

Could the parliamentary secretary respond to these three points? Then we could move on with this matter.

**Mr. Nicholson:** Madam Chairman, there were three parts to the hon. member's question.

First, we have received assurances from the officials in the Government of the Northwest Territories that there would be no further delay in implementing bilingualism in the Northwest Territories Legislature. Accordingly, we will not be requested to make any further extensions.

Concerning the second question, I would inform the hon. member that the amendment to the new act will not affect the disposition of the Official Languages Act related to the services to the public in French. It should be clear to everyone that this deadline extension only concerns the translation of laws. It is already stipulated that that extension is due to technical reasons.

Specifically in answer to the members's concern, the federal government expects that the Northwest Territories government will continue its consultations with the francophone minority on the questions of governmental services in French.

With respect to the final question, the Secretary of State has offered, by letter to the Government of the Northwest Territories, the support of the federal government to any initiative giving effect to section 23 rights in the Northwest Territories Act. In the Canada–Northwest Territories bilateral agreement on official languages and education the federal government is committed to consult the official language minority on its needs. That is the position of the government, and we will follow through on that.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gauthier:** Madam Speaker, I note that the questions that were just answered are the same I asked in my speech on second reading but I am satisfied with the government answers. I only want to ask the parliamentary secretary if we could get a copy of the letter he referred to between the Secretary of State and the government of the Northwest Territories to the effect that clause 23 will be supported and promoted by the federal government?

[*English*]

**Mr. Nicholson:** Madam Chairman, I do not have that with me, but I will undertake to use my best efforts to forward a copy to the hon. member and to the member for the New Democratic Party as well.

Clause agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, concurred in, read the third time and passed.

* * *

## BILL C–80

### REFERENCE OF SUBJECT MATTER TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The House resumed from Thursday, November 22, consideration of the motion of Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):

That a Special Committee of the House of Commons be appointed to study the subject matter of Bill C–80, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Customs Tariff in consequence thereof;

That the said Special Committee shall have all the powers of a Standing Committee pursuant to Standing Order 108(1); and

That the said Special Committee be composed of eight members, to be recommended by the Striking Committee.

And on the amendment of Mr. MacLellan:

That the motion be amended by adding the following words:

"and that the said Special Committee make its final report to the House no later than Friday, February 15, 1991."

**Mr. Robert D. Nault (Kenora—Rainy River):** Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise in the House today to speak on Motion No. 23. It is my intention to try and explain my views on this issue.

Before we get into that, I would like to mention my disappointment that Bill C-80, the bill that was before the House, was so hurriedly put together in June and because of all the difficulties with it, all the holes in it, that is, it is such a bad bill, that members opposite have decided that they cannot continue with it because it is not even acceptable to government members.

I would like to read Motion No. 23 to the House. It reads as follows:

That a Special Committee of the House of Commons be appointed to study the subject matter of Bill C-80, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Customs Tariff in consequence thereof;

That the said Special Committee shall have all the powers of a Standing Committee pursuant to Standing Order 108(1); and

That the said Special Committee be composed of eight members, to be recommended by the Striking Committee.

I find this very difficult to understand. On the one hand we have a bill that supposedly had extensive consultation and had been looked at extensively by the Minister of Justice and her department, and on the other hand, because members opposite do not approve of the bill and find it to be offensive to their constituents and I suggest particularly to rural Canada, the minister has decided to withdraw the bill. If this particular bill had been the subject of wide consultations and the information and the changes in the bill had been put to the Canadian Wildlife Federation, the National Firearms Association and the Ontario Arms Collection Association, members opposite would have realized very quickly that there were difficulties with the bill.

• (1220)

I would like to go through, in chronological order, areas of concern of the bill and also areas of the bill that are acceptable to members like myself who are from rural Canada.

I would like to start with portions of the bill that we find to be very difficult to comprehend. That is the negative aspect of this bill. These are areas that I suggest very strongly the newly formed committee have a mandate to look at. The first area is the belief that changing the sizes of the magazines and clips of particular weapons would enhance and improve the situation. Mass murderers, the criminal element and certain individuals in Canada use certain types of weapons whether they are within the law or not.

If Bill C-80 was to go through, the government would be outlawing over one million clips that are presently being used in Canada. It would also outlaw hundreds of thousands of weapons that are presently being used. These weapons have a built-in magazine. This built-in magazine has more than a five-clip capacity or five-bolt capacity.

I question the wisdom and the reasoning of the Minister of Justice, who presented this piece of legislation. Why does she feel that reducing the size of a clip will stop incidents such as the one that took place in Montreal last year?

Another area that we must look at very seriously is the Firearms Acquisition Certificate which is presently in place. There is a belief that there is a need for two references. I question the reason why one would want to have references, similar to passports, and whether any individual in this country will want to put their name forward to make a social and moral decision on their own. This individual asking to purchase a Firearm Acquisition Certificate and in essence, purchase a gun, is of sound moral and social character.

I do not know how an individual will be able to make that type of recommendation and put his or her name on this certificate. Most gun owners that I know would have great difficulty doing that, because one really cannot, without professional help, make that kind of decision. That is going to make it difficult for many gun owners who are certified and who have gone through the safety course to be able to get the sport rifles that they are looking for.

Another aspect of the bill that I find very difficult in this age of democracy is the ability to change regulations at will by Order in Council. I find that to be very offensive because it does not allow for debate in this House on issues that we, as members of Parliament, really have been put here to debate. Orders in Council on changes of significance to people's lives should always be debated in this House and that deserves to be looked at.

Another aspect is the increase in fees from $10 to $50. It is outrageous to think that we are putting in a category for every single weapon that a Canadian may own. When they resubmit their firearms acquisition certificate renewal they will have to pay $50 for every weapon they own.

Most Canadians who are hunters and sportsmen own a variety of weapons. I suggest that having two, three, four or five weapons of different varieties for different types of sport is going to be very expensive for those individuals if the changes in fees are allowed to go through.

The other change that is very difficult for an individual who is a sportsman to understand is the fact that an applicant must demonstrate a secure place within which to store his or her weapons.

I ask members opposite to explain to me in detail how that will be done because there are millions and millions of Canadians who own weapons. Are we proposing, as this government has with this piece of legislation, to allow some sort of inspector to inspect every home in the land to see if they have secured their weapons and put them in a place where they are stored in a proper manner? Or are we saying that as long as the weapons are locked in a closet or in a particular case, that is perfectly acceptable?

Is the legislation suggesting that we have to purchase a particularly secure case, one built in Canada? Most gun owners have a case worth roughly $2,000. Those particular cases are made of a very durable type of alloy which will not allow individuals to break in very easily. I suggest that that is a good idea for people who can afford it, but most gun owners in Canada do not have the financial ability to purchase such a secure type of case to allow them to store their weapons.

I want to talk a little bit about what is good about the bill. There are some good aspects to this bill. If we had not got into the emotional problems that occur whenever there is some sort of massacre or something that is disgusting to parliamentarians and Canadians as a whole similar to what took place in Montreal last year, we probably would have come forward with some very good legislation.

Although it has not been passed and given Royal Assent, I find it ironic to think that for years and years we have had on the books the ability to force all Canadians who would like to purchase a weapon to go through a hunter and safety course, or a gun safety course of some kind and have some national standard. I think the safety aspects of the bill are a very good idea and should be implemented.

Obviously we would have to take a look at what the regulations and course would entail. These particular courses would give those Canadians who are first-time gun owners an understanding of just what they are purchasing. That is a very positive aspect of the bill and I think we should take a serious look at improving this part of the legislation.

The other aspect of the bill that is very important is the photo ID that would be put on the FACs. That would make it much easier for individuals who are selling weapons to do their job in checking out the moral and social capabilities of persons owning a weapon.

• (1230)

One of the problems with the bill as it relates to the FAC is that it does not stipulate whether the FAC is going to be for all the weapons. Our belief is that it is just going to be for one individual weapon at a time. Therefore, one might need four or five FACs. I think that has to be looked at very seriously.

With regard to how the bill relates to the firearms safety course, the question that has to be raised and will have to be looked at by this committee is, is this for first-time gun owners or are we going back to square one, making every person who owns a gun in the country take the safety course. There are those in Ontario who have gone through a safety program and there are those in other provinces who have not.

Also, we have to take a look at the 28-day cooling off period. Is this essential for those who already have an FAC in hand now, who are already gun owners, and who have already taken the course to which I have referred? Is it necessary to make them wait 28 days in order to get their renewal of an FAC? If they have already been

checked out by the authorities, can they not just go in and have it renewed instantly?

The other thing I would like to touch on today is the belief that this is truly a discussion between rural and urban Canada. There are some major problems in urban Canada with the criminal element using weapons to the detriment of society. In an area such as northern Ontario where I come from, our largest town has a population of 10,000. Everybody knows everybody and everyone knows everyone who hunts and fishes and is a sportsman. It is not so easy in an environment such as that to explain to people that, "No, you cannot have a 10-bullet clip any more. You have to have a five-bullet clip because the other will do someone harm. You have to remove five bullets out of the clip." That argument is very difficult to make.

We seriously have to understand that in rural Canada we do not understand some of the difficulties that are taking place and for what urban Canada is asking. If we asked it of just the different cities in the country having difficulty with the criminal element related to the use of assault weapons that are out there, then we could understand that. But we cannot understand saying this simply because there are difficulties in Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver and Halifax, when in the rest of rural Canada there are legitimate gun owners who are very conscientious. They have taken the safety courses, are respectful of the law, and try to maintain the type of respect that I think a gun owner should have.

What I am basically talking about is attitude. There is a fundamental difference in attitude with regard to weapons between people in rural Canada and urban Canada. There is a much larger respect for weapons in rural Canada than there is in urban Canada. The reason for that very simply is because we have grown up with them. It is like suddenly telling an Inuit in the north, where there are no roads, that there is now a road and he is now going to be responsible to drive a car. That individual would have a lot of difficulty with that. That situation is very similar to what we are discussing here.

I am not suggesting for one minute that we cannot improve our gun legislation or that we cannot try, as legislators, to put a stop to the situations that have been taking place. However, for the life of me, I cannot understand how this particular piece of legislation will stop the criminal element and the insane element in our society from doing what they have been doing. The fact remains that those individuals, who are quite prepared to break the laws of society, will not adhere to this legislation any more than they adhered to the legislation currently on the books. It is very important for us to try to differentiate between the two because if we do not then we are reacting purely on emotion and it will not stop the inevitable from happening.

I would like to come to a conclusion and look at some of the aspects that possibly were not entertained in the drafting of Bill C-80. That is the effect of changing laws on the tourism industry.

The semi-automatic guns that we are talking about that are legal at this time are used throughout North America. When and if this piece of legislation ever goes through, it will also restrict those who use them in the United States of America. Those individuals come to Canada to hunt and fish. Now they will be restricted by our laws and, therefore, our tourism industry will also be affected.

Are we to tell an individual coming across the border that he can no longer use a 10-bullet clip. He cannot use a 308 that has a built-in magnum that will allow for more than five shells. There are hundreds of thousands of weapons like that out there now.

Those are serious considerations that have to be looked at in rural Canada. I know they do not affect urban Canada whatsoever, but they do affect the economy of Canada as a whole. I think we have to seriously look at that.

I am very pleased that, in a roundabout way, the minister and the members opposite, whom I know lobbied very heavily on behalf of their own constituents, have asked to have this bill removed and sent back so they can have a true dialogue.

We cannot just get into the emotion of the mass murders that take place. It is very easy for members to stand up and use that as an argument to ban all weapons in Canada. If we are going to use that argument, we will not advance the debate at all as to what is appropriate and what is not appropriate for Canadians.

As a rural Canadian, and as a member who has hunted and owned guns for many years, who has taken safety courses, and who knows that there is a lot more to this than what some members are suggesting, I am very

pleased that it is going to go to committee so we can look at it in a very sane way. With some luck, we can put some legislation in place that will have an effect on what we truly would like to do as members of Parliament. That is to try and stop the criminal element in urban centres from breaking the law.

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Madam Speaker, I have a brief comment. I enjoyed the hon. member's speech and he made some very good points. I would like to assure him that we have had the same types of representations in urban areas as he has in rural areas.

One of the things I just want to take the hon. member up on is his terminology. Guns used by individuals, whether they be hunters or gun clubs, or whatever, are firearms. They are not weapons. The hon. member kept referring to them as weapons. I mean weapons are used for defensive purposes and offensive purposes by armed forces or criminals. Then they become weapons. To my way of thinking they are not weapons when they are in the hands of responsible people and there are millions of gun owners in the country who are extremely responsible, very careful, and well trained. I had representation just a week ago from a group of reservists with the Lorne Scots in my particular area who are concerned about the legislation as well and they brought forward some very interesting information.

I was just a little concerned that every time he talked about a firearm he referred to it as a weapon. I do not think firearms are weapons unless they are used by a person as a weapon, not as a hobby or for hunting purposes.

• (1240)

**Mr. Nault:** Madam Speaker, I understand the minister's particular difficulty with the terminology but in my neck of the woods we call them weapons because they are used to hunt and they do kill. They kill animals. Normally, that is what people who go hunting do. They are used for many reasons, one of which is for sport. But for a lot of people in my area, they are used to supplement their income. They are very poor and they hunt moose and deer to fill their freezers. As low-income Canadians, they cannot afford to buy beef on a regular basis, as do some Canadians.

I do not think people opposite and some people from urban Canada understand that that is a very well-known fact in rural Canada. It is not only aboriginals but non-natives also do the same thing. They feel very strongly that this legislation will deter them and make it more difficult for them to put food on the table.

I am not going to argue with the minister as to whether he feels the terminology is incorrect or not. We do not have the same attitude in rural Canada as there is in urban Canada, as it relates to the feeling that a weapon is to kill people and a firearm is for sports. We do not differentiate. It is a very common practice, from the day one is old enough to walk, to go with mom and dad into the bush to shoot partridge, to hunt and enjoy the wilderness. We do not feel that is doing anybody any disservice. It is an enjoyable way to spend our time as northerners and rural people.

If the minister feels that that is not appropriate, I apologize to him for not using urban terminology, but it really means the same thing.

**Ms. Barbara Greene (Don Valley North):** Madam Speaker, I was very interested in the hon member's comparison of urban and rural people and also the statement that rural people need semi-automatic weapons with very high cartridge capacity in order to hunt.

My brother, who is from Newmarket, Ontario, a small urban city, believes that a deer is not worth eating if it takes more than two shots to kill it. I am wondering whether people in the hon. member's community are shooting deer with 30 shots and eating them.

**Mr. Nault:** Madam Speaker, I understand the member's difficulty with that. I know the member's involvement in this particular piece of legislation and her feelings on the matter. I do not want to get into an emotional debate with her because of her sensitivity on the subject.

The fact remains that, through time and through technology, improvements to weapons take place. That is basically what has happened. It is not different than the car. Would one like to go back to the cars of 1910 or the 1920s and 1930s? I doubt that. That is basically what this legislation is asking us to do. It is asking us to say that a gun is no good because it is high-powered, it is new technology, it has the ability to shoot from 200 or 300

yards away, and it also has the ability to carry 10 or 15 bullets in the clip versus five.

Let me just touch on the fact that some people have difficulty with the size of the clip. There is a very legitimate reason for that. The fact remains that it is very, very expensive to go hunting and people have to understand that. This is not a Saturday afternoon venture, where it costs $10 and one wanders off into the bush. These people buy four-wheel-drive trucks. They buy guns that are worth thousands of dollars. They take time off work to go up north perhaps for a week at a time and, in many cases, they fly long distances.

The guns are built in such a way that there is only one opportunity to have a shot. In a lot of cases, one might only get two, three or four shots, and one is a long way off. If the hon. member thinks that one can get 10 feet away from a deer or a moose and perhaps choke it, then we would really not need any guns. I would just like to tell her that one would be lucky to get 100 yards away from a moose or a deer. Therefore, that is why these guns are built the way they are.

All I want the hon. member to understand is that we have to differentiate between the gun and a person's attitude. What we are really talking about here is the attitude of certain people of the criminal element who are mentally unstable. I understand what the hon. member is saying. I really do want to see us try to improve that aspect of it. However, if she is talking about a legitimate railway worker, mill worker or farmer who has all the credentials to be a legitimate gun owner and will not be able to buy a high-powered firearm, then I think the debate is digressing. If the member thinks that people put 30 rounds of ammunition in a deer, those people are not legitimate gun owners. Those people are not hunters. Those people have a problem. Those individuals are not interested in enhancing the debate and should probably have their guns taken away if they run around shooting 30, 40 or 50 rounds into a particular animal because they probably have an AK-47 in their hands.

**Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to take part in this debate on the motion. I think that what we have to make clear for those who are watching on their television sets is that this is a motion to refer Bill C-80, the gun control legislation, to a special committee.

It is in fact a parliamentary device to withdraw the gun legislation, not as the previous speaker would have indicated, that if we passed this legislation it would go into legislative committee where the fine tuning to which he was referring to could take place. Oh, no. What we are seeing here is a parliamentary device, headed up by the Minister of Justice, to withdraw gun control legislation.

There was much hope when the Minister of Justice was appointed, the first woman Minister of Justice. There was a hope that finally things were going to be different; that she would bring a woman's perspective to her duties as Minister of Justice, a different perspective; and that she would be able to put that perspective on to all legislation that came before the House. Those hopes have been dashed, first will Bill C-43, the abortion legislation, and now with Bill C-80. What this parliamentary device, by putting it before a special committee, shows is that the Minister of Justice is caving in to the gun lobby.

I know the Minister of Justice received a lot of favourable comment when she visited the École Polytechnique in April and met with the students and the faculty who had proposed tough gun legislation. It must be recalled that the tragedy at the École Polytechnique on December 6, 1989, was the impetus, she said, for Bill C-80, which would create stiffer gun control legislation.

As I said, she received favourable comment that finally there was going to be stiff gun control legislation. I think that because she is not doing what was hoped would happen, giving a woman's perspective, I will.

I want to point out some of the statistics that relate to guns and women and the difference between the statistics for men and for women. This is why it is important that a woman's perspective should be brought to this debate. Almost exclusively the problems with guns involve men. Women only own a miniscule percentage of guns in Canada. Men constitute the armed part of our society, do most of the shooting and have the greatest chance of being victimized by a gun.

In addition, every poll taken on the issue in Canada and the United states shows that women are the strongest advocates for strict gun control laws. The following statistics should be noted. Only 77 women killed themselves with firearms against 1,047 men. Those statistics are from 1987. Accidental shooting deaths, this is once again 1987 statistics, were 4 women and 56 men. But women do represent one-third of gun victims classified

as homicides. In other words, the only category of statistics where women represent a significant percentage is that of murder victims. I think this explains in part why Canadian women overwhelmingly support tougher gun control laws. Therefore, the Minister of Justice, the first woman Minister of Justice, is sabotaging her own bill by this motion, putting it forth into a special committee and is letting Canadian women down, once again. We have seen the chronology of events from 1978 when the last gun control law was passed in this House of Commons. In that legislation there were provisions enforcing mandatory firearms training. However, here we are in 1990 and those provisions have never been implemented. Who are we to believe when the government says now that it will have a program in place by April 1991?

• (1250)

The women of Canada have lost confidence in this Minister of Justice, who came in with such fanfare to her new role. The tragedy that occurred on December 6, 1989 in Montreal serves notice that there have to be tougher gun control laws. I know in my riding we have the phenomena, because it is close to the American border, of American tourists bringing in handguns in their luggage on coming across the border because that is the way they do things there. It is sort of part of your wardrobe to have a handgun. Well it is not like that here, not yet, not in my riding, although I have heard that there are parts of Canada, particularly in the major urban centres, where firearms and handguns are a major threat. Women are the deficit members of society with regard to handguns.

I would urge that the Minister of Justice forget this special committee, forget the stalling tactics, forget caving into the gun lobby and bring forth this legislation so that it can be debated, it can be fine tuned, and we can talk about the debate between rural Canada and urban Canada in a real legislative committee. The stalling tactic is clear. The government is filibustering its own bill. The Minister of Justice has lost control of her bill because she is caving in to her caucus members.

In conclusion, because of my strong sentiments that strong gun control legislation is imperative, I would like to place a sub-amendment to the Liberal amendment. I move:

That the amendment be amended by deleting the words February 15, 1991, and substituting therefor December 6, 1990.

**Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, I have listened to the hon. member. I have to take exception with her comments about the Minister of Justice either abandoning this bill or this subject, or in any way backing away from it. It seems to me this is a perfectly reasonable way to proceed on this matter.

I have talked to a number of Canadians particularly concerned in this area, and indicated to them the truth that, of all the justice related legislation that has gone through this House, certainly in my experience since 1984, none has gone through completely unchanged. When Canadians across Canada make representations to their members of Parliament, as they have on this and other subjects, why is it so unreasonable for us to have a look at what they are telling us?

I agree with the Liberal amendment to this, that the committee report back by February 15 because it seems to me it would give us an opportunity to hear from groups and individuals who are particularly interested in this and have something to say.

I was among those who welcomed the idea that this legislation be placed before Parliament prior to the summer break. I thought it would give an opportunity for people who are particularly concerned in this area to have a look at it over the summer months. It seems to me that would be the time during which they would most likely come together for sporting events, for hunting, and that sort of thing. They would have an opportunity to examine the bill and make representations to their members of Parliament. I indicated to groups that, by all means, I would like to have their input on this, and the government surely would. I think the hon. member should reconsider the amendment that really makes it impossible for this committee to hear from Canadians. There is nothing wrong with hearing what Canadians have to say.

An amendment by the New Democratic Party to have this committee report back December 6 stifles the whole opportunity. What group can get their briefs together and get to Ottawa if they have to report by December 6? This is why I say the Liberal amendment is reasonable, that we report back by February 15 and at that time

consider what the special committee has to say and take that into consideration in our deliberations on Bill C-80.

**Ms. Hunter:** Madam Speaker, I do not think it should be necessary for me to point out that Bill C-43, the abortion legislation, which received many representations from many people, went through unchanged. So, his argument that this will be brought forth for changes is a little spurious. I would also like to point out that he voted against that legislation as parliamentary secretary. That is my first comment.

I would also like to say once again for those people who are watching that what the government is doing here is using a parliamentary device to pretend it is doing something when, in fact, it is doing nothing. This government will probably go down in parliamentary annals as being masters at that, but it is not lost on the people of Canada. We want strong gun control legislation for the safety of women and men in this country. We want hunters to be able to continue hunting, but the primary motivation of all gun control legislation is the safety of Canadians. It is imperative that this go through expeditiously. I will not withdraw my subamendment.

• (1300)

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt):** Madam Speaker, in the greater metropolitan Toronto area we have a certain problem with guns. There are two distinct areas, and one of them is in my riding where a young individual was shot in the back of the head at a house party.

I for one believe that we need stronger control of guns and stronger legislation. There are smugglers of elicit drugs that the RCMP and our police forces have to face; they have duties. I hear from my constituents continuously that we need certain legislation brought forward. There is no question in anybody's mind. Some colleagues in this House have referred to hunting. We have to distinguish between hunting and the use of arms within the city.

The use of arms within the city is increasing at an alarming rate. Young offenders started using guns because, if they are under the age of 18 and commit a crime, the maximum penalty they face right now is about three years. The government has been promising changes to the Young Offenders Act for the past year and a half. We are still waiting to see what will be coming forward. We need changes today, because right now guns are way out of proportion.

I would like to put a question to the member. How does she foresee the usage of arms within major cities? What changes should be brought forward, especially to deter gun usage among our young people who know that they will be facing a maximum of three years?

Is the member in agreement that we also need changes to the Young Offenders Act to make sure that the crime committed also reflects the time these young offenders will have to serve? Is she in agreement that if a young offender is found with a gun we need more stringent penalties?

**Ms. Hunter:** Madam Speaker, I have always had a lot of difficulty compartmentalizing things in my life. I tend to see things holistically. I think the question that the hon. member has posed addresses that.

I would also like to point out, in answering him, that perhaps there have to be stiffer penalties. What we are talking about is a symptom of some of the social ills in our cities and elsewhere. There is also the glamour element that pertains to firearms, to guns, on American television programs, that the real power lies in the barrel of a gun. Young people are quite seduced by that image.

As I said at the outset, we have to look at this holistically. Of course there have to be penalties. Some of the kids out there are really scary kids. They are scarred kids. We have got to put up programs to make sure that young offenders and others are not going to fall through the so-called social network which this government seems to be doing such wonderful job in dismantling.

This legislation, Bill C-80, has to be put forth expeditiously in order to provide for the safety of Canadians.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Madam Speaker, I have a very short question for the hon. member.

She is a member of a party that by its very name claims to be democratic, the New Democratic Party. Yet, she has proposed an amendment to this motion today that

has the effect of depriving people who want to make representations on this bill from doing so.

I am at a loss to understand that attitude. I wonder how it is that if she is a member of a party that claims to be democratic, she can deny to the people of Canada the right to make representations on this bill.

**Ms. Hunter:** Madam Speaker, I confess to some confusion, because I am trying to figure out the Liberal logic of that question. The Liberal justice critic has been quoted as saying about this so-called democratic committee that it will go nowhere after months and months of study. That is what is going to happen here. It is a disgrace.

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax):** Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on this motion. I am as distressed and upset as I think many of us are with regard to the emotion and, perhaps I would go so far as to say, the manipulation that has tended to surround this issue in the past 12 months.

Canada has always had better gun control legislation than its neighbour to the south. There is no question. However, as our modern society evolves and becomes increasingly more violent, it has become increasingly clear to all of us that more gun control and stiffer gun control legislation is absolutely essential if we are to maintain lawful and safe societies, particularly in our cities.

I say that I stand with some misgivings because there is no question that the events of last December 6 at the École Polytechnique in Montreal were horrific and tragic. They involved the death of 14 young women at the hands of a man who was particularly enraged at young women who broke tradition and entered professions where women were perhaps not so used to being.

The manipulation of these events is something of which none of us should be guilty. In the House on the days immediately following the tragedy there was unity, horror, sorrow, and sympathy for the victims and their families. However, there is no question that in the wake of the events at École Polytechnique came this legislation, this Bill C-80, to make gun control laws in Canada safer and more stringent.

My great difficulty, as it frequently is for those of us on this side of the House, is trying to follow the trail of bread-crumbs set down by the government as to where this bill is going to go. This bill needs to be discussed. It needs to be changed. It is a flawed bill. However, it does—and I will make mention it further along in my remarks—have some things that are absolutely necessary, if we are to maintain an orderly and safe society in this country.

What is the government's agenda on this bill? Is this bill going to come back to this House? Is it ever going to get to a legislative committee? Is it ever going to be law? Somehow the majority of us on this side of the House think that is unlikely. What we think is that the government has decided this bill is unpalatable to a number of its own back-benchers and that the gun control laws it has introduced are too stringent. Consequently it wants a safe place for this bill to die.

With regard to the subamendment of my colleague for Saanich—Gulf Islands, I disagree with her merely on the question of process. If this special committee holds hearings publicly and really does its work, it will consider the questions, concerns and fears about this bill, of what it does or does not do, it will keep this crucially important subject before the Canadian people and put more pressure on the government.

However, I do have the definite feeling that we are going to be back to square one and that this bill, as we know it, will probably disappear from this House, never to return in its current form.

I have to add my remarks to those of members who have spoken before with regard to the Minister of Justice.

• (1310)

There are certain similarities between this bill and the bill that you and I, Madam Speaker, know far too well, which is Bill C-43, the abortion bill. As difficult as it may be within the constraints of parliamentary democracy and within the constraints of our caucus and party loyalties, sometimes we have to stand and say: this is right, this is wrong, this is what I stand for, this is what I believe in.

When it comes to the kinds of recommendations in Bill C-80 that make gun control more of a reality, more of a reality that reflects the reality on the streets of our cities, more of a reality that reflects the reality of women and children who live in fear deal with every day, that is the time for those of us who sincerely believe that these innovations must become law have to stand. Whether we are talking about a Minister of Justice or a back-bencher, wherever we sit in this House of Commons, we have to say that these are changes that must be brought into law.

We know that Canadians are increasingly concerned with violence in our communities. I have risen in this House numerous times since we returned in September to talk about the upsurge in violent death, in murder in this country. We saw the horror of 11 murders within one week in the city of Montreal. We have heard from campuses across this country that the increase of sexual assaults is beyond belief for university administrators and university students. We know that there is a new violent spirit abroad in our country. We also know that the most common victims of this violent spirit are women.

I look at my colleague across the way, the hon. member for Don Valley North. I know that she and I and the member for Louis-Hébert and the member from New Westminster—Burnaby share duties on a parliament subcommittee that is specifically dealing with the question of violence against women. I know that those members in the other parties have the same feeling of commitment, the same feeling that time is running out for us. If we do not act, if we do not come in with the kinds of recommendations that will lead to legislation that will make a difference, we are going to see anarchy reign.

One way to prevent anarchy from reigning is by ensuring that gun control laws are strong enough to make a difference. One of the problems with Bill C-80—and we do say that the bill does not go far enough—not coming in is that it does nothing about the fact that there are 1,400 gun related deaths every year in Canada. Of these 1,400 gun related deaths, 1,100 are firearm suicides. We also know that tragically the question of suicide is one that relates very intrinsically to the question of disturbed young people. We know that that is where the suicide statistics are among the highest.

We do not have the same problem with guns that the Americans do. We are lucky in that, but we have to act now if we are to ensure that our country does not slide down the same slippery slope. We are subject to many of the same pressures, many of the same urban alienating aspects of life as the Americans. It is said that there are more guns in the city of Detroit than there are people. I do not think we would want that to be said about the city of Windsor. I do not think we would want it to be said about Montreal. We certainly would not want it to be said about Halifax. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, not to make light of this, probably in Halifax my constituents could not afford guns, given the economic situation.

Homicides constitute about 15 per cent of all firearm deaths each year. The overwhelmingly significant proportion of these firearm homicides are domestic disputes and crimes of passion. If the guns were not there, it is extremely unlikely that the deaths would take place.

I have heard over and over again, *ad nauseam*, the phrase that truly does irritate me a great deal and that is that guns do not kill people, people kill people. Let us be sensible about this, even this government is not in the business of outlawing people *per se*. We are always going to have people, one hopes; we do not always have to have guns.

I admit that I have an overwhelming prejudice against guns. It is part of my background. I come from an urban background. I did not grow up in a house where guns were even in evidence. I do understand that in the rural communities of this country, there is a different outlook. I understand and I sympathize with that but the kind of gun control we are talking about is, in my belief, the kind that can co-exist between the urban fear of increased violence and increased gun usage and the rural tradition of a sane, sensible, orderly and lawful use of firearms for hunting, animal control and whatever.

In conclusion, I want to say that I am disappointed in this government. I am disappointed in the parliamentary secretary and I am disappointed in the Minister of Justice because I think their agenda is the removal of this bill. I think this bill will not come back to the House of Commons. I fear that if we are to see gun control in the life of this Parliament, we will have to start all over again. I think that would be a shame because there are things in Bill C-80 that are good. There are things in Bill C-80 that the Canadian people want, my constituents want them and the people right across this country want them. If my premonitions are true, and I suspect they are, then shame on the government for not having the courage of its convictions, shame on the minister, shame on the parliamentary secretary.

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague, the hon. member for Halifax, who raised many points and I commend her on bringing out the fact that the real reason we are here today is for this government to get rid of this piece of legislation that is urgently needed and sweep it under the rug.

I have a particular concern and I want to share it with my colleague. In the riding of Scarborough—Agincourt, some very violent crimes have been committed. In 1985 a young offender used a hunting gun to kill an entire family. Very recently a handgun was used in my riding to shoot a 15-year-old young man in the back of the head. Just to the south of my riding, there was another incident last August, where a young man was killed.

There are areas in Toronto where the police will not patrol because they fear for their lives, they are terrified because of the use handguns and automatic rifles. Criminals, such as those bringing illegal drugs into the country, use semi-automatic guns, and Uzis. These people are better equipped than our police forces.

Something has to be done to curtail this usage of automatic rifles. The police forces across this country are stating this. Does my colleague wonder, as I do, if this government is really listening. If the government is not listening, what would my colleague, the hon. member for Halifax, who comes from one of the great parts of our eastern coast, see the answer to be? Do we need to move pretty fast? Do we need to consult? If we do consult, how do we go about not letting the government sweep this piece of legislation under the rug? It is caught in a bind because the backbenchers who come from the west and certainly people from the rural areas do not want this legislation. This is a way for them to sweep this thing under the carpet. What would she like to see done and what has to be done in order to keep—my colleague from across the aisle is laughing, it is not a laughing matter when a 15-year old wipes out an entire family. It is not a laughing matter when that young man is sentenced to only three years. It might be a laughing matter in your riding, but it is certainly not a laughing matter in my riding.

• (1320)

My constituents have told me this clearly. As far as the minister is concerned, being from the western part of Toronto, I am wondering what he would say to his constituents.

What does my colleague see as needed on an urgent basis?

**Ms. Clancy:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague from Scarborough—Agincourt for his question.

I have had a fair amount of experience in dealing with young offenders. Tragically, the only young offender in Canadian judicial history to be sentenced to preventive detention was a young offender from the city of Halifax. It is a very difficult area about which to make hard and fast statements. That is why there are difficulties and that is why we are waiting with great anticipation for the young offenders bill and the amendments thereto.

I still say the problem is the availability of weapons. The problem is the availability in our urban centres of handguns and high-speed rifles. If this committee is going to do something, maybe it will have the opportunity to look at the differences in gun usage, urban and rural, and the very legitimate uses for guns in the rural areas and the fact that they are used lawfully and so on.

I agree with my colleague from Saanich—Gulf Islands who spoke previously. The glamour of guns for young people is very serious. The increase in drug-related crimes in my own city is very serious. We have had numerous drug-related deaths in the city of Halifax. There have been deaths in which firearms have been used. If the guns were not there the problem would not disappear, but I suggest it would be minimized.

My great fear is that this committee, as my colleague suggested, has a way of sweeping a somewhat unpalatable bill under the rug. I hope it does not. I certainly would support the government if that were not the case, but I fear that it is the case. The parliamentary secretary and the minister know that. The minister who is present in the House is nodding at me and I know he agrees with me on the whole question of drug-related deaths and the urban problems. He too is a member who has seen this.

We have to deal with it now. Every day that we do not deal with this matter, every day that we do not tighten up the gun control laws is another day that we are going to see more deaths.

The question of young people and the use of guns is something that is better answered with gun control, in my belief, than it is in young offenders legislation by making that bill perhaps more stringent than it ought to be. We will wait until the bill appears. The answer is in going to the cause, rather than the effect, of the availability of firearms. We need to tighten up gun control.

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the intervention of my colleague from Halifax. She has put into perspective the whole issue of gun control and the implications and impact for those of us who represent urban ridings and have to live on a day-to-day basis with the impact of gun possession. There are a couple of points that I would like to draw to the hon. member's attention and hope that she will give us comments which will perhaps spread greater light on the issue. We fail to establish what is gun control, as applied generically to all types of guns, and I am in favour of that, quite frankly. I might begin by saying that.

Second, how does gun control apply, either by implication or by direct regulation, to those who see a legitimate use for guns. There is a component of our community that uses guns in rural areas of Canada for hunting and other purposes, none of which represent a danger to civilized society.

We have not had the opportunity to be able to discuss that in this bill because the bill has come to us, as the minister and other members have indicated, as the result of a tragedy that took place about one year ago, one that we all bemoan.

In fairness, what many members on this side of the House and all those who deplore the violence associated with guns have difficulty accepting is that the minister would come forward with an item of legislation without having had the opportunity to reach out, as her department should have done. The Minister of Justice and the department are supposed to be in touch with all Canadians throughout the year on a continuous basis with or without the occasion of tragic events. However, she has come forward with a piece of legislation that does not consider the interests of collectors, hunters, other gun lobbyists and the interests of society at large, and especially those who are victimized by the spread of guns and other weapons possession.

Putting aside this legislation for a moment, why should we solicit opinions when they have been coming to each and every member's office since the day the massacre happened in Montreal and since the day the legislation was presented before the House. I do not know how much more we are able to hear that the Department of Justice ought to have heard, probably has heard, and should have incorporated in legislation. Then we could recognize the merits of the government's intention in legislative form, in regulatory form as it applied to the gun lobby and as it applied to citizens at large.

In closing, I wonder if the hon. member would give us an indication whether the government, in this instance, is pulling a political ploy in order to camouflage the fact that it is failing to live up to its responsibilities, both to gun lobbyists and to victims of violence at the hands of those who wield weapons, by introducing this kind of technique so as to avoid coming to grips with the reality of the problem for at least another session?

**Ms. Clancy:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Eglinton—Lawrence for his comments, and indeed, I agree. I think they are insightful comments and lay the problems very much at the door where they belong. Again, I support a committee that will consult widely and listen to Canadians. It should have been the role of government to look at this problem. The government understood this. It has rural and urban members. It knows what the problems are in an urban community, and I am reminded—and I may be dating myself by this—of watching *Gunsmoke* as a child and seeing the people of Dodge City being told to take off their guns before they came into town. Maybe we need something in that modifying manner in our cities. Now, how we control it, I do not know. I will leave that to the great ability of the parliamentary secretary to come with a response.

**Mr. Nicholson:** That can be one of your amendments.

**Ms. Clancy:** A few more amendments. All right. The parliamentary secretary, having Nova Scotia roots, probably has the kind of ingenious mind to think of it. However, the response is that we do have to look at guns differently in an urban and in a rural context. We also have to look at the traffic in illegal guns. If we say there is one rule for the cities and another for the country, if we can manage to do that in some way that would satisfy those people who legitimately want to use firearms in a peaceful way, that is fine. That is the kind of knotty problem we are dealing with and that is the kind of knotty problem with which the government has not come to grips. It is the kind of problem that has to be dealt with without fail to ensure that this legislation can be passed. It is not going to solve any of the problems we have

enumerated here by sweeping the whole thing under the rug, throwing it to a committee, and letting it die.

• (1330)

**Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enter into this debate today and to offer some views with respect to this important subject matter.

A couple of the hon. members who just spoke, particularly the hon. member for Halifax, have implied that there was a lobby among some members of the government party that got this piece of legislation sent to a committee and, as a result of that, it would be swept under the rug, and therefore not lead to the conclusion that Canada would have effective gun legislation.

I can inform her, through you, Mr. Speaker, that I would be one of those members who has lobbied to have another look at this legislation, but I certainly would never be a member who would lobby to say that we should have no legislation or that we should have weak or ineffective legislation.

I believe that there are two constituencies with two different perspectives on this important issue. The bill just tabled tends to satisfy one of those constituencies. I say that it is possible to have good, effective, workable legislation that will satisfy both of the two polarized views with respect to guns.

When the hon. member for Halifax addressed the House, she made a comment that could not help but have me reckon back to the truth of what she said. She said that we have to look at guns differently in urban areas than in rural. I do not subscribe to the "have to" part of that, but I do subscribe to the cultural difference that exists between those two situations.

I was a member of the House some many years ago when the Liberal government was introducing its gun legislation. The heat was coming into this Chamber from all parts of the country. It was during the highest period of tension on gun control and rural Canada in that all of its regions was mad. I was struck by the fact that as I drove into the community of Hanna, Alberta, coming out of the Big Country Sporting Goods Store was a person carrying a new rifle. He walked just in front of where I had parked my car. Several people stopped on the sidewalk to examine his new rifle. They pointed it in the air. They moved the workings of it and praised this fine new rifle that he had. Then, the person went on, put it in his truck, and went back out to the ranch.

That was a very comfortable situation about which any urban person would have been struck by the casualness of that sort of conversation. Had that happened on Yonge Street in Toronto, four blocks of citizens would have absolutely evaporated. Somebody pointed a rifle in the air, handed it over to his friend, showing it back and forth, and these ranchers were thinking absolutely nothing other than one of them had purchased a new tool to his industry.

I come from that kind of country. I know there are colleagues in all three parties from those remote regions of Canada. In the Peace River area of British Columbia, one is probably a moose hunter. In Canada's two northern territories, one's livelihood and security is largely dependent on it. Wrestling polar bears by hand is largely fictional. It may make covers of men's magazines, but do not ask anyone in the high North to do it.

For personal security, for food supply, and in the ranching and farming industries, it is a tool of the industry. I am a fruit farmer, Sir, and rabbits can cause a lot of difficulty to my orchards. The presently proposed legislation would like to have it limited to a five-bullet clip in the gun. Those who know me at all know it takes more than five bullets for the rabbit to start getting scared when I go after them. I obviously need more than a five-bullet clip.

I submit that we really need to redress the thought processes on this legislation. From the earliest of examination by the Government of Canada, the community of Canada that drafted the legislation was largely urban, but not totally. It then submitted it to the justice ministers of both past and present governments. They came to the notion of gun control from the perspective that the gun is evil, that it is the instrument that is wrong,

and that it is the instrument that we somehow have to do something about.

The automobile also kills many people. We have had as a society a more mature attitude about how we regulate the automobile. We do not start from the perception that the automobile is wrong. We start from the perception that we will train the operator through written and oral examinations, and then in skill testing. I believe that ought to happen also with the gun.

One ought not to be able to use a gun unless able to demonstrate competence. One should be required to demonstrate competence not only on physical skill, but on mental security. I believe that those persons to whom I have spoken—members in gun organizations or those who use guns as a means to their livelihood—would subscribe to that.

As a member of Parliament from a rural region of Canada, I can tell you, Sir, that I do not desire, any more than any urban person anywhere, to have a gun in the hands of a lunatic. But there is that funny notion that when these awful, tragic, deplorable, emotional situations take place in our country, such as that at École Polytechnique about a year ago, that somehow if we attack the instrument, we will achieve justice. The person who committed that crime was mad. Everything about him demonstrated that he was a person filled with anger. It would be naive in the unfortunate extreme for us to presume that, had we at some earlier period of time abolished every gun in the country, the crime would not have taken place in some other way. I know that statistics do not in any situation necessarily establish proof.

With regard to training and skills, I would give the example of Switzerland. Because Switzerland does not have an armed forces as such, but requires that every male aged 18 and over must have a high powered rifle in their possession and be trained to use it. They undergo training. One of the things that is observable about Switzerland is it has one of the western world's lowest incidences of crimes with a gun and yet it is a nation in which virtually every home has a gun. I submit that what has been wrong through a history of almost 20 years now is that we have approached this issue from the perspective that we have to control the gun, rather than to somehow control licensed safe operation of the person.

• (1340)

The other area that I wish to mention is that, for those regions of the country where guns are used in the line of work or as a tool to a livelihood, ambiguity in the regulatory process causes a great concern. People know who the regulators are and they know it is largely urban Canada. It is the bureaucrats of Ottawa. They are very fine people and many of them are very, very hard working, but there are not many people in the rural and northern regions of Canada who believe that their views will be expressed in a change in the regulation. They want a consultative process that designs the right legislation and fixes it specifically.

If we leave lots of changes for the regulatory process, where many things can be changed at whim, it will never be changed with the consultation of rural Canada. That fear must be set aside. I say to you, Sir, it is not difficult to set it aside.

I am absolutely convinced of it and I am pleased that we have been effective in asking the minister to go one consultative process further in an attempt to draft legislation that, on the one hand will make urban Canada say that this is safe and this is good, and on the other hand those who use a gun in of their day-to-day lives will also come to the conclusion that this is acceptable, that this is reasonable, and that we can endorse it. I am fully convinced that that kind of balance can be achieved.

The first objective should be to set aside the notion that it is the instrument that is wrong and come to a far higher and more intense training in the skills and the use, and the testing of the persons competence, both mentally and physically, to use that weapon. When we do, hopefully, we will have a safer society and a more trusted one for all sectors of our country.

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his speech. I enjoyed the way he makes a presentation. I agree with him on the over-all position that there are two constituencies out there, rural and urban, if you like, and that we must find a way of bringing them both together with workable gun control. That is, gun control which works for rural people as well. We are in agreement there, but our agreement stops there.

He said: "Guns don't kill, people do." That was in the latter part of his speech. Is it not a fact that guns make it a heck of a lot easier for people to kill? It is pretty hard to kill with bare hands or even with knives, although one can kill with knives.

The fact is that gun control has affected the murder rate in Canada compared to the United States. That is the best example I think.

In Switzerland they do not keep AK-47s in their houses or semi-automatic weapons, as I understand it.

**Mr. Crawford:** Yes, they do.

**Mr. Waddell:** They do? Well, in any case I want to ask if that is not kind of the old argument against having any kind of gun control. Guns don't kill, people do. It seems to me that if the guns are controlled, then there is going to be a lot less killing. I think the statistics which he spoke about bear that out. I also want to ask him if hunters really need semi-automatics or automatics, some of the new kinds of guns. I went to the RCMP here in Ottawa and looked at some of the guns they have seized. It is unbelievable the kind of weapons that are coming into Canada, even weapons that are now controlled in California and other places, but not controlled yet in Canada.

What do you need in the woods? Do you need more than five shots? What animals are in Canada? Do we have tigers in Canada? What kind of animals do we have in Canada that you cannot kill with a regular gun and without having a semi-automatic or automatic, and without having more than five rounds at one time? I do not know of any animals.

**An hon. member:** Dinosaurs?

**Mr. Waddell:** Dinosaurs? No, they are all over. I do not know animals in the woods that a good hunter cannot deal with and I do not know why we have to use that argument.

The hon. member mentioned training. I think that is an excellent point. It is the one part that the gun lobby is right on. There has to be training. But it still has not been proclaimed. That gun law came in in 1978 and it is now 1990 and they still have not got around to getting a training system. I think we can both agree that it should be done.

Let me just end by saying this to the member and perhaps he could deal with it. He says: "We,"—meaning the Conservative backbench—"have been effective to have convinced the minister to go another step, that is to have this committee". He has already heard me say in the House that I interpret this as a major defeat for the new Minister of Justice in the cabinet, a major defeat for her after her promise to the students at the École Polytechnique in Montreal last April that she would bring in effective gun control. I see this as a major defeat for the minister. The member has said that the backbench has been effective in putting it off.

Why could we not have passed the bill in principle, dealt with it in committee and made the amendments that we need to make to protect rural Canada in committee? Now we are going to have a committee which is really a phoney. Any committee could look at a subject matter. The justice committee could look at gun control. We are passing a motion to send this material to the committee and the committee can send it back to the House and we never get to Bill C-80.

Why would the member not agree to protect at least the integrity of his own justice minister and her promises that she gave last April that the matter could pass in principle here in the House, then go to committee? If it goes to committee it will bounce around committee for a period. It will come back and God knows when we will ever get to it. Is it not, in fact, what he has done is succeed in burying gun control?

**Mr. Malone:** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to respond to the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam. I am always very proud of myself when I can pronounce his constituency. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the minister's integrity is absolutely intact. Her commitment to those who are relatives and friends of those persons who were so tragically slain at École Polytechnique is absolutely intact. I totally, 100 per cent support absolutely the need for legislation.

Surely I would ask of the hon. member for Moody—Port Coquitlam that he also recognize that if it is possible to get better legislation by trying to rethink the fundamental principle that we are better off. Why do we not just amend it? I think we shot and missed—pun intended. We have started on a process for 20 years that pretends somehow that if you take this instrument and chop away at it in a legislative process, you can be effective. There is room for that. The hon. member asks

the question: "What do you need in the woods." With tongue in cheek, I tell him mosquito spray. But, not tongue in cheek, I tell him he is right. You do not need fully automatic weapons. They should be outlawed. They should not be allowed into our country. You do not go moose hunting with an automatic weapon. Automatic weapons do only one thing well. They kill people. They do nothing else well. It is similar to the pistol. The pistol does two things well. It kills people or, in sporting activities for target shooting, it is part of a gaming event where the pistol is used that way. It is one of those things that is easily concealed.

• (1350)

The semi-automatic is a different thing. When you pull the trigger, the explosion of the first bullet allows for the second bullet to enter the chamber. I have a semi-automatic rifle. You should see the parking lot, the area where berry pickers come to my farm, and where the gophers are in the spring of the year. Colonies of them come up. You need a rapid capacity to be able to have varmint control. Anybody who is a northern resident will also submit to the same perspective. If you want to limit clips, I said fine. Five cartridge clips destroys the very reason why you have a semi-automatic in the first place. They are very different instruments. Fully automatic is military equipment, whereas semi-automatic is not.

The hon. member asks about the slogan, 'guns don't kill people, people kill people'. I have never tried to make persuasions or arguments on the basis of slogans. If I wanted to live my political life with slogans, I would join the Reform Party. There may be an element of truth to that message on bumper stickers. The gun can kill in a faster way.

I think the hon. member will recognize that in violent societies, death rates can be very high. He may or may not be surprised by the fact that the instrument that killed the most Albertans last year was the knife. It was not the gun. The most murders in Alberta took place with a knife. Most domestic murders in Canada do not take place with a gun, they take place with a knife.

To what does that logically lead us? Knife control? If so, what knife? The butter knife? Who defines and how do you define? This is a problem we have to wrestle with in an effective way that leads to its natural results that we all want, both urban and rural. People should not be of the view that there is some rural group out there who likes the notion of violence. I have no knowledge of any, though I am not naive enough to believe that there are not violent people in our society. I do not personally know of any.

Those are the questions I believe asked of me. That is what I offer him as my response and hope that that is of some satisfaction to the hon. member.

**Mr. Rex Crawford (Kent):** Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise and speak about the merits and the shortcomings of Bill C-80.

Specifically today, we are speaking on a motion to refer the bill to a legislative committee for further study.

It seems that the Tory caucus has reached the Minister of Justice. As a former president of the Dover Rod and Gun Club, I bring certain strong views to the subject of gun control. I am a hunter and sportsman, as are many of my constituents. It is economically important to my riding that hunting is allowed. I am of the firm belief that any gun control legislation must not hinder the honest citizen, that the current laws on the books should be used to the fullest against the dishonest citizen.

It is estimated that there are six million guns in Canada today. Canadians can buy firearms and ammunition at more than 10,000 outlets across Canada. Those figures may startle those who favour tougher gun control, but the figures show Canada does not have a high homicide rate or a high gun use.

The laws that are on the books now should be enforced by the police and the judicial system. We have a strong gun law in Canada today. It is not being enforced.

A strict system of controls was first introduced by the Liberal government in 1977 in order to prevent the criminal and irresponsible use of firearms and to encourage responsible gun ownership and use.

I have received many letters from constituents who are hunters like myself. One, in particular, the Kent Clover Leaf Conservation Club has some serious concerns with the bill that I share. For example, the proposed limitation of magazine capacities to five rounds on semi-automatics is unacceptable to the club, and it was mentioned earlier by the previous speaker. Guns are designed for

certain clips and a five-clip in an automatic is of very little use.

They also stand in opposition to any further restrictions to or the banning of semi-automatic rifles, pistols or shotguns. Again, it does nothing to deter crime, but only hinders the enjoyment of a legitimate sport. Those who know nothing of guns or sport shooting are quick to offer that sport shooters do not need the new technology of self-loading firearms. It must be pointed out that they have been on the scene since the turn of the century and are an important part of sport shooting, in fact, also of the Olympics.

In the town of Wallaceburg, which is in my riding, we have the Lee-Enfield rifle in the museum. This gun under the new legislation would be banned. This gun has been known all over the world and has been used in two world wars.

The club makes some good points and I want to quote from their letter to the Minister of Justice on June 26, 1990:

> The criminal aspects of gun use must be tightened and enforced. Murder, armed robbery, assault with or without a weapon and the possession of a firearm or ammunition at a public gathering are all illegal.

So, we do have the law, but it is not being upheld by the judicial system.

Now is definitely the time for action in dealing with Canada's crime problem, but let us aim the action in the proper direction. We must place the responsibility solely where it belongs, on the shoulders of the criminal element.

The provisions in Bill C-80 regarding conditions for a firearms acquisition certificate, the FAC, are very reasonable. Gun clubs have always been supportive of safety courses and strong background checks of prospective gun buyers.

The requirement that an applicant must complete—

**Mr. Nicholson:** I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member but I have just been informed by members that the question will automatically be put at two o'clock.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** So it will. The hon. member still has a few seconds.

**Mr. Crawford:** Under provincial law hunters have to complete safety courses before obtaining a hunting licence, so it is fair that firearm owners be properly trained, too. That is why the sportsmen's clubs are around. That is one of their most important functions, to teach the safety of firearms.

The FAC should bear a photograph of the applicant, and the 28-day waiting period is also fair and reasonable. I am certainly not against that. I support it 100 per cent.

Currently, many police authorities do inadequate checks for an FAC. I must say the ones in my riding certainly do their job well.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I do regret, but it being two o'clock p.m., pursuant to an order made earlier this day, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the motion now before the House.

The first question is on the amendment to the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment to the amendment?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The next question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

Amendment agreed to.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The next question is on the main motion as amended. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the main motion as amended?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

* * *

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. McDermid:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understand there have been discussions and I would like to place the following consent motion:

> Notwithstanding the Order of the House adopted earlier this day, respecting proceedings this day, at the completion of the times provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business, the House shall stand adjourned until 1 o'clock p.m., Monday, November 26, 1990.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The House has heard the motion as moved by the minister. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** It being 2 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—MOTIONS

[*English*]

### NORTHERN QUEBEC

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL CONSTITUENCY

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should introduce legislation to provide an additional constituency in Northern Quebec which would be identical to the territory covered by the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement of 1975 and thereby provide better representation for the people of Northern Quebec and, in particular, for the Inuit, Cree and Naskapi citizens who are the majority in this area.

He said: Madam Speaker, the purpose of this motion is to provide a new constituency in the extreme north of Quebec where the great majority of the population is Cree, Inuit or Naskapi. The area for the constituency that I have in mind is the area which would be more or less similar to the area covered in the James Bay Agreement of 1975.

In 1975 a land claim settlement was arrived at with respect to the Cree and the Inuit living in the north of Quebec. It was followed a few years later by a companion agreement with respect to the Naskapi who live on the more eastern side of the same territory.

At the present time, these aboriginal people living in the north of Quebec are not properly represented. I am not saying that the individual members of Parliament who represent those constituencies are bad members of Parliament, but they do not truly reflect the people who live in the far north of Quebec.

Right now in this area there are two constituencies. One of the constituencies, Manicouagan, is on the eastern side of that territory and runs from the St. Lawrence River right up to Hudson Strait and includes the more southern communities—one can call them southern in respect of that area but they are quite north—of Sept-Îles, Port-Cartier, Baie Comeau, and so on.

The majority of the population in the Manicouagan riding is in the southern part of that constituency, near the St. Lawrence River. Consequently the control of the constituency is with those people who are traditional Quebecois people and not aboriginal people.

The other constituency, which is on the western side of the area, is the constituency of Abitibi. It includes the southern communities of Rouyn, Noranda, Val d'Or, and so on. These communities, as well, control what happens in that constituency of Abitibi, and the people in the far north have very little to say.

Rather than have two constituencies which run right up to Hudson Strait and which are divided by a line that runs north and south, I am suggesting that we cut off the northern part of Quebec with a line that would run east and west and form a new constituency which would more or less include the same territory as the territory of the James Bay Agreement. The Quebecois cities of Sept-Îles, Baie Comeau, Port Cartier, Rouyn, Noranda, Val d'Or, and so on, would be south of that constituency and would belong to properly composed traditional Quebec constituencies.

I am not proposing that we take away one of the constituencies now allocated to Quebec for this purpose. Right now Quebec has 75 seats. I am suggesting that we have a 76th seat to deal with this very special need and very special proposal. Of course such a constituency would have fewer than the average population of most constituencies in Canada. The population would be more or less 20,000 people north of that line. By the way, that line would run near the 52nd parallel.

I must point out that in a sense it would be equivalent to the new constituency of Labrador, which is now a single constituency. Since 1988 the constituency of Labrador does not contain any territory on the island of Newfoundland, and that is new since 1988. It was done for the same purposes as I am suggesting now for the north of Quebec, but the southern boundary of this new

constituency would be more or less the same as the southern boundary of Labrador. This sort of exception for constituencies has been done before. We did it in 1988 for Labrador. Before 1988 Labrador was lumped in with a large number of communities on the island of Newfoundland, but it was decided for cultural, historical and community purposes to give Labrador its own constituency.

It was also done, I cannot remember the exact year, for the present constituency of Nunatsiaq. Nunatsiaq is that part of the Northwest Territories on the eastern side which is above the tree line and which contains principally a population of Inuit people. A few years ago we decided, despite the fact that this area had a very small population compared to other Canadian constituencies, that it was appropriate to give the people in that area a representative in Parliament. It was agreed that we would set up this new constituency of Nunatsiaq. I will put on the record the population of that area.

It was also done when we first established the constituencies of Yukon and the Northwest Territories, because we would never have constituencies in Yukon or the Northwest Territories—and here I am talking of the western Arctic, the area around the Mackenzie River—if they were based on numbers of constituents. If we were to be very strict with respect to the number of constituents required for a constituency, then the Yukon, Western Arctic or Nunatsiaq do not meet that criteria. They are way below that criteria, but we did it because we felt that those people needed representation in Parliament and should not be lumped in with the more southerly areas of Canada which have larger populations. By the way, these southerly areas are economically, socially and culturally quite different in many respects and would not really represent the more northern areas.

• (1410)

We also make exceptions for Prince Edward Island. In the Constitution of 1867 we decided that Prince Edward Island should also have the same number of members of Parliament as senators. Consequently Prince Edward Island has four constituencies even though, according to the average Canadian standard for constituencies, there should be only one and a half constituencies in that province.

I would like to put on record some of the populations of these areas. For example, right now the constituency of Labrador has about 28,000 people and about 17,000 electors. I would have you compare that with the average Canadian constituency.

For example, let us take the two constituencies that presently exist in the north of Quebec. The constituency of Abitibi has a population of nearly 87,000 people with an electorate of 61,000. I am rounding off the figures. The constituency of Manicouagan has a population of a little over 57,000 people with nearly 39,000 electors. Labrador has a population of 28,000 with 17,000 electors, the Yukon has a population of nearly 24,000 with 16,000 electors, Nunatsiaq has a population of 19,000 with a little over 11,000 electors and the Western Arctic has a population of 32,000, with 18,000 electors.

If we look at the four constituencies in Prince Edward Island, Cardigan, Egmont, Hillsborough and Malpeque have populations of 29,000, 34,000, 31,000 and 30,000 respectively. As I say, we can easily see that these are all much less than the average for Canadian constituencies, which is around 60,000 to 70,000 people in each constituency.

We have done it in the past. We did it for Labrador and Nunatsiaq because we thought it would be a good thing for a group living with the same type of economy to have the right to representation in Parliament.

I should also point out, because it is very instructive, that at the time of Confederation in 1867, when this country was first established, there were 182 constituencies. The average population at that time of each constituency was 17,400. We were able to carry on quite well as a country and our members of Parliament were able to represent those areas quite well.

I gave you the populations for the constituencies of Abitibi and Manicouagan, Madam Speaker, but the national average population for constituencies in Canada is 85,794, and the average for Quebec is 87,099. What I am proposing is, of course, an exception to the rule, but it is not an exception to the rule that has not been done before.

I do not think anyone will deny that we need more aboriginal representatives in this House. We already have two in this party, one from the Northwest Territories and one from Nunatsiaq. I doubt if we would have them if we had stuck to the general rule for populations for constituencies. If we did not have those special

constituencies with smaller populations than the average, if we did not have them in Nunatsiaq and the Eastern Arctic, we would not have the two members that we now have in this party. There is a member of the Conservative Party from Alberta, a treaty Indian, who comes from an ordinarily constructed constituency, and it is good that he does represent that area, but again, I think we need to do more to involve these peoples in our parliamentary process.

One way of doing it is to carve out constituencies in the northernmost parts of our provinces, such as I am suggesting, where there is a heavier than usual concentration of aboriginal people. It is very difficult for aboriginal people, who are a minority, to be elected in more southerly constituencies. It was done by the hon. member in the Conservative Party to whom I have just referred and it was done on this side of the House a few years ago when Senator Len Marchand was elected in the constituency of Kamloops.

If we look at the situation last summer, where we had a severe crisis at Oka, Quebec with respect to the Kanesatake community, there was nobody to really represent those people here in Parliament. Many of us tried to represent them. I did, and others did as well, but there was nobody from that community itself. With respect to Kahnawake, it is sad to say but the member of Parliament for La Prairie took very opposite views to the people of Kahnawake. As a matter of fact, the member for La Prairie suggested that the whole population of the Kahnawake community be moved to Labrador or some such place. I do not think that was a good idea.

No matter what we might think of Elijah Harper's politics, while many of us might have supported the Meech Accord and were upset that it did not succeed, we have to admit that the fact that Elijah Harper was in the Manitoba legislature representing a northern constituency in Manitoba helped him represent the views of his people. Whether or not we liked the outcome, the fact that Elijah Harper was in the Manitoba legislature in a minority Parliament meant that he was able to represent the views of his people. I think that is very important.

If you are not in Parliament where you can legitimately put forward the views of your people, in this case aboriginal people, then you will very often have extra-parliamentary action and that action is not always legal or appropriate. You have demonstrations, you have blockades, you have all sorts of things that might happen if you cannot legitimately pursue your views through the ordinary democratic process of elections and Parliament. People get frustrated because they feel they are not being represented in Parliament and therefore they take our their frustrations in other ways to get their political views known. I do not think that is a good thing.

I see here today the hon. member for Abitibi who is one of the most active members on the government side and one of the most active backbenchers in Parliament. I am not suggesting that he be replaced. I am suggesting that it would be more appropriate that he represent the communities that he comes from in the more southern part of the Abitibi riding and, as I said, that we add an additional riding to Quebec to take care of the area that is north of the communities, the Quebecois communities as opposed to the Cree and the Inuit communities which are in the north.

I am familiar with those communities because I was a former Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and I visited that region several times. I know that there is a real difference between the Cree, Inuit and Naskapi communities and the communities of Sept Iles, Port Cartier, Baie Comeau, Rouyn, Val d'Or, Amos and all the other communities which are non-aboriginal communities and for the most part reflect different cultural, economic and social values, not totally but enough to require special representation in Parliament.

• (1420 )

I was responsible as minister for putting through the James Bay legislation in this House. We finally passed it in 1977. Since that time, there has been great development in these aboriginal communities in the north of Quebec. They have their economic development programs, their own school boards and their own health programs. In the Inuit areas there is the Makivik Corporation, the Kativik regional government and so on. It is only appropriate that we give these people some means of being directly represented in Parliament and this is my proposal.

Ideally, there should be two constituencies in that area because there are two or even three aboriginal groups. There is the Cree community, which has its own way of life. Then there is the Inuit further north in their own communities. If we can get agreement to move forward, it would be a great accomplishment. For example, in the western Arctic, which is represented by my colleague from Yellowknife, who is a Dene Indian, her constituency also has some Inuit. There are white people as well, people from different backgrounds. The great majority of people in that constituency are either Indian or Métis or Inuit. The overwhelming percentage of the population is of aboriginal background.

I have been campaigning for this proposal for several years. I have written to the Chief Electoral Officer who, in principle, does not oppose it. This is an idea that came to me from leaders in the north of Quebec. People from the Makivik Corporation and people from the Cree communities felt that this was the only way that they would ever get represented in Parliament. Some of them have run for office before in the constituencies of either Manicouagan or Abitibi as independents, but did not have any chance at all. Their population cannot compete with the populations in the southern part of the constituency.

This is a motion and not a bill. I am asking the House to approve, in principle, the formation of a new constituency in the north of Quebec. This constituency would be more or less contiguous with the territory of the James Bay agreement so that the people in that area could be represented, need not be, but would most likely be represented by an aboriginal person from that area.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Madam Speaker, *Narkurmik Marialuk*. I rise today to speak on motion M-415 presented by my honorable colleague, the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, proposing that the federal government introduce legislation to provide an additional constituency in Northern Quebec. This new constituency would be identical to the territory covered by the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement of 1975, and would provide better representation for the people living in this large northern area.

Madam Speaker, the constituency of Abitibi covers an area of 553,837 square kilometers, or 213,837 square miles, and has a population of 86,990. It is the largest constituency in all ten provinces after the Northwest Territories, and it covers a substantial part of that agreement's territory together with the constituency of Manicouagan, represented here by Charles Langlois. Rest assured, Madam Speaker, we do not intend to replace the member who is here today, because since his arrival in 1988, he has defended the interests of all of his constituency, north and south.

Numbering 3,584, the Inuit are scattered in the following villages: Salluit, Ivujivik, Akulivik, Povungnituk, Inukjuak, Umiujaq, Kuujjuarapik, and Mailasikkut.

Some 9,593 strong, the Crees are scattered in the villages of Whapmagoostui, Chisasibi, Wemindji, Eastmain, Nemaska, Waswanipi, Waskaganish, and Mistassini.

On February 8, 1983, Mr. Jean-Jacques Martel, of Amos, who has been a member of Parliament here in Ottawa, appeared before the Electoral Boundaries Commission, and said: "As another practical suggestion, the great northern Quebec area, also known as New Quebec or the Ungava Territory, should make a separate electoral riding because of its enormous size, its scattered population, its needs and problems which are different from ours and those of the major metropolitan centres".

During hearings held on December 1, 1986, Mrs. Jeannette Dupuis Lessard, speaking on behalf of the Abitibi-Témiscamingue Regional Development Council (CRDAT), stated similarly: "The climatic and soil conditions which exist in the southern part of the Abitibi riding allows such economic activities as agriculture, forestry and mining, which is clearly not the case of the Middle and Far North of the riding. Do you realize, Madam Speaker, that there is a distance of 1,600 kilometres between the south and the north of my region, which is about the same distance as between Val d'Or and Tampa, Florida. You can understand the time it takes to cover such an area and what enormous task it would be for one member.

The northern part of this territory is inhabited by Natives, Crees and Inuits, with a culture and both social and economic needs different from those of the south. Transport and communication are very difficult. There is no longer any road to the north of James Bay and the airplane is the only means of transportation to visit this

whole territory. The inhabitants of the middle North and the far North are our neighbours and our social and economic ties with them are increasing. Yet, the CRDAT representative added: "Because of its peculiarities, this northern territory should have its own electoral representative in the House of Commons."

The current incumbent of the Abitibi seat and his predecessors have done everything possible to represent this huge territory. Yet, it must be recognized that such a task is beyond human capacity.

That is why the CRDAT is in favour of the creation of a third electoral riding which would represent the inhabitants of both the middle North and far North of the current Abitibi riding. In view of the small number of its inhabitants, it is true that the creation of such a new electoral riding would not meet the current electoral standards.

But you must realize, members of the Commission, that this electoral ratio does not reflect the reality of the huge and sparsely populated northern territories.

In short, we wish that that portion of the territory be made into an extraordinary electoral district, as defined in the Canada Elections Act and as is the case for the Northwest Territories of Canada.

Madam Speaker, the message from every Quebec electoral district boundaries commission is the same: "Some findings based on geographical or ethnic considerations suggested that the commission should establish electoral districts with less than the minimum population requirement. That was the case of requests received from Inuit and Cree people. Of course, the commission does not have any authority to act on these requests."

Madam Speaker, let us not forget the residents and workers of the La Grande complex, a hydro development with various sites in Radisson, LG1, LG2, LG3, LG4 and elsewhere, as well as the residents in northern communities.

The Cree-Naskapi Commission, chaired by the honourable Justice Réjean F. Paul, from the Superior Court, recommended in Chapter 3 of its 1988 report the recognition of the Cree in Ouje-Bougoumou as the ninth Cree band, in accordance with the Cree-Naskapi of Quebec Act. Nowadays, Canada should officially recognize this new Cree band, which was omitted in the hon. member's motion, and put in place a process to establish this new village.

Madam Speaker, the James bay and Northern Québec Agreement divides the lands in three caterogies: the first category includes lands to be controlled solely by the native people; the second category comprises provincial public lands on which the natives have the exclusive right to hunt, fish and trap; and finally the third category is made up of public lands belonging to the province.

• (1430)

Since the James Bay and northern Quebec Agreement was signed 12 years ago the Governments of Canada and Quebec paid more than $1 billion in cash and services to the 17,000 native people of Northern Quebec living in the ridings of Abitibi and Manicouagan. On-going payments by Canada under the agreements amount to more than $100 million a year.

The Inuit, Cree and Naskapi people have been using these funds to raise the standards of living of their communities. They have shown outstanding ingeniosity and a remarkable spirit of entreprise.

The most enduring benefit of the agreements is that the native people have been able to gain better control over their own future. This very positive climate was highlighted by the July 13, 1984 enactment of the legislation governing Quebec Crees and Naskapis. Crees and Naskapees do now have the power to look after all matters related to their land and affairs. Inuit have also taken charge of their own affairs as a result of the James Bay and northern Quebec convention.

Madam Speaker, we must always remember that in the vast territory of Northern Quebec, in my constituency and that of my colleague of Manicouagan, there are several cities and places that belong to, or rather should I say that are presently inhabited by white people, such as Chapais, Chibougamau, Matagami, Joutel et Lebel-sur-Quévillon. And there is also the buffer zone established by the James Bay convention which exceeds a little bit the James Bay municipality located at the 49th parallel. It represents a vast territory and that is why it is important to consult our people before introducing a bill.

Madam Speaker, before tabling a legislation to provide for an additional federal constituency in Northern Quebec, we will have to ask the Inuit, the Cree, the Naskapi and the permanent residents of the North, as well as the Cree-Naskapi Commission under the chairmanship of the hon. Réjean F. Paul, justice of the Superior Court, to present us with a draft legislation to provide for an additional federal constituency. The success of this collective effort will be a model of co-operation between our native friends and the members of the House of Commons.

This is not an easy challenge, but I am confident that our joint efforts will enable us to set up a northern federal constituency in Quebec. Norkurmik Marialuk.

[*English*]

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** Madam Speaker, I rise to support the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce on his motion. I do so, not necessarily because I spent five years or so in the constituency of my friend from Abitibi, but mainly because I have spent most of my life in northern communities and I feel that I can speak with some authority on the kind of approach that the hon. member suggests. I must congratulate the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce for his approach to this.

To a certain extent, in our democratic structure in Canada and in a large part of the world, we have been seduced by the idea that representation by population, the old "rep by pop" approach, is the proper and most fair way of representation across the country. That motto, "rep by pop", has been the motto of electoral democracy over the years. We should not really knock it because it is still the essence of what we believe in as the democratic base of the country—one vote for one member and representation in the governing body by equal numbers.

Democracy can sometimes be undermined by the majority. We face it every day in the House. The ruling party, which represents a minority of the people in Canada but has a majority of the seats, marches over the will of the people without much concern for what the people of Canada think. It is sort of jack-boot democracy, if you would call it that. But that, Madam Speaker, is another story.

Every minority, every group, has the right to have representation in the House. That often does not happen. Theoretically, I suppose, we could expect the House would be a mirror image of the representation of the various groups of people across the country, but that is not likely to happen. It has not happened in the past and it is unlikely to happen in the future.

We can do something to allow certain geographic areas to have the kind of representation which, because of our immense geography in the country, makes it possible and necessary to vary the rule of representation by population. Many live in vast areas of this land and have not been directly represented in the House at any time.

We have solved the problem, as the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce has pointed out, in many places. We solved it in the Northwest Territories. We solved it in the Yukon. We established representation in those areas, regardless of how many people happen to live in those particular areas. We have also made some room for a specific kind of regional representation by varying the numbers of electors that are needed to elect a member in the provinces. For instance, a considerably fewer number of electors are required to elect a member in Prince Edward Island and in Saskatchewan, than are required to elect a member in Ontario or in Quebec. Consequently, to some extent, we have moved away from the idea of representation by population and the number of people required to elect a member to represent them in the House being the same across the country.

But there are large groups and regions that fall through the cracks of our representation. The hon. member has pointed out one or two of these groups by looking at the situation in northern Quebec. I am supporting this particular resolution because the same kind of situation exists in the northern parts of almost every one of our provinces that reaches up to the 54th parallel, or at least to the 60th parallel and above. Quite often, there are very few people in a large area, but those people have a particular point of view.

As I indicated before, I spent a considerable part of my career in those northern areas and have a feeling for the lack of representation they have sometimes felt. A large portion of my time was spent in the Yukon and Northwest Territories where representation is recognized on a regional basis. I have also had some responsibility in

northern Saskatchewan where at one time I was the director of education for the northern half of the province.

I suppose it is a good indication of the kind of lack of representation there, in that in the southern half of the province there are something like 85 superintendents of schools. In the northern half, there is only one, but we expect the representation of the large group in the south to be effective in the north.

Northern Saskatchewan, like northern Quebec, has large rural areas, but very little in common with their urban neighbours to the south, or even with their rural neighbours to the south, because a large part of rural Saskatchewan is our farming communities. Consequently, they are being represented by people who do not necessarily feel the same kind of empathy for that group as they would for their more numerous neighbours of the south. I gather that this is the reason for this particular motion and that is to try to give representation to the people who now feel they are not represented as they might be.

• (1440)

The area that we consider to be northern Saskatchewan starts approximately halfway between the U.S. border and the border of the Northwest Territories, just 100 miles or so north of the city of Prince Albert. Therefore, it is approximately half of the territory of the province of Saskatchewan. That territory is presently represented by the hon. member for Prince Albert—Churchill River, who has a great deal of empathy for the people in the north, but recognizes, as he works in that area, that he is not considered by the people to be a northerner.

During the last readjustment of boundaries in northern Saskatchewan, the people of northern Saskatchewan placed before the commission, whose responsibility it was to draw the borders of the constituencies, a number of very broad and responsible briefs which indicated that they felt they would like and needed representation for their particular area separate from that of the more southern areas of the province. The Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act allows a 25 per cent deviation between constituencies within a province. In Saskatchewan the average is about 70,000. The northern part of the province would probably be composed of 35,000 or 40,000, so the deviation would be more than 25 per cent. That is the reason the commission said it would not continue with the idea of establishing one northern constituency.

I support this particular motion because, if we look at it thoroughly, we will recognize that the idea is proper and that it can be adapted, not only for northern Quebec, but for many other parts of the country where representation is needed and not available at the moment.

[*Translation*]

**M. Charles A. Langlois (Manicouagan):** *Narkurmik, Marialuk*, Madam Speaker. It is with great interest that I am participating today in the debate on motion M–415, tabled by the hon. member for Notre–Dame–de–Grâce. The motion, tabled on April 11, 1989 by my hon. colleague, deals with a situation about which I have been concerned since November of 1988, that is since I was elected as the hon. member for the riding of Manicouagan.

In the next few minutes, I will use both official languages, in order to respect the linguistic duality of the country. I would have liked to be able to address the House in Innutituk, the language of our fellow Inuit who live in the communities of northern Quebec. Unfortunately, I cannot do it. Therefore, I will use the English language, since the Inuit are more familiar with it than with the French.

As you know, Madam Speaker, the riding of Manicouagan, that I have been representing in this house since November of 1988, is one of the largest in the country. It covers an area of over 465,680 square kilometers. It stretches along the north coast of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, from the community of Franquelin to Blanc Sablon, in the eastern reaches of the province of Quebec.

[*English*]

It also stretches from the north coast of the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the northern reaches of both coasts of Ungava Bay. It is a vast and diversified land. The riding territory includes industrialized sections where the major centres of Port–Cartier, Sept–Îles, and Havre–St–Pierre are located. It covers vast areas where logging operations are taking place. It also covers vast areas where there are tourist attractions. The eastern part of the riding, called the Lower North Shore, is made up of 15 fishing villages, most of them linked by sea and air.

It also covers vast lands rich in natural resources where the towns of Fermont and Schefferville have been built. Moving further north, the riding of Manicouagan reaches the southern part of the Bay of Ungava where we find the community of Kuujjuak. The communities on both coasts of the Ungava Bay are also located in the riding of Manicouagan. When we get there, we have an Inuit land.

[*Translation*]

I recognized from the start of my mandate that it would be difficult for me to give good and frequent services to Inuit communities of Ungava Bay. I planned several times to go and stay there for a while but unfortunately, it was impossible to carry out my wishes.

[*English*]

One must understand that Manicouagan is a large riding with different needs and problems.

Since the fall of 1988, I have tried to be as useful as possible to the people of the northern communities. I have worked actively with my colleague from Abitibi to implement economic programs. I have followed very closely the project of installing an FOL base in Kuujjuak by the Department of National Defence. I felt from the beginning that this project will bring economic activities and employment in Kuujjuak.

While supporting the project, I share the concerns of the community of Kuujjuak and its leaders about the impact that the project could have on the way of life of its people. The Minister of National Defence would be well advised to take the necessary steps to clean up the garbage, debris and drums accumulated in Kuujjuak by the U.S. Air Force during the Second World War and left there. The shore of the Koksoak River and its beaches are littered with drums full of tar. Clean-up procedures satisfactory to the community should be undertaken right away.

After the Royal Commission on Electoral Reform and Party Financing was established, I had several meetings and discussions with its chairman, Mr. Pierre Lortie, on the problems of representations for the northern communities. These discussions led to the visit to Kuujjuak by the royal commission. It gave the Inuit leaders the opportunity to express their view on northern representation and participation in the Canadian democratic process and in the Canadian government.

In a letter sent to the commission chairman and to Mr. Jimmy Johannes, Chairman of the Kativik Regional government, I strongly supported the position of the Inuit leaders. In my letter I stated: "I fully support the position of the Inuit people as outlined in your brief." I also said: "The time is long overdue for a better and more active representation of the native people in the House of Commons."

In my letter to Mr. Pierre Lortie, chairman of the royal commission, I wrote: "I would like to take this opportunity to express the view that all efforts should be made to allow the native communities of the northern part of Quebec to be part of a northern federal riding." I further stated: "The creation of a federal riding that would include all communities located on both shores of the Ungava Bay would allow more normal representation in the House of Commons. The process of self-government for the Inuit and other native populations should include representation by a native person in the House of Commons."

Madam Speaker, you will agree that my position is very clear on this matter and I will keep on working to assure better representation for the people living in the north.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, it is now time to ask the following question: Does the motion introduced by the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce give a good answer to the expectations of northern populations? I don't think so.

The motion specifies that a new federal constituency should match exactly with the territories covered by the James Bay and northern Quebec agreement signed in 1975.

In this geographical context, what will happen to the native population living in the villages located outside the territory covered by the agreement?

Since the terms of the motion refer to the Naskapi people, I think we must evaluate its impacts on the Naskapi and Montagnais groups living in seperate reserves in Schefferville.

[*English*]

The motion implies two main points: First, that the people of northern Quebec, especially the Inuit, Cree and Naskapi citizens of this region are in need of additional representation in this House, and I agree.

Second, that the Government of Canada may not be exercising its responsibilities to safeguard the economic, social, cultural and environmental rights of all peoples living in this important region of our country.

• (1450 )

I would like for a moment to focus on the second point since I have covered the first aspect quite extensively.

The hon. member calls for additional representation, presumably to address a deterioration in conditions faced by native people in northern Quebec. The facts suggest otherwise.

The James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement was signed in November of 1975. This was followed by the signing of the Northeastern Quebec Agreement in 1978. Since the conclusion of these two landmark agreements, 18,000 Cree, Inuit and Naskapi living in these regions have received cash and services totalling more than $1 billion from the Government of Canada and the Government of Quebec.

The James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement involved an initial compensation of $225 million. The Northeastern Quebec Agreement provides $9 million in compensation and a subsequent agreement involved various types of compensation, relocation and related funding totalling more than $250 million. These figures are significant in their own way.

By themselves, they do not provide the true appreciation of the profound improvement in the quality of life and health standards which the Cree, Naskapi and Inuit have experienced over the past 12 years.

Each village now has its own dispensaries providing first aid care, home visits and community health services. Communities have been divided into independent municipalities. The Cree school board and the Kativik school board are run entirely by elected representatives of the communities.

The James Bay development has actually resulted in considerably reducing the cost of supplies to northern Quebec communities. The existing highway system has made transportation more accessible. Moreover, Cree-owned Air Creebec and Inuit-owned Air Inuit now supply coastal villages from Val d'Or to the Bay of Ungava.

Housing is yet another area where substantial improvements have been achieved. Cree, Naskapi and Inuit families now live in modern homes. Community construction projects are carried out by the Cree, Naskapi and Inuit themselves.

These are impressive accomplishments by any standard of measurement. They offer solid evidence that the aboriginal peoples of northern Quebec have been able to reap significant and lasting benefits from the James Bay development.

Never before have the Cree, Inuit and Naskapi citizens of this region had more control over their own lives, or enjoyed a higher quality of life and health standards, as demonstrated by the considerable population growth in this region in recent years.

The Cree, Naskapi and Inuit citizens of northern Quebec have made some very significant advances over the past decade, both from an economic perspective and in terms of their over-all quality of life.

The Government of Canada is committed to seeing that this progress is not only sustained, but advanced. We will honour our agreements with the aboriginal peoples of this region, as with aboriginal peoples in all regions of Canada.

I would like to suggest in response to the motion by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce that Parliament wait for the report of the Lortie royal commission that is taking place at the present time to see its recommendation on this important aspect.

I would also suggest that members' budgets representing those areas, are funded in such a way that will make it possible for us to open up riding offices in those areas, hiring aboriginal peoples so we can provide a daily and a more appropriate service for the people of these communities.

I will conclude by saying that in my capacity as member of Parliament for the riding of Manicouagan, I will continue to represent the Inuit people to the best of my capacity.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Marc Ferland (Portneuf):** Madam Speaker, I would like to rise today on motion M-415, brought forward by my honourable colleague from Notre-Dame-de-Grâce. He referred to the James Bay agreement, signed in 1975, which sought to provide better representation for the people of that region. According to this

agreement and the northeastern Quebec one, which was signed in 1978, these agreements have allowed native people of that region to improve their standard of living and to better control their own development.

Moreover, with the Cree-Naskapi of Quebec Act, the Cree and Naskapi have been the first native people in Canada to achieve some kind of self-government. Bands administer their lands and the natural resources they are controlling. They maintain the native culture, values and traditions and look after community development.

So, the question is this: Why should the federal government create a new electoral district to better represent the native people of that region when there are systems in place that work properly?

Madam Speaker, I admire the interest the member from Notre-Dame-de-Grâce shows in the aboriginal people. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to create an additional constituency in Quebec.

Much still remains to be done and many of their grievances are legitimate. That is why the prime minister made public, on September 25, an action plan in order to settle some of the issues concerning aboriginal people of Canada.

That action plan is not made up of vain promises. It is a realistic and concrete plan made which has four objectives: to settle territorial claims; to improve economic and social conditions in reserves; to enhance relations between aboriginal people and governments; to bring the concerns of aboriginal people into contemporary Canadian society.

During the last two months, you noticed for sure that this government takes land claims very seriously. We said that nothing was more important than that and we kept our word.

As early as the beginning of October, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and his Minister of State sought the co-operation of a number of native leaders having experience with the process of specific claims.

That group asked for our support in the setting up of a task force to have discussions with aboriginal communities throughout the country. We agreed, and the task force was struck and is chaired by Manny Jules of British Columbia. It should submit a report at the beginning of December stating its position on a great many subjects concerning specific claims.

We also made progress in other areas. Policy changes were made to allow the negotiation of land claims in British Columbia. We took the necessary steps to ensure that legal obligations contracted over a century ago concerning the transfer of land entitlements to Treaty Indians are respected.

As a matter of fact, the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs announced a few weeks ago that the government was willing to negotiate Treaty land entitlement claims in Saskatchewan. Negotiations will be based on the Treaty Commissioner's report. We have already announced similar measures in Alberta and Manitoba.

The second objective of the government's action plan is to improve living conditions on Indian reserves. As we all know, while major progress was made in recent years, living conditions on native reserves are in many cases still lower than those of the majority of Canadians.

We are ready to co-operate with Indian leaders and provincial governments in order to introduce a number of improvements to basic community programs and services, like running water, sewers, sanitary facilities and so on. The government will soon announce concrete plans designed to make life easier in all native communities.

The third objective is to improve the relations between native people and governments, that is to make it possible for our native fellow citizens to have the same opportunities as other Canadians to contribute to the growth and prosperity of our country. This, Madam Speaker, is definitely not an easy task.

I am convinced that real progress in that field can only flow from redefining the legal relation between government and native people.

The Indian Act, very seldom amended since it was enacted in 1876, maintains native people in a situation of dependence on the state. It belittles both natives and non-natives.

Native leaders on the task force to which I referred a moment ago are expected to make their recommendations on that issue in the near future, so we are looking forward to unveiling the first of a series of amendments to the Indian Act early next year.

The ultimate objective is to prepare native people to assume their autonomy within the Canadian Constitution. Native people would thus be able to take control over the development of their communities, upgrade their social and educational systems, and acquire the economic infrastructures they need to live the kind of life which reflects their own culture.

Finally, when the Prime Minister announced the creation of the Citizens' Forum on Canada's future on the first of this month, he set in motion an in-depth review of the fundamental place and the role of native people in Canadian society, which happens to be the fourth phase of the federal government's plan of action.

This initiative gives native people an unprecedented opportunity to share their concerns and their hopes with the Canadian public and to insure that their ideas will be considered when we redefine the constitutional status of our country.

Much has passed since our honourable colleague, the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, introduced his motion. The government of Canada has clearly demonstrated, over the last few months, its will to find a resolution to the problems affecting the aboriginal people.

I am convinced, Madam Speaker, that the policy plan implemented by the federal government to deal with the problems of the aboriginal communities will be successful. My colleagues in the House will no doubt agree that a comprehensive program like the one proposed by the government is more appropriate than any initiative pertaining only to a single region or a single part of the country, as regards its representation in this humble assembly.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** 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.

It being three o'clock p.m., this House stands adjourned until Monday next at one o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 3 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Monday, November 26, 1990**

The House met at 1 p.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** 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—BILLS

[*English*]

### BANKRUPTCY ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

**Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt)** moved that Bill C–217, an act to amend the Bankruptcy Act (priority of claims) be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my bill is being debated at a most propitious time, a time when this country finds itself in recession, when it finds that bankruptcies are soaring beyond belief. Personal and business bankruptcies are up 60 per cent. Bill C–217 addresses particularly the whole question of business bankruptcies and their effect on employees.

My bill which cries out for some attention by this government attempts to correct an injustice to employees who, when the company goes bankrupt, end up going to the back of the bus to get any kind of compensation for lost wages and benefits, and in some cases even pensions and vacation pay.

The Bankruptcy Act came into effect in 1949. It divides creditors into secured creditors and preferred creditors. Secured creditors are banks and any other individual or group who has lent money to the company and their loans are secured against the equipment and assets of the company.

The employees are preferred creditors and the preferred creditors are limited in the 1949 act, which is still in effect, to a maximum limit of $500. This may have been quite generous in 1949 but since it has not been adjusted since then is really an insult in 1990.

In 1966 amendments were passed which provided some administrative tinkering with the act with respect to filing a bankruptcy for individuals. In fact it never dealt with the very important question of securing for the employees of a bankrupt company their past wages and benefits. It did nothing at all about placing them in a spectrum or in a line so they would take some priority with respect to getting any money when the company goes bankrupt.

We had an example here in Ottawa. Leigh Instruments in Ottawa went bankrupt in about April of this year. Seven hundred and fifty employees lost their jobs. These employees go to the back of the bus when it comes to collecting their lost wages and benefits, and then they could only collect to a limit of $500.

• (1310)

What happens is that the bank gets its cut and any other secured creditor gets their cuts. If there is any money left in the pot, then come the employees. They can get a limit of $500. If the amount that they are filing for exceeds $500, they then have to make a separate claim which has to go to the end of the list.

After the secured creditors get their take from the pot, there is nothing left for the preferred creditors. The employees, in many cases, get nothing. We do not even have to talk about the red tape of the bureaucracy and the administrative detail of filing with the bankruptcy trustee, and the time it takes to even collect the crumbs to which they might be entitled.

This matter just did not start in 1990. There have been all kinds of studies done by successive Liberal and Tory governments since 1970. They have studied this question to death. They promised that they would amend the

Bankruptcy Act. In the early 1980s, the then consumer and corporate affairs minister tabled a bill. It died on the order paper.

In 1986, the previous consumer and corporate affairs minister of this government, the man who is now the House leader for the government—

**An hon. member:** Is that Harvie?

**Mr. Rodriguez:** That is Harvie Andre. —said that amending the Bankruptcy Act to give more protection to employees was one of his priorities. Two ministers and four years later, this priority has not been achieved yet.

**An hon. member:** The banks got to him.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** The banks got to him. It shows that there are other priorities that have more priority.

Now we come to the present consumer and corporate affairs minister. What is he saying? He said in the House the other day, "I am going to look at the NDP proposal in Ontario where some kind of fund will be set up". Where have these people been? Where are they?

First of all, I want to say in making my argument that there are two things that have to be considered. One is the limit. I have dealt with the limit in my bill. I have raised the limit to $9,000 per employee.

I do a second thing in the bill. I moved the employees to the top of the parade. They go to the head of the line.

**An hon. member:** Where they should be.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** I want to talk about the secured creditor and the preferred creditors of business. I do not understand secured and preferred. I really do not. They can secure a loan against a piece of equipment—a chair, a table, or a microphone. This is secured creditor. But what about the workers' toil, labour, commitment? Is that not a secured right? When an employee works for an employer, he puts in his commitment, labour, time, effort and loyalty to the company. That has to rate above securing a loan against equipment. The employee has given credit to the company and that credit has to be secured ahead of the security against equipment and the money that the company borrowed against equipment.

We have two problems. It is not just raising the limit to $500. It is actually saying that employees come first and the banks go to the back of the bus, or secured creditors go to the back of the bus.

My friend across the aisle is smiling because he knows that what I am saying is common sense.

I do not know what the great fuss is about. I do not know why this government and previous Liberal governments have sat on this egg for so long. I know the gestation period for an elephant is nine years. Surely, this has got to be a super elephant to try to amend the Bankruptcy Act. It cannot be that difficult.

**An hon. member:** What's the gestation period for the NDP?

**Mr. Rodriguez:** The member wants to know what the gestation period for the NDP is. Let's go to an election now and we will see where you are going to be dispatched to. You will be dispatched to the waste basket of history, brother, just like Maggie Thatcher.

There has been a suggestion from the government that it will look at a fund. Employees and employers can contribute to the fund. I have a problem with that. Why should the employees contribute to a fund? They are not responsible for the company going bankrupt. Oftentimes, it is the company's own fault that it goes bankrupt. Employees do not have any participation in the decision-making of the bankrupt company, that is, management's right to make decisions for the company. Those are protected very fiercely by management. Why should the employees put their own money into the fund so that when the bosses make the mistakes and lose their jobs, they get paid back their own money? Why should they be contributing to the fund?

If the workers go to the head of the parade, then the employees will get their share on a priority basis when the assets are sold. It seems to me that that makes a lot of common sense. Surely, if this is a priority for the government, it ought not to take four years and three ministers of consumer and corporate affairs to realize that the legislation has to be placed before the House of Commons. There have been enough studies done on this matter. There has been other legislation which has been attempted. Yet, we still do not have the Bankruptcy Act updated.

Recently the Auditor General said in his report that it is a crying shame and it is a scandal that employees of bankrupt companies are left without the moneys for which they have worked for the company. This situation has been allowed to continue. Only a heartless govern-

ment—I am not talking about brainless—can turn a blind eye to the misery that the present act creates. Surely, after a person has worked so many years for a company and the company goes bankrupt, it is not good enough to say that they have to join a line and, in the meantime, go on welfare. In most cases, the company has not paid the UI premiums. That has to be sorted out because the Unemployment Insurance Commission goes to the back of the line, as well.

• (1320)

Surely, that is not the way a caring, feeling, sensitive society treats people who, through no fault of their own, end up losing not only their employment, but they lose the wages for which they have worked and contributed.

I know the Conservative government is looking for good ideas because it does not think of any good ideas. There is a magnificent government in the province of Ontario that is about two months old. In its first Throne Speech it has outlined its determination to come to grips with the whole question of employees getting a fair shake on their wages, benefits, and possible pensions lost as a result of bankruptcy. It is determined to move ahead with a fund, but this will only apply to provincially incorporated companies.

Where is the leadership from the federal government? I saw the government move with more action on the question of sending the *Nina*, the *Pinta* and the *Santa Maria* to the Gulf, without even the United Nations having approved it. It moved with the speed of light. Yet, Canadians are being treated unjustly, unfairly, and most shabbily.

All the government needs is the resolve to say, that yes, the workers of a company that goes bankrupt must go to the head of the line as secured creditors. I cannot stress that more firmly, Mr. Speaker. They are secured creditors. They gave hours of work as credit to the company, yet they are being treated as preferred creditors. In this case, preferred might sound nice. At the racetrack there is preferred parking, and it sounds like you are being treated special. But, in this context, preferred does not amount to a pinch of salt. A pinch of salt. The government does not give a pinch of salt.

**Mr. McWilliam:** It doesn't work.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** It doesn't work. I am not going to put salt in the wounds here.

Where is the federal leadership from the government? The government of the province of Ontario, in office only two months, has already indicated a desire to move in the direction of clearing up a problem in its own backyard with respect to the employees of bankrupt companies. Yet, the federal government, with all the vast array of personnel in the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the vast treasury of the federal Parliament, and the people of Canada, and all we get are pious statements that it is a priority. A minister says: "It is my priority." Before the guy could realize his priority, he has gone through the revolving door and the next cardboard figure comes up for us to take target practice at. Just when we are getting warm with him, he resigns from the cabinet.

Then we get another cardboard figure coming through on the revolving door. He has been studying this question for a year now. He is just a slow studier. He studies slowly. The minister, too, now says right here in the House of Commons: "I am going to look at this proposal." A federal minister may borrow a NDP idea on worker protection in bankruptcies. He may. He is even playing on the words now. He does not say: "I will borrow." He says: "I may borrow." Of course, if he borrows that he is a secured creditor, or is he a preferred?

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** My bill, I think, is timely. It comes at an appropriate time. It is an excellent bill, not just a good bill. It is an excellent bill. It deals with the current problem, a problem that has been festering for too long. Yet, the government, which has the responsibility to lead, has reneged on its responsibility by not acting. We cannot treat people who are unequal in an equal fashion and compound it by treating people who are unequal in an unequal fashion. The government, by closing its eyes to this blot on the escutcheon of labour and management relationships in the country, should hang its head in collective shame, that it has done nothing about this problem.

Why does the House not pass my bill and let us get on with it. If the government cannot do it, I have done it.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Dave Worthy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs) and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Nickel Belt again did himself proud. He does do a good job when speaking to bills.

I would like to emphasize that I believe, probably as strongly as the hon. member for Nickel Belt, that the current Bankruptcy Act does not provide adequate protection to Canadian workers whose employers have gone bankrupt. I would review the existing Act briefly.

The existing legislation allows workers a privileged claim for up to $500 in unpaid wages and commissions. In 1949, when this law was enacted, $500 meant three months' wages. That meant that three months' wages were protected for that worker. A lot has changed in 40 years. Five hundred dollars is now just a week's wages. This Act that we have now unfortunately protects a worker for one solitary week. Of course, not every worker is able to collect even that first $500 or the rest of his or her wage claim. There are simply not enough assets to give workers their due in most cases, not when the workers' claims are dealt with only after the banks have recovered on their securities and after the trustees have been paid.

I am told that over half of the workers who submit a claim for unpaid wages in bankruptcy recover little or nothing from their claim. First, the workers find out that the wages that they have worked hard for and for which they are due, will not be paid to them. Second, they find out that they have a waiting period, even if there was going to be some payment. Of course, if they then turn to unemployment insurance, in many cases they have to wait for it as well because technically they have money coming to them from their former employer. Eventually, if they do recover any money from the company, it is long, long, after the bankruptcy. It can be years before any amount is paid to the creditors, and this is a long time to wait. It is a long time to wait for a nearly forgotten pay cheque, especially if you are out of work.

• (1330)

Canadian workers certainly deserve to have those wages paid. But, the changes we are talking about today, I am sorry to say, do not correct that situation. This legislation, although it is based on a good intention and a good idea, offers workers a super priority. It is a super priority claim for their wages, commissions and pension contributions, going back six months, to a maximum of $9,000.

Super priority means that the workers who have valid claims will be paid before the secured creditors receive anything. On the surface, that sounds like a good idea. These secured creditors are often banks, but they might also be businesses or other individuals. Secured creditors hold securities or mortgages as collateral against the money they have loaned the company that is now bankrupt. These securities must have been properly registered so that subsequent creditors could be aware of liens on a company's assets. It is important to see that a security is a precise thing.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** The workers are precise.

**Mr. Worthy:** The workers are of ultimate importance. but one has to understand the environment.

Let us say that creditor *a* has a mortgage on a bankrupt company's factory and creditor *b* has registered a security on an office building that the company owns. The way a bankruptcy is administered, under the law, is that the factory and office building can be sold.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Who is more important?

**Mr. Worthy:** Obviously, the people are more important. The money received from the factory goes, first, toward paying creditor *a* what is still owed on the mortgage. The purchase price of the office building goes to pay creditor *b*. It is only then that the value of the remaining assets are distributed to other creditors including workers. In this case, they may or may not receive their money.

The hon. member in his bill has not explained how workers will be paid, before the creditors *a* and *b*. Will the unpaid wages be paid out from the proceeds from selling the factory or will they be paid from the proceeds of the sale of the building or will they combine the proceeds from the building and the factory or will some employees only get paid if there is a surplus from the factory?

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Sell it all and you will make the workers worse off.

**An hon. member:** Are you addressing the right bill?

**Mr. Worthy:** I have to apologize, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, I have confused some of the people. The question has to be looked at. Someone has to consider the issues when legislation is put down. One has to have answers which satisfy all conditions. The hon. member, in spite of his good intentions, has not considered all those alternatives.

Over the last 15 years there have been six bankruptcy reform bills which have been put forward in this House. The first and the last proposed super priority for wage earners. In the case of the last bill, the system devised to administer super priority for wage claims was so complex that it took 31 subsections to explain it. Both times that super priority was considered by this House or the other, the conclusion was that it did not answer all of the problems for providing promptness and certainty of payment to those workers. It was considered by many to be impossible to administer. If it cannot be administered and does not solve the problems, it really does not provide protection to the workers.

In case my colleague has not been convinced of these arguments, I would like to discuss the impact that the implementation of super priority could have on the lending industry.

Increasing the priority of paying wage claims in bankruptcy, as I have already shown, will have a direct impact on secured creditors.

Most of these, as the hon. member knows, are banks. As a result, they will be facing a higher risk with the money that they are lending to these companies. To compensate for this higher risk, and the hon. member knows better than most in this House, the banks will find it necessary to increase their rates.

Increasing the interest rates on the business loan is not exactly what we are trying to achieve in today's economy. In fact, it is exactly the opposite of what the businesses nowadays need.

Super priority leads to distortion in lending practices. We have already mentioned it can lead to higher interest rates. In many cases, that higher interest rate based on the argument I have put forward could in fact break the camel's back. It could be the straw.

Similarly, recognizing the super priority would risk their investments. Banks might begin, in fact, to move more quickly to foreclose to ensure that they do get their assets returned. This could trigger action by banks that would create more foreclosures than we have now. This also is opposite to what we want to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I see you signalling that I only have a minute. I have so many arguments to face here, I will have to try to summarize them.

I think if I am going to summarize many pages into the key points, we have to recognize that the worker who the hon. member has gone out to protect is the one who does need to be protected. His best protection is, in fact, the job, and wherever possible, a continuing job. I think the hon. member would agree with that.

A bill that tries to address not only the employee and his or her protection, but tries to ensure that those companies that are approaching bankruptcy get all of the assistance they need, in fact trying to prevent the bankruptcy from occurring, is the best protection that you can get, Mr. Speaker, for those same employees.

The member's intentions are good. He has argued well, but in fact this bill does not solve enough of the problems. We would be wise to wait for the government's bill that will do so.

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today and support the initiative of my friend from Nickel Belt.

It is something that this government obviously lacks either the intellect or the courage to do, that is to take the bull by the horns, particularly in these very trying times, and to try to initiate some change in the outdated Bankruptcy Act, and to protect the interest of workers in bankrupt firms.

It is very easy to stand here and to criticize a member because his or her particular piece of legislation does not go far enough. The parliamentary secretary just said: "It is a good proposal, but it will not work because it is very complex." It is a big world out there, and since 1947 or 1949 nobody has been able to figure out how to make this piece of legislation better.

If anything, the parliamentary secretary should have first of all admitted the impotence and incompetence of this government in coming to terms with a very real problem. He could have said: "The legislation no longer has any relevance in a modern economic world, and we cannot do anything about it. We do not have the

wherewithal to come in with a comprehensive set of changes to the Bankruptcy Act." He could have asked some of the members on this side of the House and on the New Democratic Party side of the House for some assistance.

What we are seeing is a made in Canada recession. I know the government does not like to hear that, but when we talk about recession of business downturn, it means the companies go out of business.

Companies are going out of business at an unprecedented rate now because of the government's reckless economic policies. The government could not control growth in southern Ontario.

• (1340 )

What did they do? The only weapon that they could find to use to try to cool down that engine was high interest rates. So they jacked up the interest rates to an unconscionable level and caused the level of bankruptcies, usually in the peripheral economies in the Atlantic, in the north, and in the west, to go through the roof.

In the *Financial Post* of November 22, just last week, we read: "Bankruptcies Leap". My goodness, the headline must be three inches high. "Cases rise 61 per cent as recession takes financial toll". There has been a 61 per cent rise in bankruptcies. At a time when this government has caused a recession that is pushing bankruptcies to an unconscionable level, it absolutely, positively, fundamentally refuses to sit down and look at the changes that are necessary to the act to protect the interests of workers.

The way the act is currently, it gives you 500 bucks. Big deal. My friend opposite, the parliamentary secretary, admitted that maybe $500 in 1949 was three months wages, but $500 today, if that is what you are making a week and you have a family of two, probably would put you below the poverty line. With $500 a week, you are still going to a food bank, for goodness sake, in order to feed your kids, if you live in any major city in this country.

He admits that the $500 limit is unconscionable. It does not address the real needs, but at the same time, he tells us to wait until the government comes in with more comprehensive changes. I am not going to pretend that changes to the Bankruptcy Act are going to be easy. They are going to be very complex.

If Bill C-217 goes through, what is it going to do to the banking institutions? Are they going to still want to lend money to some of the small businesses that are very labour intensive, like a trucking firm? They probably do not get paid for 45 or 60 days. What are they going to do? Are they going to be able to get financing? There are the real considerations.

I have always attacked a problem by looking at what was the most grievous error in the system before deciding what was the best solution, and then effect all of the other necessary changes as a result of that solution. That is what my hon. friend's motion does. It states a desired outcome.

A worker's wage interest in a company that is going bankrupt today because of this government's fiscal policy is protected. That interest is not protected for a measly $500, but it is protected much deeper. Again, he says that we cannot support this because we do not know how to solve all of the rest of the problems.

The government does not know how to solve the rest of the problems with the Bankrupt Act or with the economy. It does not know how to solve the rest of the problems with national unity. Perhaps this government should just throw in the towel, go to the Canadian public and let them elect a new government. You will see some action on these problems that have been going for much too long. They have been aggravated by this government's policies.

When you talk about the flaws in the Bankruptcy Act, this government will tell you that it has a study group to come in with some comprehensive changes to the Bankruptcy Act. Well, we are waiting. We wait, and wait, and wait.

There have been a number of proposals that have been put forward, but they have all died on the Order Paper. There is only a report recommending that legislation like this be put into place at some future point in time. I am not going to question the sincerity of the hon. parliamentary secretary when he says that we should wait and see with regard to these problems.

I am sure that he would like to see those problems addressed in a new comprehensive reform of the bankruptcy bill. One has to wonder about the government's sincerity. After all, one of the most spectacular bankruptcies that we have seen in recent years is a bankruptcy by Route Canada. Do not forget that it was this government which, in its frenzy toward privatization, sold off Route Canada. It sold it to an individual who could not

even get a credit card, for God's sake. They gave it away for about a quarter of what it was worth.

All of a sudden, after the new owner had split the real estate assets off, he declared bankruptcy and threw nearly 2,000 employees out of work. Those employers have been trying to get this government to do the right thing and have a parliamentary investigation through the transport committee. They have not received their moneys yet.

There was a deal that this government had put together with the new owners that offered protection, job security, wage protection to those employees after the sale for, I think, a period of 24 months.

As soon as that agreement expired, this government did not have the good faith to step in, admit that it had sold it to the wrong company, admit that it had made a mistake, and make sure that those workers had the wage and pension protection that they should have.

When the hon. parliamentary secretary gets up and says "trust us", how can we when we have already seen what the government has done to the lives of Route Canada employees. Their lives have been thrown into disarray, some after working for that company for 18 years and 20 years. Perhaps the government opposite is saying: "Wait until we come in, because we are going to come in with a wholesale package that is going to protect workers". It has had an opportunity with Route Canada employees to protect their jobs, to protect the interest of those employees in a company that this government and the people of Canada had owned. It was remiss, and it reneged on that responsibility.

I also have to take a crack at my friends opposite. The member for Nickel Belt is a gentleman who participates greatly in debate in this Chamber. I have no question about where his loyalties lie with the workers of Canada. It is also ironic—and I should put it on the record—that, in dealing with the Route Canada employees, just recently the House committee that may look at it made a decision to defer it. There was a motion put forward by the Liberals, and they made that decision.

It is interesting that the New Democratic member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan who was on that committee voted with the government to defer a full investigation as to how Route Canada was sold in the first place and why the interests of the workers were not paramount and looked after by this government. I would only hope that the next time that committee meets an individual such as my friend from Nickel Belt, who does have the interest of the workers at heart, perhaps will represent his party at that table. Then maybe we can see some real progress toward a full investigation of that fiasco.

Reform of the Bankruptcy Act is absolutely essential. Do I have faith that this government is serious about reforming it? No. Do I think that Bill C-217 goes far enough? No, I do not think it does, but it is a start in the right direction because it takes the workers and it puts them in priority so that their sweat and labour get recognized when a company goes bankrupt. That is something that everyone in this House should recognize and should affirm, and the rest of it could come later.

In conclusion, I wish to offer my support of these humble beginnings so that the interest of workers and the equity that they put into a company get recognized when the company unfortunately, like happens many times these days, gets forced into bankruptcy for whatever reason.

**Mr. Thompson:** Wind it up. We want to speak on this matter.

**Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth):** My hon. friend over there has asked me to wind it up. I did not know that he had been made Speaker.

I am very pleased to support this initiative. I would hope that hon. member's opposite will see their way clear to do the same thing.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey (Chicoutimi):** Mr. Speaker, it is not very encouraging to hear a member of the Liberal Party, which was instrumental in bringing our country to the brink of bankruptcy over a period of 12 years—

**Mrs. Maheu:** That's not nice!

**Mr. Harvey (Chicoutimi):** —and increasing the debt to $200 billion in just a few years, and which allowed inflation to rise to 13 or 14 per cent and interest rates to 22 per cent, I repeat, it is not very encouraging to hear him criticize the government for its consistent economic policy.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the bill before the House today, again sponsored by the hon. member for Nickel Belt, the goverment cannot support a bill that concentrates solely on protecting employees, at a time when it is about to table in the House a bill to amend the entire Bankruptcy Act.

Improving the protection of employees in the case of bankruptcy or insolvency of their employers is a question that our government is looking at very closely, and it is part of a series of measures that it intends to introduce. In fact, the government is finalizing a bill designed to revamp the 1949 Act. The government can hardly be accused of acting hastily, forty-one years later, to bring about substancial reforms.

Granted, employees are often the first to suffer when an employer is in financial difficulty, and the present Bankruptcy Act offers inadequate protection. The inadequacy of the provisions of the present act is readily acknowledged but all parties. Unfortunately, nothing has been done yet to correct this problem.

On May 5, 1975, Bill C-60 was tabled in the House of Commons. It proposed to pay employees in priority to any other creditors, secured or unsecured, up to a limit of $2,000 per employee.

• (1350)

This type of preferential treatment, known as "super priority", would have granted absolute priority of wage claims over any other secured debts.

In its report on Bill C-60, the Standing Committee of the Senate responsible for bankruptcies indicated, however, that granting "super priority" to wages would lead to a serious disruption of the commercial lending system. There are a number of reasons why the super priority clause is not the best way to protect the rights of employees.

First of all, the clause would provide no absolute guarantee of payment of unpaid wages after a company goes bankrupt. In fact, the remaining assets of a company might not be sufficient to cover the amount of wages claimed. Second, this priority would offer no guarantee of speedy payment. In fact, it might take sometime before wage claims could be paid, since the sale and disposition of the assets of a bankrupt company might turn out to be a lengthy operation. Furthermore, the courts would have to settle disputes or clear up certain problems, which might further delay the process. A super priority clause would not guarantee that employees would immediately get the necessary funds to live on until they find work.

The super priority clause also has a number of serious drawbacks from the administrative point of view, Mr. Speaker. All amounts paid to employees would have to be taken from money owed to secured creditors. The latter, however, also have certain payments that must be met, and they want to be paid. Determining how wage claims would be paid would involve some very complicated arithmetic.

For these and many other reasons, the super priority clause, attractive though it may seem at first glance, is not the best way to protect employees whose employer goes bankrupt. This was acknowledged by the Senate Committee, which, as an alternative, recommended creating, under the provisions of the Bankruptcy Act, a government administered fund that would guarantee payment of unpaid wages as soon as the employer declared bankruptcy.

This formula—an administered fund—seems to have been supported by the government at the time. The then Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the Hon. Warren Allmand, said: "If it can be justified, after careful analysis, a funded insurance scheme would clearly be the most desirable solution to the problem of indemnifying employees who suffer losses of wages as a result of their employer's bankruptcy"(13). However, no measures were taken at the time. Bill C-12, tabled in 1980, was another attempt to reform the Bankruptcy Act.

In 1981, a committee chaired by Mr. Raymond Landry, the present Dean of the Department of Civil Law of the University of Ottawa and former Superintendant of Bankruptcy, was appointed to find ways to protect employees. In its report submitted in 1981, the Landry Committee recommended setting up a wage protection fund. Despite the recommendations of the committee, Bill C-17, tabled in 1984, basically contained the same provisions with respect to wage earners as did Bill C-12. However, it was subsequently amended to grant priority to wage claims.

Since Bill C-17 died on the Order Paper, we still have the 1949 legislation which, as I said before, badly needs improving if we are to provide adequate protection for employees.

The bill before the House today, like the other bills sponsored by the same member, including C–249, tabled in February 1987, would extend the protection granted to unpaid wages to contributions paid or deemed to have been paid into a pension fund. Although the concept as such is indeed praiseworthy, the financial impact of such a provision might well prove to be extremely severe, and would probably lead to even greater credit restrictions, especially in economic sectors that are highly labour intensive.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the mechanisms we choose to protect employees in case of employer bankruptcy must not affect the ability of Canadian businesses to compete on international markets. In fact, with the present globalization of markets, it is imperative that protection mechanisms do not, as might well happen with the super priority which is the focus of Bill C–217, impede business financing and as a result impair the efficiency and competitive potential of our businesses. If businesses cannot develop as they should—and they are the motor of our economy—the result is fewer jobs, which means that in the end employees are the ones who suffer.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, these were the reasons why Bill C–217 cannot be supported by this government as well as the main points of the bill the government intends to table early next year.

[*English*]

**Mr. Greg Thompson (Carleton—Charlotte):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak on Private Member's C–217.

Going back and looking at from where the bill comes, the member proposing it and the party he represents, I think we have an understanding of what he is attempting to do. We do not disagree with that. The difficulty obviously is that they do not understand the complexity of legislation and the net effect it will have on our business community.

None of us will disagree with what he is telling us and what he is proposing should be done, but it is much more complex than that. The member for Nickel Belt mentioned in his speech an elephant gestation period of nine years. In response to that, they have been around here for about 40 years and have yet to conceive. If they hang around long enough possibly they will deliver, but at this point I do not think we are going to have to worry about it. There is no question they have not taken the time to read thoroughly what they are suggesting. If they did so, they would change some of what they are saying.

One of the problems obviously when a firm goes bankrupt is the little people, the people who carry lunch boxes, the ordinary worker. All of us want to see those people protected. However, in a much broader and much bigger picture, obviously we need factories and places of business for those people to enter to work. We all want them to get paid, but what they are proposing goes beyond that. They are taking a look at super priority for workers; in other words, being at the head of the bus, as the member for Nickel Belt pointed out, in terms of getting their wages.

We do not disagree with that. However, what that is going to do is throw a few other elements into the equation which they have not considered, one of them being the fact that trustees have to be appointed. At some point trustees have to receive payment for their services to ensure that the business is liquidated and that other creditors are paid, including the workers. If there is no trustee there to do the job, no one gets paid. Members of the NDP have not considered that.

The other thing they have thrown at us is the fact that there should be an onus, a responsibility on the backs of the banks to make sure that employees are paid. I guess none of us would disagree with that either, but the difficulty obviously is if that is the way it is done in every business that goes bankrupt, investment in that business will be stifled from day one. Obviously banking institutions and others will take a hard look at where they want to put their dollars if they believe that they are going to be the last to be paid.

The secret to the whole thing is a healthy economy, and that is what we have had for the last six years. We have been number one or number two in the world for the last six years.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please. It being two o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to Statements by Members, pursuant to Standing Order 31.

*S. O. 31*

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*Translation*]

### TRIBUTE TO PASCALE LEFRANÇOIS

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to Quebec's new junior spelling champion Pascale Lefrançois. At age 16, her message to other youths her age was simple: «Love your language, learn to speak and write it well, for it is a beautiful language. The more you get to know it, the more you will like it. To me French has always been very important. I talk a lot but I like to use the right words to express all my feelings.»

Mr. Speaker, Pascale modestly says that part of the credit for her victory goes to her family. I for one want to assure her that we are very proud of her accomplishment. Thanks to her all Quebec youths have made a name for themselves on the international francophone scene.

* * *

[*English*]

### SPORTS

**Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas):** Mr. Speaker, the efforts being made to obtain National Hockey League franchises for the cities of Ottawa and Hamilton deserve the support of all members of this House.

I would like to commend my colleague from London—Middlesex for forming the national hockey caucus of parliamentarians who support the application for NHL franchises in these two cities.

Hockey is an integral part of Canada's cultural and sport heritage and is a unifying factor in our country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I have close contacts with the world of hockey. Throughout my ten years as a National Hockey League official, a time during which Quebec city, Winnipeg, Edmonton and Vancouver joined the NHL, I was able to see personally to what extent a new franchise contributes to a municipality, its residents and their economy.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my wholehearted support to those involved in bringing the National Hockey League to both Hamilton and Ottawa.

* * *

### GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, at a time when Canadians want peace rather than war, want social and environmental security, not arms, this government instead, with the excuse of the gulf crisis, cuts spending allegedly to finance a war effort, but in reality to finance the implementation of the general sales tax. As a result, the government cut $14 million from the budget of Environment Canada and $24 million in environmental grants and contributions.

Canadians, who are on the side of peace, are asking why the environment and other important measures are being sacrificed to protect American dependency on foreign oil and implement the hated general sales tax. What à disgrace, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

### CONFLICT OF INTEREST

**Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, recent events in Alberta, where the premier was caught in a clear conflict of interest, shows the need for effective conflict of interest rules for members of Parliament and senators.

At this point in time, we have senators who are tied very closely to the financial institutions of the country. It seems to me these same senators are participating in passing legislation such as the deregulation of financial institutions, selling shares in Petro-Canada, Hibernia handouts, not to mention the hundreds of private contracts that go out in the name of government every day.

The temptation is there for these foxes to get in because there is no fence around the chicken pen. The Prime Minister still has not learned his lesson. When it comes to guarding the chicken coop this government has once again left it in the hands of the foxes.

This government made a commitment not once, but twice, to bring in new legislation to keep conflict of interest out of government. We still do not have any effective rules safeguarding against conflict of interest by

members of Parliament and senators. This is not right. We must have conflict of interest regulations now.

The Prime Minister need only take a look at the example set by his friend, the premier of Gettysburg, to know that this problem needs to be addressed—

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member's time has expired.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## EPILEPSY AWARENESS MONTH

**Mr. Charles-Eugène Marin (Gaspé):** This year, Mr. Speaker, November has been chosen as the month to make people more conscious of epilepsy. Epilepsy Canada and the various associations included in this organization have made concerted efforts throughout the month to help Canadians become more familiar with this neurological illness.

Current statistics put at roughly 400,000 the number of Canadians suffering from some form of epilepsy, a far higher percentage than in the case of any other neurological disorder. Today, appropriate care and treatment enable many people to lead a normal and productive life, yet about half of epileptics continue to be the victims of uncontrollable seizures.

Strange though it may seem, our so-called advanced society still nurtures myths and false conceptions with respect to epilepsy. Some people hesitate to admit they are subject to epileptic convulsions because they fear losing their job, their friends or their status. Discrimination and rejection still cause problems at school, at work and in society generally.

Mr. Speaker, let us hope these people will soon be openly accepted by their fellow citizens.

* * *

[*English*]

## NORTHERN TAX BENEFITS

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the New Democratic caucus again I would like to raise the issue of a northern tax benefit. I would like to point out that it is our caucus, the New Democratic caucus, which has raised this issue more often in the House than the other two parties and/or the independents.



I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister of Finance that the Christmas season and the new year are fast approaching. The people of thousands of northern Canadian communities are living with uncertainty because of the impending elimination of the northern tax benefit to their communities effective this January.

The Minister of Finance has had a task force report on northern and isolated areas in his hands for over one year now and has not announced what he will do with regard to this issue. The government has a responsibility to act immediately. It is a shame that some Canadians will face the new year and the holiday season with this uncertainty about their financial situation. It is a disgrace that these Canadians have had to wait as long as they have for action.

Once again, I call upon the government to reject their flawed task force report and implement a fair taxation system for Canada's northern and isolated areas.

* * *

## FISHERIES

**Mr. Peter L. McCreath (South Shore):** Mr. Speaker, this morning saw 2,000 lobster fishermen from Nova Scotia districts 33 and 34 heading out to set their traps for the first day of the lobster season. We wish them safety and a full harvest.

The lobster industry in Nova Scotia brought some $69 million this year, up $3 million from the year before. While prices were low, catches, particularly in western Nova Scotia, were high.

The recent lobster dispute with the United States has created some uncertainty with respect to prices and markets for the immediate future. In response to the express wishes of a significant majority of Nova Scotia lobster fishermen, the government rejected the recently negotiated lobster agreement with the United States. I commend the government for listening to and acting upon the wishes of the people most directly affected.

This morning a 40-knot gale greeted the lobster fishermen as they headed out with their traps. We pray they all return safely. To greater enhance the possibility of this in the future, perhaps the government should consider providing fisheries officers with some flexibility in opening dates to accommodate the exigencies of the North Atlantic's November weather.

*S. O. 31*

## GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, the lessons of Thatcherism are lost on the Prime Minister. While support for the PM and his party are at new lows the cutting, slashing and privatization continues unabashed.

The government has used the Persian Gulf crisis as a convenient excuse to slash $350 million from key federal departments. Let us be honest here, Mr. Speaker. We pay for the ships and crew whether they are in Canada or in the Persian Gulf. In fact, it may cost the government far less while the ships and crew are in the gulf.

Employment and Immigration will lose over $25 million which will not only cut language training programs for recent immigrants but will further clog the refugee backlog process.

As well, the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety will be receiving $80,000 less than expected. Although my private members' motion calling upon the government to reinstate full funding for the CCOHS was adopted last spring, the Minister of Labour has chosen to ignore Parliament and to fast-track privatization.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister says that Canadians have never looked for a free ride. I say the only free ride has been the one taken by the Prime Minister in his rule by decree. Any Heseltines over there?

* * *

## THE GREY CUP

**Mrs. Dorothy Dobbie (Winnipeg South):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday Canada watched the Winnipeg Blue Bombers march with unflagging energy to defeat the Edmonton Eskimos 50-11 for a stunning Grey Cup victory.

Today's *Ottawa Citizen* has it right with a one-word headline on its sports page "*Winner-peg*". Winner-peg is the pretty city of the prairies that knows how to do things right and next year the heat is on for the biggest, the best, the hottest Grey Cup in the history of the Canadian Football League.

Congratulations Winnipeg and congratulations Bombers. As Michael Gray says: "There is nothing like a little smoked ham at Thanksgiving".

## NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond).** Mr. Speaker, the NDP are at it again.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, no.

**Mr. Dingwall:** It was reported over the weekend that the leader of the New Democratic Party stated: "We are a federal party". Yet the NDP's only Quebec member of Parliament, the member for Chambly, tabled a brief before the Bélanger-Campeau commission that favoured a form of sovereignty association, not federalism.

• (1410)

Once again the NDP, the no direction party, has an exposed difference of opinion between its leader and its backbench.

Mr. Speaker, I sometimes like to compare the NDP to a ship, rather than an organized political organization, because we all know a ship makes the most noise when it is in the fog. Here we have the NDP, not only in the fog but drifting without a political hand at the helm. Canadians want sound, solid and sensitive answers to the country's problems and we in the Liberal Party of Canada can provide that direction.

* * *

## LILLOOET LIBRARY

**Mr. Dave Worthy (Cariboo—Chilcotin):** Mr. Speaker, my fellow members will recall that in March of this year, a fire in my constituency totally destroyed the town of Lillooet's only library.

I am pleased to report that the response to our appeals to other communities, publishers, and libraries was overwhelming. Most impressive, however, was the response from my fellow members of Parliament. The original centre's construction, as is the case in so many small towns, was a community effort. I am pleased to acknowledge that my colleagues in the House and their staffs united in a community effort of their own, providing the library with a base of some several thousand books upon which it can now build. Considering the diversity of the donors, Lillooet can now lay claim to a truly unique catalogue.

On behalf of the people of Lillooet, I would like to extend heartfelt thanks to all members of the House, from all parties, for their support.

* * *

## FORESTRY

**Mr. J. W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury):** Mr. Speaker, I would again like to draw the attention of all the hon. members to the forestry subcommittee report entitled *Forests of Canada, the Federal Role*, which was tabled in this House two weeks ago.

The words "sustainable development" were first used in federal legislation in Canada to help create the new Department of Forestry with Bill C-29 which became law in February of 1990.

The forestry subcommittee report proposes a practical process by which the federal government can help lead the implementation of sustainable development in forestry in this country to translate that concept into reality on the ground and in the forest. As the report states, that should become the mission for the new Department of Forestry. The forests of Canada must not be taken for granted. They are pillars of our nation's prosperity and they constitute the very essence of our environment.

If sustainable development is ever going to be practised successfully in Canada, it must begin in our forests.

I urge every member of this House to read the forestry report and to help promote its proposals and purposes.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## SHIPPING

**Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil):** Mr. Speaker, the brunt of the government's cost recovery policy for the Coast Guard will be borne by St. Lawrence shippers who will have to foot the bill. Once again, the federal government is leaving Quebec with a bill that in the medium and long term will financially drain the shipping industry in Quebec. The Coast Guard cost recovery project is unfair to Quebec. If the minister thinks we are going to stand aside while this happens, I can assure him that we intend to watch developments very closely.

[*English*]

## THE GREY CUP

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday's 78th Canadian Football League Grey Cup Game created new records. The Winnipeg Blue Bombers cruised to a 50-11 victory—their second championship in three years, with a 28-point third-quarter outburst—a record in any Grey Cup game, led by the second longest interception return in Grey Cup history—56 yards.

I salute the Bombers for a great performance. A special salute goes to Warren Hudson—the outstanding Canadian, Tom Burgess—the outstanding offensive player, and to Greg Battle for the twin honours—the game's and the league's top defensive player of 1990.

Indeed, Manitobans have special reasons to celebrate yesterday's event. May we, in Parliament, and all Canadians pay tribute to the Winnipeg Blue Bombers for a unique display of team work and a one of a kind Grey Cup victory.

Let us continue to support the CFL for a distinctively Canadian game and as a source of Canadian pride.

* * *

## GUN CONTROL

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice has been sabotaged by her own back-bench on a major piece of legislation, the gun control bill.

Last week, she was forced into the humiliating spectacle of filibustering and blocking her own bill. Her only other significant act in her tenure so far—other than calling my colleague, our House leader, cute—is the recriminalization of abortion, which she professes to oppose.

It is almost a year since the massacre of 14 young women at the École Polytechnique in Montreal and six months since the Minister of Justice promised its students action on gun control, a promise now betrayed. To think that just a month ago, some journalists were talking about the minister as a possible successor to Mr. Mulroney. They should look again at this record of

incompetence, defeat and lack of political will, especially on abortion and on gun control.

---

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance.

Last Friday, the government tabled supplementary estimates in which it tried to use the Persian Gulf crisis as a smoke-screen to hide its own economic mismanagement. An example of this mismanagement lies in the numbers for the government's plans to implement the GST.

Last month, the Minister of National Revenue said that the government will be spending $260 million to bring in the GST. But if we look at the supplementary estimates tabled last Friday, we will find the government intends to spend, not $260 million, but more than $380 million just in this fiscal year, until the end of March alone.

Why will the Minister of Finance and the government not admit that they have no idea just how much it is going to cost to bring in this unfair tax? Why will the government not listen to Canadians and scrap this tax, before it wastes millions more of taxpayers' dollars trying to get ready for a tax that Canadians have said over and over again they just do not want?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Leader of the Liberals in the House does not know the difference between apples and oranges. That is precisely the type of arithmetic that he is using to try to establish the cost of implementing and preparing the GST.

There are two levels of additions to be made: one for the collection and administration, and one for the preparation and implementation. The figure that I quoted last month was that I was estimating $260 million for costs this fiscal year for the preparation and administration of the GST.

The supplementary estimates confirm that that figure, in fact, is going to be $257 million. When he adds in social services, such as social benefits which will be accrued to some eight million Canadians who will receive the GST credits, then of course the figures are larger.

Is the member suggesting that social elements of the GST are the same as administration and preparation? Is he against the GST credits? If he is against the GST credits, he should stand up and say so.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue.

What he just said is another example of this government's tortured logic. It wants to have Parliament approve the spending of another $108 million to help send out rebate cheques to some of the thousands of Canadians who are going to be clobbered by this unfair GST.

Does the Minister of National Revenue not realize that these rebate cheques would not be necessary if the government was not proceeding with the GST? All these rebate cheques do is try to make up for just some of the negative effects of this unfair tax.

I ask the minister to answer this question on behalf of the government once again: Why will the government not come to its senses and drop this unfair tax?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition talks about people being clobbered by this tax.

Let me remind him that when he was in the government, there was no GST credit. There was no refundable sales tax credit. People in low income brackets paid indirectly through the price of the products that they bought. They paid sales tax and they got no credit for it.

The result was that people with low incomes paid three or four percentage points more of their income in sales tax than those in upper income brackets.

• (1420 )

The result of the GST credit is that will be reversed. People in low income brackets will pay two or three

percentage points less as a per cent of their income than people in upper income brackets. That is why we say the GST is a fairer tax.

If he wants to talk about people being clobbered by sales tax, they were clobbered by sales tax when he was in the government.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, there would be no tax on haircuts without the GST, there would be no tax on muffins, there would be no tax on popcorn, and there would be no tax on funerals. No wonder the government's funeral is being brought about by this GST.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, according to the Supplementary Estimates, the government intends to waste another $14 million on a propaganda campaign for its own GST. I want to ask the minister why his government wishes to undermine the freedom of thought of Canadians by taxing books, when it has no scruples about promoting its own GST and does so without regard for the cost to Canadians.

[*English*]

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise that the Leader of the Opposition is using these questions as a diversion from what is going on in Canada today.

There is a poll of Canadians done by Angus-Reid which said that respondents do not believe Liberal Leader Jean Chrétien's promise to kill the tax if his party forms the next government. Sixty per cent of Canadians do not believe the Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada. Sixty per cent of Canadians say if he comes in—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre):** Mr. Speaker, 70 per cent believe that we are going to have this GST in place, so they believe what we are saying.

We are committed to the GST, but for good reasons. We are committed to the GST because it is going to help our exporters. It is going to put Canadian companies on a level playing-field with imports when imports now pay one-third less tax. It will result in a reduction of the cost of new investment of 4 per cent for all of Canada and, for those provinces that harmonize, 7.5 per cent.

There are good, solid economic reasons why we are bringing in this tax, in addition to the fairness that the GST credit will bring to low-income Canadians. Those are the reasons why we are going to bring in this tax.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## PERSIAN GULF

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, last month the House passed a motion on the gulf crisis condemning the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and affirming Canada's support of the UN approved multinational military effort enforcing sanctions against Iraq. At the time, the Secretary of State confirmed to us in correspondence that the government agreed to bring Parliament into debate on any change in our countries involvement in the gulf.

The government benches are quite empty today, but I wonder if a minister in the name of the government will immediately guarantee that parliamentarians will have the opportunity to debate the present gulf situation before Canada votes on a new resolution this week?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, this Parliament has had an opportunity to debate the gulf situation and, of course, the opposition can always bring forward a motion for a debate on the gulf situation any time it wishes.

With respect to any other debate on the gulf situation, I will pass on to the Secretary of State for External Affairs the member's suggestion. He will announce on behalf of the government whether or not that is a request that can or should be acceded to later in the week.

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, Canada holds the position at the UN Security Council of vice-chair of the Gulf Sanctions Committee.

In order that Parliament could have a debate, and in order that parliamentarians and the Canadian public can evaluate the effect of sanctions, will the government immediately provide the House the fullest possible documentation concerning the history and effectiveness of the Iraqi sanctions to date?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that the Secretary of State for External Affairs is quite prepared to make available to the House, or to the Standing Committee on External Affairs, the full information on how effective the sanctions policy appears to be.

With respect to the Gulf situation generally, the House knows that the government is giving its full support to the concept of collective security with respect to the events in the Gulf and the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq. We intend to continue with that policy and to support those people who believe that together, collectively, we have to protect the security of all countries in the world, certainly countries that believe in the UN and support the United Nations system.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. There are reports today that the United States will seek a UN resolution setting a deadline for war and ask for the support of the United Nations for that deadline.

On October 26, the Secretary of State said that he would entertain a full debate in the House, if there was time, on the Gulf crisis should conditions change. They appear to be changing, at least at the urging of the United States. This weekend, the Secretary of State for External Affairs said that, while he personally might have some disagreement with setting a deadline for war, Canada would probably support that proposition. Surely, if the minister responsible is to go against his conscience, it shows how much we need this kind of parliamentary debate.

Will the government support the New Democratic motion for an emergency debate on this situation?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, the House has already debated a resolution in connection with the Gulf crisis. The policy of the government is a policy of supporting the nations of the world in the concept of collective security.

**An hon. member:** We are talking about war now, John.

**Mr. Crosbie:** As far as war is concerned, war was an act that was instituted by Iraq as a country when it invaded Kuwait some months ago.

The government is not planning any declaration of war, but it is planning full support to the United Nations and to our allies with respect to a responsible approach to this crisis. It is a crisis that threatens every country in the world which might have a powerful nation living next to it, a nation which in the future might covet its territory.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, the government clearly has not been able to tell the House what period of time it supports to see whether economic sanctions will be affected. The Secretary of State for External Affairs has said that his government would support a resolution, even though he may be in disagreement that we should be specifying a time where offensive action would be taken. Surely, circumstances have changed. We have not debated this in the House of Commons. We have debated the economic sanctions.

Again, will the Acting Prime Minister commit his government today to debate the UN resolution that will be coming up later this week, before that resolution comes up and before the government commits Canada to an action that has not had full democratic parliamentary debate?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, the offensive action that was taken was the offensive action of Iraq invading and taking possession of Kuwait, by force of arms, without any warning, and without any justification, several months ago. That is the offensive action.

The government is clearly against that and it is going to support the countries of the world who are united in their condemnation of those acts. We will support whatever action is necessary so that Kuwait can be restored to the *status quo ante*.

With respect to a request for a debate, that is a matter, as I have said, that I will pass on to the Secretary of State for External Affairs who is presently travelling in the area, doing his best to ensure a Canadian presence there and to support those countries that have been adversely

affected by these unprovoked and war-like actions of the country of Iraq.

I will pass on to him these requests. They will be dealt with when he returns.

• (1430)

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, the minister responsible for external affairs has indeed been travelling around making very inflammatory remarks, which may in fact have put the Canadian hostages at risk, just when it seems that the whole parliamentary committee is making some kind of progress.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the government cut its budget allocations for workers, social services, the environment, fishermen and veterans. The government said it was because of the gulf crisis, but according to a survey, the increase in the price of oil will result in more than $1 billion of revenue for the federal government. Furthermore, it is estimated that oil companies will be able to increase their profits by $5 billion annually. Why should Canadians who are least well-off have to bear the brunt of the gulf crisis?

[*English*]

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, it is not remarkable and, of course, it is to be expected that the Leader of the New Democratic Party will always take a simplistic approach to whatever problems may arise in the world.

With respect to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, he has just visited Jordan and Egypt where he has announced that we are providing $26 million in assistance to Jordan and $25 million in assistance to Egypt, along with $13 million in debt write-offs for previously granted development aid to assist those countries because of the position they have been put into by the aggressive actions taken by Iraq.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has expressed the policy of this government clearly and succinctly. The policy of this government is not going to change, no matter what position is taken with respect to the Government of Iraq, with respect to hostages who they should not have taken in the first place. We have no intention of altering our policy of assisting in a collective response to Iraqi aggression. That is a policy we are going to continue firmly and decisively in the future.

* * *

## THE ECONOMY

**Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale):** Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the President of the Treasury Board said in this House: "Liberal members are certainly not helping by saying constantly that things are going awfully bad. I wish to warn him against constantly making negative and pessimistic statements which do not reflect the reality." Let me try just a little slice of reality.

Record bankruptcies have devastated our manufacturing sector; there are 216,000 fewer jobs than a year ago; our economy is in recession and, last Friday, the government announced an accounting error of $4.5 billion.

All Canadians are anxiously awaiting the good news. When will the minister end the suspense?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Willowdale spent most of his weekend talking about a $4.8 million error. That is not the case.

I refer him to documents tabled and discussed in this House, the Main Estimates, in which we indicated that we were setting aside reserves of $2.6 billion and that we were expecting a lapse of $1 billion. This is not an accounting error. This is good management.

On program expenditure we were threatened with an over-spending of $350 million. Instead of pushing it on the deficit as the Liberals did for so many years, we made an additional effort to try and finance it from within. We are still on target, as my colleague, the Minister of Finance, said in September, of $106 billion for program expenditure, and not more.

**Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale):** Mr. Speaker, it is fantastic economic management that the government underestimated the deficit by $2.5 billion.

On Friday, the President of the Treasury Board defended his government's record in terms of the underestimation of costs, in terms of its high interest rate recession-causing policies, when he defiantly declared: "We will stay the course."

How many more Canadians must lose their homes, their jobs, their farms and their businesses under this government's devastating economic mismanagement?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member leads with his chin in this way, we have to bring out some of the facts relating to the last few years of the Liberal administration.

In 1982–83, the projection of the deficit was $10.5 billion. It was revised in June to $19.6 billion. It was revised again in October to $23.6 billion and the final outcome was $27.8 billion, a full $17.3 billion over estimate. That was equivalent to 20 per cent of total spending at that time.

What my colleague and I have been saying on many occasions is that it is important for us to manage far, far better than that, and we are, because the $1.5 billion increase in the deficit this year is equivalent to less than 1 per cent of total spending.

The reason it is important to maintain this good spending record is to ensure that we maintain the confidence of the markets. I see members opposite are laughing. They are willing to compare their record where it was $17.3 billion or 20 per cent over the total spending. That was the amount of the error. I know what they are laughing at. They are laughing at the record of the administration when the Leader of the Opposition was the President of the Treasury Board.

**Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. No region has paid more for his government's misguided, high interest rate and high dollar policies than Atlantic Canada. We have paid through lost exports and lost jobs. We have lost our trains. We have lost CFB Summerside. Now, for $150 a plate, the minister tells the last 175 Tories in New Brunswick that we must pay $21 million more in cuts to ACOA to get lower interest rates and a lower deficit.

Why will the Minister of Finance not wake up to the fact that it is his interest rate policy that is causing the deficit and stop punishing Atlantic Canada for his own fiscal incompetence?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, the point I was making in response to a question I was asked in New Brunswick last week was the same point that I just made to the hon. member's colleague, that we have to manage our expenditures well here. We have to manage our deficit position well. If we can get our deficit down, we will be able to get interest rates down, and that is the primary objective of the initiatives that were announced on Friday by my colleague, the President of the Treasury Board.

All Canadians, including those in Atlantic Canada, will enjoy the benefits of lower interest rates if we are able to get the deficit down. There is simply a shifting of expenditures on ACOA from one year to others. There is no loss of those moneys. They will be spent in Atlantic Canada. It is just a question of different timing and the result will be part of a broader effort to keep our deficit under control.

**Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso):** Mr. Speaker, after that answer, I would suggest that those Tories ask for their money back.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the minister responsible for the implementation of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency Act. The minister knows that the Atlantic region is already in a recession, that we have the highest unemployment rates in Canada and that the GST will hit us harder than anyone else in Canada, except perhaps in the North. He knows this is the worst time to cut regional development programs. Why, as the minister responsible for ACOA, did he accept these cutbacks?

[*English*]

**Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works):** Mr. Speaker, I can understand the concern of my hon. friend opposite. Surely he must have paid attention to the reply of the Minister of Finance which summed up the situation accurately. ACOA has not lost its capacity to deal with economic and regional development. We have absorbed a cut, as well we should, to help with other contributions in reduction on our O and M, operations and management. Our capacity to respond to the mandate that ACOA has in Atlantic Canada has not been affected.

* * *

• (1440)

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

I have here a copy of Friday's briefing notes to the cabinet ministers in terms of the supplementary estimates, the notes that the Minister of Finance and others had on Friday. In here we have 10 pages of briefing notes and 25 questions and answers suggested for the ministers in areas dealing primarily with the GST, cut-backs, and the military.

I do not have time to refer to many of these. but I want to ask the Minister of Finance if he can be frank and honest with the Canadian people and tell us what the cost of administering and setting up the GST will be in light of the fact that among other questions, question No. 4 says: "What are the ongoing costs of implementing the GST?" The suggested answer is: "Once legislation is approved, we will be reviewing departmental requirements for this year and the availability of funds in existing appropriations. If additional funds are needed, they will be included in further supplementary estimates".

In light of that, Mr. Speaker, are we to expect even further supplementary estimates for the GST? Can the minister now be frank, open and honest with the people of this country and tell us exactly how much it will cost to set up and administer the GST, or do I have to read the rest of his notes into the record?

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can read any note into the record that he wants. He will know that in so far as the proposed costs for the GST are concerned, we have been open right from the start about what the costs are going to be.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville):** So far.

**Mr. Jelinek:** This member is a member of the Standing Committee on Finance where, on March 13, I gave the estimate officially as to what the costs were going to be for the GST for the preparation and planning. That figure which I gave to the finance committee was $300 million. I am happy to note that the cost for that is below $300 million.

If the hon. member is talking about collection and administration, that has been stated in the finance minister's budget papers of earlier this year, and we are on budget and on target on those. I have been open and honest with everybody, as were all my other colleagues. I can tell the hon. member that we are on track and on budget.

* * *

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, on the same subject, the same briefing notes say in respect of National Defence expenditures that National Defence had been planning to absorb the 1989 and 1990 budget reductions through a series of internal measures, but it goes on to say that now that the gulf situation has come about, we can squeeze in these items under the heading of the Persian Gulf expenditures. In fact, when one looks carefully at the notes that were provided the public on Friday, it becomes very clear.

Of the $121 million in capital expenditures for equipment, only $21 million are for the gulf and over $100 million expenditures are for "the advancement of previously planned military equipment purchases". Will the minister explain to the House what planned expenditures are being advanced, exactly what these funds are going for, why over $200 million is not going to the gulf at all but in fact going to enhance the Department of National Defence?

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I guess I should not be surprised at the member's mathematics after hearing him on the weekend say that he was informed the cost in the gulf was $1.3 million a month, which included rental for some accommodation and some dry cleaning for forces stationed there. He should have paid a little more attention to the briefing and the information we provided not only to the members, but to the media.

If he takes a look, he will find that there is $121 million for capital. I said on Friday that a major portion of that was under commercial negotiation by the government to acquire additional capital assets that we need at this time.

The member asked for what purpose. I can inform him that it is for the general military preparedness of Canada because we have a very serious situation. Because the government—and I am sure it is supported by the hon. member and his party—has put men and women in the Persian Gulf region, the government believes that they should be sustained and supported.

## ALGOMA STEEL

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

The strike at Algoma Steel in Sault Ste. Marie was settled over a week ago, involving some 6,000 employees and having a devastating impact on the community.

Because only 1,000 employees have been called back to work so far and because of the estimates of reinstatement of jobs, it is estimated that most employees will not receive any UIC benefits until the end of December of this year.

What is the minister going to do about this travesty of justice to ensure that cheques are sent out to these employees who have been on strike for over four months.

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, the rules that are being applied in the Algoma situation, which has been a long and unfortunate one, are the same as the rules that are applied in other situations.

The Algoma management has confirmed with my officials that something like 2,000 workers will be recalled in the next two or three weeks. To expedite claims, our officials in Sault Ste. Marie have set up temporary headquarters in the union hall to assist with claims and are planning to register all workers who will need unemployment insurance as efficiently as possible.

This is the normal procedure within UI in events like this.

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Surely the minister cannot hide behind the unfair regulations and the UIC act. Thousands of families in the Algoma district face a Christmas without money unless the minister acts now.

I wonder if the minister would use the discretion she has under the act and the regulations to order that cheques be sent out immediately.

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member knows that this is not something the minister can simply wave a magic wand over.

Forty years of jurisprudence have gone into these kinds of decisions. We have asked our officials to work as efficiently as possible within the parameters of what we have to do. We will be getting the money to them as soon as possible.

* * *

## RADIO CANADA INTERNATIONAL

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, over $10 million in cultural cuts were announced Friday allegedly to pay for our military exercise in the Persian Gulf.

On August 13, the CBC extended its international voice in Arabic to the Middle East, bringing messages from a western middle power.

My question for the President of the Treasury Board. At this time of crisis, with the citizens of Iraq and Kuwait isolated to Saddam Hussein's message, does the minister agree that Radio Canada International is vital to Canada's pursuing peace with these people, as well as a key voice to our Armed Forces? Is this not an important role for Canada and Canada's national interest?

**Hon. Gerry Weiner (Secretary of State of Canada and Minister of State (Multiculturalism and Citizenship)):** Mr. Speaker, CBC Radio-Canada is an independent society. It is an independent, arm's length body that functions in a completely independent fashion. I imagine it will make—

**Some hon. members:** Come on, give us an answer.

**Mr. Weiner:** I will, if you let me try. I imagine that when the expenditure reduction was applied in an equitable fashion, there was a sharing by all of us. The CBC will indeed determine what its priorities are and continue to offer the same high quality service it always has.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, the President of the Treasury Board, had he cared to answer this question, knows perfectly well that he controls the funds.

In controlling those funds, the President of the Treasury Board controls the program, so don't try to hide behind arm's length in this circumstance.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, this government is responsible for cutting the CBC budget right down to the bone by reducing corporate appropriations to the tune of more than $240 million and forcing management to slash legitimate outlays to the extent that the future of some services is in doubt. My supplementary is directed to the President of the Treasury Board. Does he not think that Radio Canada International has to know today that the necessary funds will be set aside just so it will survive? Yes or no?

**Hon. Gerry Weiner (Secretary of State of Canada and Minister of State (Multiculturalism and Citizenship)):** Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that our government has done all it could to maintain the funds required by the CBC to fulfill its mandate. Being one of its supporters I can tell you quite frankly that I have always been satisfied with its excellent service. The CBC management now has to deal with some restrictions, but I am sure it will continue to provide outstanding services.

* * *

• (1450 )

[*English*]

## OIL INDUSTRY

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** My question is for the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker.

As my leader stressed, economic forecasts show that the oil industry in Canada will make an extra $5 billion in profits next year from the gulf crisis, as a direct result of that. In fact, Statistics Canada has just reported an increase of $600 million in petroleum products profits in the third quarter alone.

Will the minister see to it that these super profits pay the cost of the blockade in the gulf instead of cutbacks in programs for people across this country?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, as my friend already knows, we have made significant changes to the taxation of corporations, with the result that there will be significant tax revenues coming from the additional profits that the oil companies will be making with the increase in the price of oil. He can be assured that those moneys that will accrue to the Consolidated Revenue Fund will be applied in the appropriate way. One of those ways will be to help finance a variety of programs in a variety of ways.

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance makes an important point. The estimates which have been undertaken by Informetrica, for instance, suggest that indeed the government will get an extra $1.1 billion in revenue as a consequence of the oil price increases coming out of the gulf crisis.

Why will the government not take this money to pay for the blockade in the gulf? Why is the government trying in a sense to make money out of this gulf crisis for its own revenue?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the hon. member has asked me this question.

The net effect of the increase in the price of oil over all on the revenues of the Government of Canada is not positive. It is negative.

There is an increase in revenues related to the increased revenues that the oil and gas companies make, but offset by that is the negative impact on the economy of the increased price of oil and the impact this could have on inflation.

The net balance is not positive, as the hon. member suggests. The net balance is negative, and that is why my colleague, the President of the Treasury Board, came to the House last Friday with supplementary estimates to finance the increased cost of the efforts in the gulf.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## FORESTRY DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Forestry. On October 24 last I rose in the House to enquire about the Canada-Quebec forestry development subsidiary agreement.

My question is this: Should Quebec fail to respond to the August 24, 1990 federal government offer, will Ottawa look at another option to help the province's hard-pressed forestry producers?

[*English*]

**Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of Forestry):** Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend knows, on August 24 we offered Quebec a model that would serve as a future generation forest resource development agreement.

The province wanted to take some time to assess its own priorities. I indicated subsequently that failing any response from the province we would consider other options that would perhaps assist us in enlarging our traditional role in research and assistance to private wood lots.

However, I can report to my friend in the House that on Friday there was a very useful meeting with Quebec officials, and it seems now that there is a desire to arrive at a new agreement quite soon.

* * *

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. David Walker (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in his role as the minister responsible for the core area initiative.

For the first time since the Great Depression, there are thousands of Canadians who can no longer feed and clothe themselves or their families. If we look at the supplementary estimates, we see there is nothing but bad news for all regional development projects.

I would like to ask the minister about a very special project in Winnipeg, the core area initiative, which thousands of Winnipegers depend upon and look forward to its renewal. The project is due to end on March 31, 1991 and yet there has been no announcement from the federal government.

Will he tell the House today what the government intends to do about the core area initiative?

**Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, there is very good news about regional development in western Canada.

In terms of the estimates, my colleague, the Minister of State for Grains and Oilseeds who is responsible for western diversification, has stated that any reductions will be done in the area of management and operating costs. I know his staff is working on that, and I think it is fully in harmony with that.

I remind the hon. member of western diversification in his own city with Boeing, a tremendous expansion in the aeronautical industry. He was a member who decried western diversification giving money to Boeing because it was another one of these ugly multinationals that happened to be in Winnipeg and happened to create over 1,000 jobs for us.

That is what western diversification has done for our region and, if he does not want to praise his city, I will, including the great results yesterday in Vancouver.

**Mr. David Walker (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, the minister is the first western minister to announce that a cutback is a gain for the west. I am sure that will be well received throughout western Canada.

Second, he refers back to the Boeing example of the federal government giving $9 million to that corporation while in fact another department was paying out $150 million in a legal settlement. Quite obviously the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing when it comes to economic development.

The minister refused to answer the question. I will ask it again. The core area initiative has less than six months to go. You have not said anything. People think you are about to bail out on this city. Would you tell Canadians you are not going to bail out on Winnipeg?

**Mr. Speaker:** I would ask hon. members to direct their questions through the Chair?

**Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased the hon. member now feels that the Boeing deal is a good deal for Winnipeg and for Canada. I find it surprising, if he is talking about the CAI deal.

That deal was there before this government came into power in 1984. It has cost the country a tremendous amount of money, and the only person who has really benefitted is a certain Liberal who happened to be a supporter of that party in Manitoba.

**An hon. member:** A lawyer.

**Mr. Epp:** He is a lawyer of course but, more seriously, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the core we will be having a tripartite meeting on Friday of this week. I say to the hon. member that I appreciate his interest in core and that we will do the right thing for Winnipeg.

## THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of the Environment.

The government has cut $38 million from the department responsible for the highest priority of Canadians, the environment. It has cut over $130 million additionally from the programs of other departments which impact on the environment.

Will the minister tell us now what specific environmental programs will suffer from the cuts announced on Friday? What specific programs?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to answer to my hon. colleague that there will be no program cuts.

The cuts announced by my colleague, the President of the Treasury Board, will be reflected in increased efficiency in operations and management. It is O and M expenses that will reflect the cuts.

In terms of programs I would like to repeat, for the benefit of my colleague, that the budget of Environment Canada has been increased by 9.4 per cent for 1988–89 and 11.7 per cent for 1989–90, without counting for the current period an increase announced in the supplementary estimates of an additional $78.3 million to Environment Canada.

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Finance.

We are all aware of how the budget of the Department of the Environment was gutted in the first mandate of this government, and now it is just starting to get back. Canada is likely to have a white Christmas long before it has a Green Plan. The minister has said repeatedly in the House he knows the cost of the Green Plan and that the government has set aside reserves for this.

• (1500)

Will the minister tell us exactly where in these supplementary estimates we will find the money for the Green Plan? What page? What line?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** I find it very hard to accept the word that the hon. member used when she said that the Environment Canada budget was gutted by this government. This gutted budget went from $777 million to $973 million. If that is gutting a budget, I do not know what increasing a budget is.

The hon. member has asked where the moneys are for the Green Plan. We have made it quite clear that there have been reserves that have been established for this purpose. The Minister of the Environment will be announcing the Green Plan in due course and that will set out more detail on this matter.

* * *

## THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment. Robert Cliche, the federal negotiator of the joint environmental assessment for the Great Whale project is quoted on the weekend as saying: "It is very, very, very unlikely that Quebec will ratify the agreement". There is an old saying that I am sure the Minister of the Environment is aware of, three strikes and you are out.

Given that two years have been fiddled, piddled and diddled away trying to negotiate a joint agreement on the Great Whale with the province of Quebec, will the minister stop dithering today and call for a full environmental assessment and review process of the Great Whale project, the dams, the flooding and the reservoirs, before the proponents start bellyaching that there is not time for assessing the environmental impacts of the project.

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat what I said last week. There will be an environmental assessment of the project, the roads and the airport. It will be a public process.

I stated very clearly, at that time, that we would prefer that process to be a joint process with the other interested parties, namely, the provincial government and native people. That is what we are discussing with the province at the moment and, hopefully, we will have news to report shortly. But there will be a process; it will be carried out; and, the process will be complete.

*Point of Order*

## PRESENCE IN THE GALLERY

**Mr. Speaker:** I wish to draw to the members' attention the presence in the gallery of Dr. Dalibor Brozovich, Vice President of the Republic of Croatia.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## PRIVILEGE

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B)

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege arising from the tabling of the supplementary estimates on Friday last. Attached to my copy of the supplementary estimates was a press release. The press release says, and I quote from it: "Parliament will be asked to approve expenditures that include $257 million to prepare and plan for the goods and services tax".

Over the weekend I took the time to read the supplementary estimates, as the government House leader recommended we do, and I found on page 32 a provision under the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs for the establishment of a goods and services tax consumer information office for a total estimate of $19,496,000. I found on page 52 of the supplementary estimates an additional $14,305,000 under the Department of Finance for its advertising campaigning to convince Canadians that this is a good tax. I found on page 84 of the supplementary estimates the sum of $202,987,000 under the Department of National Revenue (Customs and Excise Department) for preparation and planning for the GST. For the taxation portion of the same department, on page 85 of the estimates, there was shown an additional $67,254,000. On page 88 of the supplementary estimates, I found an additional $40 million for the Department of Public Works for preparation and planning for GST accommodation. On page 100—

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not know whether the hon. member wishes to debate the supplementary estimates, but I am sure that there will be an opportunity to do so.

I am having some difficulty in finding the point of privilege. Perhaps he could get to the point.

**Mr. Milliken:** I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but the last one was an additional $21 million. The $21 million in supply and services was for cheques. Now if all those figures are added up, it comes to $365 million for the goods and services tax. The minister's press release says it is $257 million. I submit there is a very serious discrepancy.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Milliken:** His press release is misleading the public.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have to say to the hon. member that that is a matter of debate and is not a question of privilege.

**An hon. member:** Oh, yes.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is a matter of debate, not a question of privilege.

**Mr. Milliken:** Mr. Speaker, with great respect, the press release is not correct.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is a debate about what is correct or not correct in a press release. That is the question of debate.

The hon. member for Shefford on a point of order.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## POINT OF ORDER

THE BLOC QUÉBÉCOIS—REQUEST FOR A RESEARCH FUND

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, because it has been several months since my colleagues in the Bloc québécois and myself sent a request to the Chair and to the Board of Internal Economy about our rights and access to a research fund.

I am convinced that the fact we are not heated the same as other members, although there is a precedent for doing so, makes it difficult for us to function as efficiently as other members. And now, four months later, Mr. Speaker, I must say I find it hard to accept that not only are we deprived of adequate research but our former parties still receive funding allocated on the basis of our membership. Both the Liberal Party the Progressive Conservative Party continue to receive this funding.

Mr. Speaker, these funds should be put in trust immediately, because I believe access to research is a privilege to which all members should be entitled. I therefore find it very difficult to accept that it takes four months for the Board of Internal Economy to send us a reply, when we realize that in Quebec City, the four members of the Equality Party who represent a much smaller constituency—

Look at today's polls, Mr. Speaker—I won't read them to you, modesty forbids—but we represent a substantial share of the Quebec population. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I hope and trust you will give us an answer as soon as possible. Whatever your decision we are at least entitled to a reply.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** I will take into consideration what the hon. member has said. It may well be that an answer has been sent and the hon. member may not have received it. I will look into it and report back to the hon. member.

The hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond on a point of order.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps it might be best to choose another location to discuss this with you, such as your chambers, but I would like to raise this matter with you.

On November 1, 1990 the hon. member for Abitibi under Statements by Members made reference to my colleague from Burin—St. George's in terms of his travel expenses which the Chair allowed to proceed in its entirety.

On November 8, the member for Scarborough—Agincourt made certain references to subject matter which he believed to be important. He was thereafter called to order by the Chair.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, on November 19, my colleague from Burin—St. George's made some remarks with regard to the different positions being taken by the New Democratic Party in the province of Newfoundland, as well as on the floor of the House of Commons. I believe at that time the Chair stood in its place and again directed certain comments to that particular member. I, as well as other members on this side would like to have the opportunity of perhaps visiting your chambers in order to discuss both the process and indeed, the substance of what appeared at first hand, to be different treatments, if you will, being given to different members of Parliament from different political parties. I am sure this Speaker would at least entertain me in his chamber in order to make those particular points.

• (1510)

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to assure the hon. member that the Chair, as much as is humanly possible, would not ever treat one hon. member differently than the others.

A few days ago I said to the hon. member for Scarborough—Agincourt that it may well have been that something slipped by my careful consideration. That is not satisfactory, but perhaps that is what happened. With respect to the hon. member for Burin–St. George's, I would be very pleased to go over the transcript. I might also ask the hon. member to give me in full what it was he intended to say.

We will try to keep within the bounds of the prescription of Madam Sauvé of some years go, in that Statements by Members are not supposed to make a personal attack on a member. I recognize that that gets a little difficult sometimes, especially when what is being attacked is a political position taken by the member.

Madam Sauvé also commented on the fact that congratulations are really not the purpose of members' statements. I received a note today from one hon. member who is very diligent on these matters, pointing out that it may not have been appropriate to offer congratulations to the Winnipeg team. I felt constrained, despite the fact that there have been comments by past Speakers, I was not sure that to restrain hon. members in congratulating the winner of the Grey Cup would make any friends in the Chamber at all.

However, it is a difficult line sometimes to find. It is doubly difficult because the Chair cannot always be sure of exactly where the statement is going. If it is giving members trouble and difficulties, I would be very pleased to discuss it and to see if we can straighten it out. It is not my purpose to leave even an impression that one member is getting treatment that is not available to another member.

I would ask all hon. members because it is an important matter, to be very careful in giving members' statements. If it is strictly a comment upon a political position, that is one thing. If it passes over that and becomes a personal attack, then we have tried to stay away from that sort of thing.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to the same question of privilege, since my name was not mentioned. It was on Thursday, October 1, that I mentioned in a statement in the House of Commons that the hon. member for Burin—St. George's had spent $118,865 on travel expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I made this statement on the basis of information taken from the Public Accounts of Canada, available to all members of this House, and I merely said what appeared in the Public Accounts. I only reported the truth.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the best thing to do would be to leave it as I said. I will see the hon. member and other hon. members if there is difficulty.

We have tried to be very careful in this matter. I think hon. members can understand why.

* * *

## PETITIONS

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant):** Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege and honour, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present this petition signed by Canadians from coast to coast.

The petitioners implore the government not to impose a GST on journals, magazines, books and other reading material, and to maintain the tradition in Canada that taxes not be placed upon reading materials and the promotion of literacy in a country that needs that kind of promotion.

### RADIO LICENCE FEES

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present, pursuant to Standing Order 36. It is from residents of the town of Dominion in my constituency, primarily those individuals who have been associated for quite some time with the Dominion volunteer fire department.

As duly noted in their petition, fire departments provide a vital service protecting the lives and property of all citizens. Because the federal Department of Communications has now imposed huge increases in licence fees for radio telecommunications including all emergency service radio equipment, the petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to exempt fire departments such as those in communities such as the town of Dominion. I would call upon the government to act forthwith.

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, on another subject matter, I have a number of petitions to present, pursuant to Standing Order 36, signed by individuals from across the country, from places such as like Markham and Don Mills, both in Ontario.

The petitioners are calling upon the Government of Canada to withdraw the goods and services tax and in particular the tax which has been levied upon books, newspapers, magazines and various other materials. They would hope that the members of the government would see their way and acknowledge the outright opposition that Canadians have from coast to coast with regard to this particular measure and in particular the effect that it has on magazines, books and newspapers and that the GST be withdrawn immediately.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, this petition has been certified correct as to form, pursuant to Standing Order 36. Your petitioners do not support the government's intention to apply the goods and services tax to books, magazines and periodicals.

[*English*]

These people find that the dissemination of the printed word as a corner-stone of democracy, culture, and education and of a literate and productive society will be negatively affected by the GST. The petitioners call upon the government and this minister to understand the impact. A 1 per cent increase in books is a 2 per cent loss in sales. As this is the year of literacy internationally sponsored by the United Nations, this is a very serious matter and I hope the government through the Prime Minister's good offices—because he agrees with us—that this tax will be withdrawn.

**Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present a petition signed by just over 250 residents of Edmonton, Alberta, and St. Albert, Alberta. They are petitioning the government and the House of Commons to apply a zero rate of tax to magazines, books and newspapers now as it has done in all of the years since Confederation.

The petitioners are concerned that uninhibited dissemination of the printed word is a corner-stone of democracy, of culture, education, and literature, and a productive society will be negatively affected by the application of the GST to the printed word. The petitioners call on the government to reaffirm the historic principles embodied in tax-free status for the printed word by retaining the zero rate in the GST legislation as it affects the printed word.

**Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke):** Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise on behalf of a large number of petitioners from Ottawa, Toronto and other Ontario communities, who do not want to see the GST applied to books, magazines and other reading articles.

At a time when we are talking about promoting literacy, it is just not the time at all, at any time, to be putting a tax on reading. This has never been done in Canada since Confederation. Surely, with the interest that Canadians have in education and the need for the wide dissemination of knowledge today, there should be no tax inhibiting the progress of knowledge and reading material in any way whatsoever.

• (1520)

RADIO LICENCE FEES

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to rise, pursuant to Standing Order 36, once again to present a petition to the House signed by members of the communities Shubenacadie and Stewiacke, most of whom are volunteers with the volunteer fire departments of those communities.

The petitioners are asking the government to withdraw its increases in radio licence fees, telecommunications licensing fees. They believe that these fees which have not applied to them since 1986, but now do, will place a severe financial burden on these volunteer fire departments. Also, because of the additional cost, volunteer fire departments may be prevented from upgrading their services and equipment.

The petitioners are asking the government to see the error of its ways and to forthwith reduce and eliminate these unfair licence fees that volunteer fire departments now find themselves faced with.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East):** Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise, pursuant to Standing Order 36, with a petition which has been affirmed as correct.

The petitioners humbly pray that the government will withdraw the GST from the printed word. There are over 250 signatures from various cities in Alberta. The petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to reaffirm the historic principles embodied in tax-free status for the printed word. The petitioners find it deplorable that a government would be bringing in a tax system at this time when we are trying to allow people to have a better opportunity to upgrade their reading skills and so on. They are calling for the government to abandon its taxation of the printed word.

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, I rise, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present to the House five petitions wherein the petitioners call upon the government to abandon the proposed GST on books and periodicals. This tax, if passed, would be an impediment both to improved literacy and our freedom of expression, both of which are principal underpinnings of our democracy here in Canada.

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** Mr. Speaker, it is my honour and duty to present a petition on behalf of citizens of Edmonton who point out that they dislike the GST under any circumstances, but they particularly dislike the idea of it being put on magazines, books and newspapers. The petitioners call upon the government to retain a zero rate of GST on those articles.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I, too, have a petition along the same lines signed by numerous residents of the city of Toronto who are opposed to the goods and services tax. They are opposed to the greedy way in which the government has proceeded to levy this tax.

The petitioners support the senators in their efforts to excise from the goods and services tax bill the provisions

relating to the tax on books and the printed word which is unprecedented in this country and, indeed, in almost any reasonable democracy.

I call upon the government, as do these petitioners, to withdraw the goods and services tax in its entirety and, if it is unwilling to do that, at least to amend it to excise these very odious and offensive provisions.

* * *

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 295 could be made an Order for Return, the return would be tabled immediately.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is it the pleasure of the House that Question No. 295 be deemed to have been made an Order for Return?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Text*]

TRADE

Question No. 295—**Mr. Boudria:**

1. Can the Government identify the members of its Free Trade negotiating team and support staff and, if so (a) what are their names (b) in each case, what is or was the duration of their employment?

2. What is the total cost of the Free Trade negotiations in terms of (a) salaries (b) office expenses (c) travel expenditures?

Return tabled.

* * *

[*English*]

## STARRED QUESTIONS

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Starred Questions Nos. 355, 362, 374 and 376. Due to the number of responses, I would ask that they may be printed in *Hansard* as read.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Text*]

WEEKEND RETREAT IN PARKSVILLE, B.C.

*Question No. 355—**Ms. Langan (Mission—Coquitlam):**

1. Has the Minister of Justice invited any Canadian women to a weekend retreat in Parksville, B.C. and if so (a) who was invited (b) what criteria were used in the selection of invitees (c) what is the purpose of the meeting (d) what items are on the agenda of the meeting (e) are there any costs to the federal treasury associated with the meeting and if so, from what budget will those costs be paid?

2. What reasons are given for this meeting being hosted by the Minister of Justice rather than the Minister responsible for the Status of Women?

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** 1. Parksville (B.C.) meeting was cancelled.

(a), (b), (c), (d) and (e): Not applicable

2. Not applicable

TRANSFER PAYMENTS

*Question No. 362—**Mr. Duhamel:**

1. For each year since 1984, how many "actual dollars" have been transferred to each province for (a) health (b) education?

2. If the current formula remains unchanged, how many "actual dollars" will be transferred to each province for (a) health (b) education for the period 1991–92 to 2000–01?

**Hon. Michael Holcombe Wilson (Minister of Finance):** See attached.

1. Transfers to Provinces in Respect of Health and Post-Secondary Education (PSE) under the Established Programs Financing (EPF) Arrangements 1984–85 to 1990–91

| | | NFLD | PEI | NS | NB | QUE | ONT | MAN | SASK | ALTA | BC | NWT | YKN | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | ($ Millions) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1984–85 | health | 238 | 52 | 359 | 294 | 2,697 | 3,699 | 438 | 416 | 972 | 1,183 | 21 | 10 | 10,379 |
| | PSE | 96 | 21 | 145 | 119 | 1,089 | 1,493 | 177 | 168 | 392 | 478 | 8 | 4 | 4,189 |
| | total EPF | 334 | 73 | 504 | 413 | 3,786 | 5,191 | 615 | 583 | 1,364 | 1,661 | 29 | 13 | 14,567 |
| 1985–86 | health | 254 | 56 | 387 | 315 | 2,892 | 3,998 | 472 | 448 | 1,043 | 1,274 | 23 | 10 | 11,171 |
| | PSE | 102 | 23 | 156 | 127 | 1,167 | 1,614 | 191 | 181 | 421 | 514 | 9 | 4 | 4,508 |
| | total EPF | 356 | 79 | 543 | 442 | 4,059 | 5,612 | 663 | 628 | 1,463 | 1,788 | 32 | 15 | 15,680 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1986–87 | health | 267 | 59 | 410 | 334 | 3,071 | 4,279 | 503 | 474 | 1,115 | 1,357 | 25 | 11 | 11,905 |
| | PSE | 108 | 24 | 165 | 135 | 1,239 | 1,727 | 203 | 191 | 450 | 548 | 10 | 4 | 4,805 |
| | total EPF | 375 | 83 | 575 | 468 | 4,310 | 6,006 | 706 | 666 | 1,565 | 1,904 | 34 | 15 | 16,710 |
| 1987–88* | health | 279 | 63 | 431 | 350 | 3,237 | 4,550 | 530 | 499 | 1,168 | 1,436 | 26 | 12 | 12,580 |
| | PSE | 113 | 25 | 174 | 141 | 1,307 | 1,836 | 214 | 201 | 471 | 580 | 10 | 5 | 5,077 |
| | total EPF | 392 | 88 | 605 | 491 | 4,544 | 6,386 | 744 | 700 | 1,639 | 2,016 | 36 | 17 | 17,657 |
| 1988–89* | health | 291 | 66 | 453 | 366 | 3,406 | 4,836 | 556 | 520 | 1,229 | 1,531 | 27 | 13 | 13,294 |
| | PSE | 118 | 27 | 183 | 148 | 1,374 | 1,952 | 224 | 210 | 496 | 618 | 11 | 5 | 5,365 |
| | total EPF | 409 | 93 | 636 | 514 | 4,780 | 6,788 | 781 | 729 | 1,725 | 2,149 | 38 | 18 | 18,658 |
| 1989–90* | health | 307 | 70 | 477 | 387 | 3,599 | 5,150 | 583 | 542 | 1,307 | 1,644 | 29 | 14 | 14,109 |
| | PSE | 124 | 28 | 193 | 156 | 1,453 | 2,078 | 235 | 219 | 528 | 664 | 12 | 6 | 5,694 |
| | total EPF | 431 | 98 | 670 | 543 | 5,052 | 7,228 | 819 | 761 | 1,835 | 2,308 | 40 | 19 | 19,803 |
| 1990–91* | health | 307 | 70 | 479 | 388 | 3,619 | 5,222 | 587 | 544 | 1,328 | 1,674 | 29 | 14 | 14,260 |
| | PSE | 124 | 28 | 193 | 157 | 1,461 | 2,108 | 237 | 219 | 536 | 675 | 12 | 6 | 5,755 |
| | total EPF | 431 | 98 | 673 | 545 | 5,080 | 7,330 | 823 | 763 | 1,864 | 2,349 | 41 | 19 | 20,016 |

Totals may not add due to rounding.
* Estimate

2. No detailed forecasts of such payments are made beyond five years, due to the difficulty of accurately forecasting factors such as gross national product, basic federal tax and population for these years.

Projections of EPF entitlements in respect of health and post-secondary education for the program years 1991–92 to 1994–95 are shown below. All figures are on a basis consistent with the February 1990 Budget. These projections are also subject to the difficulty of estimating transfers based on economic and demographic variables well into the future.

2. Projected transfers to Provinces in Respect of Health and Post-Secondary Education (PSE) under the Established Programs Financing (EPF) Arrangements 1991–92 to 1994–95

| | | NFLD | PEI | NS | NB | QUE | ONT | MAN | SASK | ALTA | BC | NWT | YKN | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | ($ Millions) | | | | | | | |
| 1991–92 | health | 307 | 70 | 482 | 390 | 3,639 | 5,300 | 590 | 546 | 1,348 | 1,703 | 29 | 14 | 14,418 |
| | PSE | 124 | 28 | 194 | 157 | 1,469 | 2,139 | 238 | 220 | 544 | 687 | 12 | 6 | 5,819 |
| | total EPF | 431 | 99 | 676 | 547 | 5,108 | 7,438 | 828 | 767 | 1,893 | 2,391 | 41 | 19 | 20,237 |
| 1992–93 | health | 314 | 72 | 495 | 400 | 3,744 | 5,504 | 608 | 562 | 1,400 | 1,773 | 30 | 14 | 14,917 |
| | PSE | 127 | 29 | 200 | 162 | 1,511 | 2,221 | 245 | 227 | 565 | 716 | 12 | 6 | 6,020 |
| | total EPF | 441 | 101 | 695 | 562 | 5,254 | 7,726 | 853 | 788 | 1,965 | 2,488 | 42 | 20 | 20,937 |
| 1993–94 | health | 322 | 74 | 509 | 411 | 3,851 | 5,707 | 626 | 578 | 1,455 | 1,844 | 31 | 15 | 15,422 |
| | PSE | 130 | 30 | 206 | 166 | 1,554 | 2,303 | 253 | 233 | 587 | 744 | 12 | 6 | 6,224 |
| | total EPF | 452 | 104 | 715 | 577 | 5,405 | 8,010 | 879 | 811 | 2,043 | 2,588 | 43 | 20 | 21,646 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1994–95 | health | 330 | 77 | 526 | 423 | 3,977 | 5,937 | 647 | 597 | 1,519 | 1,924 | 32 | 15 | 16,004 |
| | PSE | 133 | 31 | 212 | 171 | 1,605 | 2,396 | 261 | 241 | 613 | 777 | 13 | 6 | 6,459 |
| | total EPF | 464 | 108 | 738 | 594 | 5,582 | 8,333 | 908 | 837 | 2,132 | 2,701 | 44 | 21 | 22,462 |

Totals may not add due to rounding.

EVENTS AT KANESATAKE AND KAHNAWAKE, QUE.

*Question No. 374—**Mr. Riis:**

Does the government intend to inform Canadians fully of all the details of the events at Kanesatake and Kahnawake, Que. and, if so, will it be gathering that information through an impartial judicial inquiry?

**Hon. Thomas Edward Siddon (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** On October 22, 1990 the House of Commons unanimously agreed "that the subject matter of the events at Kanesatake and Kahnawake during the summer of 1990 be referred to the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs".

EVENTS AT KANESATAKE AND KAHNAWAKE, QUE.

*Question No. 376—**Mr. Riis:**

Has the government determined the cause or causes of the events at Kanesatake and Kahnawake, Que., and, if so, what are they?

**Hon. Thomas Edward Siddon (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** The immediate cause was the non-settlement of the land question at Kanesatake. The federal government had been in negotiations with the Kanesatake Band Council concerning its land grievances and an agreement was reached in the Fall of 1989 which was to be discussed and ratified by the community in early 1990. In January 1990 the Band Council was changed and in March 1990 the Band Council informed the federal negotiator that the Council would not pursue the negotiated agreement and would not continue talks until further notice.

The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development met with the Council in June 1990 to attempt to put in place a process aimed at resolving the long standing issues in the community. In late June the Municipality of Oka obtained an injunction against individuals blockading municipal land and a violent confrontation occurred when this injunction was served by the *Sûreté du Québec*.

[*English*]

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

* * *

## MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S. O. 52

PERSIAN GULF

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, as I understand, a letter was delivered to the Speaker notifying the Speaker that I intended to ask today for an emergency debate as provided under Standing Order 52.

The emergency to which I refer is the fact that the reports are that on Thursday of this week the United Nations Security Council will consider a resolution authorizing the use of force in the Persian Gulf. Canada, of course, is a member of the Security Council. We will have no opportunity between now and then in the House to debate the position that Canada should be taking at the United Nations.

The issue is one of momentous international significance and of tremendous significance to Canada and to the people of this country. The government has earlier indicated that it would ask Parliament for its advice on key issues in the gulf crisis as it moved along. There is no more significant issue than the issue of war and peace in the gulf.

I would therefore ask you, Mr. Speaker, to find that this is in fact a genuine emergency, one of those for which Standing Order 52 was developed and an appropriate motion under that standing order.

[*Translation*]

SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The Chair fully agrees that the question raised by the hon. member for

Victoria is extremely important. However, it was raised today during Oral Question Period, and for the time being, as far as today is concerned, the Chair does not feel this question is so urgent it should be debated immediately.

I therefore repeat: Although the question is important, it is not as urgent today as the hon. member for Victoria would have us believe.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved that Bill C–91, an act to amend the Financial Administration Act and other acts in consequence thereof, be read a second time and referred to a legislative committee.

He said: On November 1, Bill C–91, an act to amend the Financial Administration Act and other acts in consequence thereof was introduced in the House. The amendments this bill proposed for consideration by the House are largely technical in nature. I do not anticipate that the hon. member will find much with which to take issue in this bill.

In leading off debate, I would like first to describe the government's purpose in proposing these amendments to the House, and then describe the most significant of them in further detail so that hon. members can appreciate their significance and understand why they make sense and why they should be passed as quickly as possible.

• (1530 )

This bill amends some 70 sections of the Financial Administration Act. The bill has been drawn together after considerable thought and a lengthy consultation process into a package of amendments designed to do a number of things.

First, they would improve the management of the federal government's cash inflows and outflows. They would streamline internal administrative processes that have tied the hands of our management in the past. They would clarify roles, responsibilities and authorities so that accountability is increased and uncertainty is decreased.



They would increase the efficiency with which government programs and services are administered. They would permit Public Service employees and managers to offer better service to the public by cutting red tape and giving more flexibility to fund delivery of services.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, the government's aim in coming forward with these amendments is to prepare the federal government's financial administration practice for the increasingly complex and competitive 1990s and beyond.

**An hon. member:** And the GST.

**Mr. Loiselle:** Mr. Speaker, the government must remain competitive with advances being made in the private sector. It must be prepared to cut its costs of operation further and to work more efficiency. It must measure up to the increasingly demanding expectations of Parliament, the Public Accounts committee, the Auditor General, and all taxpayers.

Bill C–91 contains some amendments designed specifically to help our program managers achieve some of the spending cuts and management improvement that were contained in the December 15, 1989 announcement and to open up new opportunities to save money in the future when it is appropriate to do so along the same lines.

By permitting the introduction of new efficiencies, these amendments would make a significant contribution to deficit reduction which will benefit all constituents. At the same time, they would improve the consistency and fairness with which the government's user fees are applied, which I am confident is important to all members.

[*Translation*]

Bill C–91 also supports the goals and general direction of the government's ongoing Public Service 2000 initiative.

Mr. Speaker, Members of this House are aware that Public Service 2000 aims to cut back on red tape and internal constraints that have long impaired the efforts by Public Service managers to improve program efficiency. "Constraints to productive management", as the Auditor General has referred to them in the past, have prevented many government departments from becoming what he referred to more recently as "well–performing organizations".

They have also resulted in low morale among government managers and employees who seek only to serve the public in the best way they know how.

[*English*]

Since Canadians are both shareholders and customers of the Public Service, I thoroughly endorse and recommend for rapid passage these worthy amendments that I would now like to describe in some detail.

The Treasury Board has had an informal role in the planning and administration of real property management in the Public Service for some time. Amendments proposed would formalize that role.

Several amendments are designed to improve cash management and to modernize the government's payment practices. They are driven by an overriding desire to be fairer to all taxpayers, the majority of whom pay their bills to the government on time.

Among these are provisions to make collection agency fees statutory expenditures, thereby eliminating the current budgetary disincentive faced by managers when using them.

In the case of the minority of Canadians who do not pay their bills to the government within a reasonable time, thereby placing a financial burden on all taxpayers, there are provisions to make regulations to charge interest on overdue accounts and to impose an administrative fee when payment is made by NSF cheques.

There is, throughout, provision to exempt taxpayers from these measures for humanitarian reasons when it is appropriate to do so, including an expanded authority to forgive any debts, not just fees and taxes, where enforcement and collection is considered to be unreasonable or unjust under the circumstances. The issue also arose during debate in this House on Veterans Affairs' overpayments on September 23, 1988.

The forgiveness provisions are important because they would make it possible for the government to recover at least some of the hundreds of millions of dollars that are owed, but which are deemed to be effectively uncollectable, by making it possible in exchange for payment of the principal. This would also extend to all Canadians the same straightforward process that we apply to crown corporations. This proposed change was recommended by the Senate finance committee in its fourteenth report in March 1986.

There are also provisions to permit the making of payments electronically, which is the wave of the future, and in general to permit more businesslike practices in the interests of all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Other amendments are aimed at clarifying and modestly extending *Financial Administration Act* provisions regarding cost recovery and user charges. Among other things, the amendments will facilitate a more consistent and equitable approach to charging across the government.

These amendments would enhance revenue-generation and cost-recovery opportunities from the users of government programs and services, which are important to the government's efforts to improve efficiency and attack the deficit.

Furthermore, the government feels that charging clients a fee for specific services and the use of facilities when there is a clearly identified beneficiary is fairer to all taxpayers. It is also an important means of improving the management and allocation of scarce resources.

[*English*]

Other provisions of this bill would help certain commercial type government operations to respond in a more businesslike way by adjusting the level of service to meet client demand on a full or at least partially self-financing basis. This would both relieve pressures on the government's operating reserve and support the Public Service 2000 initiative with its clear emphasis on improving service to the public.

I would like to stress that neither the user charging nor the spending of revenue provisions containing these amendments would result in departments suddenly supplementing their appropriations with user fees. Only Parliament may authorize departments to spend revenues they collect. Fees would be prescribed by order and therefore would have to be published in *The Canada Gazette*. In addition, consistent with the government's regulatory process, which provides an opportunity for public input, users would be notified in advance and, where warranted, would be consulted prior to the establishment of fees.

Authority to spend revenues would have to be included in appropriation acts that Parliament would be asked to review and approve. These arrangements facilitate spending of revenues and create revolving funds which would be used only when it is considered that significant managerial improvement would result.

The government agrees with the Auditor General that spending of user fees should be restricted to specific existing activities. They would be tied directly to expenditures incurred and limited to actual out-of-pocket expenses. Cross-subsidy or diversion to other activities would be strictly prohibited.

• (1540)

These amendments would also support the financial arrangements necessary for more innovative and cost-effective forms of organization to deliver services to the public. An example of these is the new special operating agency concept that was announced on December 15, 1989.

With the passage of this bill, the Department of Finance would be assisted in its day-to-day management of the government's debt while some technical amendments would improve or clarify some 39 other sections of the Financial Administration Act, of which 25 deal with the accountability and control of Crown corporations.

Proposed amendments concerning Crown corporations are largely technical in nature, or build on established policies already in place and on lessons learned since the control and accountability regime for Crown corporations was extensively revised in 1984.

Members will be aware that an important element of the Comptroller General of Canada's cash management strategy, a successful strategy, that has saved taxpayers $1 billion since it began five years ago, is the recovery of millions of dollars of cash surplus to the needs of some Crown corporations.

The government proposes to amend the Financial Administration Act to require that corporate plans of profitable Crown corporations that operate in a commercial environment would provide a dividend payment strategy. With these changes to the act, commercially-successful Crown corporations would expect to provide a return on the investment made by taxpayers.

[*Translation*]

Although a minister responsible for Crown corporation and the Minister of Finance, with the approval of the Governor in Council, can now direct a Crown corporation to return surplus funds to the Consolidated Revenue Fund, there is no provision explicity for dividends that would make planning for dividends an integral part of the corporate planning process.

However, the government feels that these corporations have a responsibility to pay dividends to the shareholders—that is, to ALL Canadians—whenever they are capable of doing so. After all, in the private sector, it is considered normal that a shareholder earn a return on investment, and the government does not feel ordinary taxpayers should be shortchanged in this respect.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendments would enshrine the clear-cut expectation that commercial, profitable Crown corporations would be expected to pay dividends, just like their competitors.

Annual dividend proposals would be included as part of the corporate plans for Schedule III, Part II, corporations such as Petro-Canada, CN and Canada Post, although the Governor in Council would be able to waive or vary dividends, when considered appropriate.

[*English*]

To summarize the aims of this bill, it is felt that the passage of Bill C-91, an act to amend the Financial Administration Act, responds to the view of the majority of Canadians that the government should continue to adopt more businesslike practices and that the clients who use specific government services and facilities should pay their fair share of the costs of providing those services and facilities.

Consumers have told us that in the 1990s and beyond they will expect more quality and a higher level of service from the providers of goods and services, be they companies in the business community or governments. The Public Service 2000 initiative supports this expressed desire from the public, and Bill C-91 supports it as well.

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, the minister tells us that this bill meets the wishes of Canadians for more business-like practices, for the government to remain current with practices in the private sector and to operate in a more business-like manner.

On the other hand, it is presented as primarily a technical and housekeeping bill. I cannot express the concern with which I have just heard some of the minister's statements.

Less than a month ago, the minister and officials of the government made a commitment that there would be no legislative implementation of the directions of Public Service 2000 until there had been full consultation with employees and with their unions, and further consultation with the public.

The comments I have heard today have made it clear that the government is consulting with a very limited segment of Canadian society. The names one sees on the consultations throughout the process of PS 2000 make it evident that primarily large corporations are directing the tendency of this government and the ways it intends to practise. The commitments it made to its employees just a short month ago do not count at all. I must express to the minister my very bitter disappointment that he has chosen to take that approach today in speaking to this bill.

One thing that concerns me deeply is that there is a tremendous need for revitalization in the Public Service. There is a tremendous need for reform, for renewal of morale, commitment and excellence in the Public Service, one which the employees are willing and eager to co-operate with. In proceeding with the implementation of a plan that they have not been part of developing and in that they have not been part of identifying solutions and problems, the government is undermining any hope for realistic and lasting reform and revitalization in the Public Service.

The government may have heard the views of a certain segment of Canadian society that we should be operating more like the private sector. In my view that has not been appropriately or sufficiently balanced by the recognition that this is not the private sector. Our bottom line is not profit, but people.

I want to talk to some particular aspects of the bill. The minister mentioned that people would be consulted on various things that are being done with this bill. Yet today his very commitments to consultation with his own employees have not been kept.

We are seeing some major fundamental changes here in a number of ways. We are certainly seeing progress along the path of privatization and depublicizing the public sector that perhaps a limited circle of those with whom the minister and the government can consult are entirely in favour of but with which I think the majority of Canadians are not.

I want to address some of the changes made to Crown corporations. Nobody disagrees that there should be more accountability and that the ways in which that can be achieved should be achieved.

However, I also want to point out the tendency in this bill to look at profits rather than public policy as the major objective of Crown corporations. We have seen the devastating results in a number of areas from the government's basic approach of not believing in a public role for Crown corporations, of believing that when they become profitable they immediately no longer become a public sector operation. This bill paves the way for even more of that approach.

• (1550)

I want to remind the House of some of the areas in which the government seems to have forgotten the public policy role of Crown corporations.

I would mention VIA Rail. If this is an example of the government's concept of how a Crown corporation should operate in a more customer oriented way and in a more responsible way to deliver good service, I can assure members of the government sitting opposite that that is not what is happening.

It is now impossible, if one wants to travel by rail, to do it conveniently, to arrange to have a ticket conveniently, or to change one's travel plans conveniently. I can walk into any airport in this country and at the last minute decide that I am not taking one flight, that I am taking another, and switch my ticket. I cannot do that on VIA Rail. In fact I cannot even walk into VIA Rail, pick up my ticket on the basis of my Visa card, and get on a train. Students who come home for the weekend to visit their families, mostly because they want a nice hot meal on Sunday evening, cannot leave Ottawa and go back to Toronto, Montreal, or Kingston after six o'clock.

I would mention Air Canada and the approach of the government on privatization. I well remember a program just before Air Canada was privatized or put on the road to privatization. I would like to replay it in this Chamber today. I remember Mr. Claude Taylor saying how wonderfully he could manage Air Canada if only he were not hampered by the rules and regulations imposed on his by government. My private thoughts were: if he can manage

so well, why would he not manage in the public interest as well as in the private interest?

Now we see Air Canada, just a little over a year later, losing business. We see competitiveness in our air industry damaged beyond belief. We see reduced service, and we see increased costs.

We see the post office under this government's view of how Crown corporations should act, delivering a lesser and lesser level of service to fewer and fewer Canadians and abandoning all pretence at what this country is about, which is equality of service and equality of standards to Canadians across Canada.

I hesitate to accept that the changes being made in this bill as to how Crown corporations are going to report and how they are going to be held accountable will improve the functioning of Crown corporations. They will do nothing more than prepare them a little better for privatization and sell-off.

What has the public got out of the sell-off of Crown corporations? The selling of a Crown corporation and not using the proceeds to reduce the national debt is a little like selling your house to pay your heating bill. If you are selling off an asset, you should use it to reduce your capital obligations, and this government has not done that.

It has sold off billions of dollars of Crown corporations over the last six years. Has any of that money been used directly to write down the debt and to reduce the growing burden of interest payments on the taxpayers of Canada? I do not think so. If we look at the debt now compared to what it was when the government came to office in 1984, we see that it is more than double.

I would think that in making changes to help Crown corporations operate and in trying to make them more accountable this government should also be reaffirming its commitment to the idea of the public sector—public policy role of Crown corporations and their obligation to serve a public policy purpose as opposed simply to making profits.

If for instance we were amending the accountability processes for Crown corporations, this would have been an opportune time to include environmental auditing and the other various audits and mechanisms with which the bill deals, but it does not do that. It further reduces the obligation of the President of the Treasury Board to report to this House on how Crown corporations are exercising their accountability. It reduces that obligation from four times a year to once a year.

I think that is enough on Crown corporations. I would like to move on to some of the other financial management measures in this bill. One of the difficulties is that the public does not have a very good record of financial management by this government on which to judge this bill.

We are slightly suspicious of intentions to expand the use of collection agencies, especially as we see the government forcing more and more of the burden of taxation on to lower income Canadians. That will only be exacerbated when the GST is imposed. We see increasing discretion by ministers in this bill for forgiveness of debts to the government. Yet we see the ability to use collection agencies to go out and grab from Canadians the few dollars that they may not be able to pay.

I see very little in this bill that controls the use of collection agencies by this government. I would like to touch on one area where we have reason to be concerned about the failure of the government to explain adequately to Canadians how it is spending their money and how it is being accountable and responsible for their money.

I was shocked to be sitting at a meeting of Standing Committee on Public Accounts less than six months ago when a member of the committee asked if Treasury Board officials could tell us whether we are really saving money by downsizing the Public Service, for instance. They were asked if they could tell us how the cost of contracting out services, hiring contract people, hiring temporary agencies to perform work previously done by Public Service employees was saving us money, or how it compared to the cost of doing it with permanent, long-term committed Public Service employees. The shocking answer was that Treasury Board could not tell the public accounts committee that because it did not keep track of it. It is no wonder that Canadians have lost confidence in the financial management practices of the government.

I would like to refer to some of the cuts that were announced by the government last Friday which give us deep cause for concern. It was almost the atmosphere in which this was done. We saw the travesty of the Prime

Minister, for over a week before this announcement was made on Friday, attempting to create the impression that the government would be bringing in cuts to government programs and cuts to government spending in order to finance the efforts of our men and women in the gulf.

Instead we find out on Friday that the bulk of the overspending by government is not due to the efforts of those people who are serving us in the gulf. It is due to the high interest rate policy of this government. We have $2.5 billion of overspending to cover the increase in public debt charges due to the high interest rate policy of this government. It is the same high interest rate policy through which Canadians are losing their homes and their jobs. It has also increased the number of bankruptcies. People are losing their ability to keep their heads above water in difficult economic times. It is not our forces in the gulf that are causing this cut to government programs. It is $2.5 billion of overspending by this government, based on its own interest rate policy.

Then we have over $300 million additional spending on the goods and services tax, a tax that nobody wants. Where is most of this money going? It prepares to grab and gouge that tax from Canadians. Then the insult of insults: it prepares propaganda to convince them they like it. Even worse is to send out cheques, bribing them into thinking that next year they really want to pay more tax. For the Prime Minister to talk for over a week about the needs of our forces in the gulf and then to table this kind of financial information, where less than 10 per cent of the overspending is due to the forces in the gulf is an insult to Canadians and an abuse of those men and women who are serving us away from home.

• (1600)

I want to talk about a few other cuts that were announced on Friday. They are great examples of the financial mismanagement of this government. We are not going to refurbish or rebuild our Archives. We are going to go through another winter with freezing pipes and irreplaceable antique records and documents lost as they were last year.

A recently released spills report says that the government is incapable of responding to an even minor oil spill, much less a one. The coast guard is 25 per cent underfunded for what it needs to do in the area of protecting our oceans and our waterways.

The report of the Auditor General says there is no monitoring of ocean dumping whatsoever under Environment Canada. Again the Auditor General's report tells us that the enforcement of CEPA is tremendously lacking, that there were in total three convictions for violations of Canada's Environmental Protection Act out of well over 3,000 investigations.

The report that was tabled on Friday tells us cuts that the government has made in the past to the transport department now have to be reinstated because the aviation safety of Canadians can no longer be assured. The government was told that when it cut personnel from aviation safety, but it persisted with that cut anyway. Now here it is, having received a devastatingly, critical report on aviation safety in Canada which pointed out that we have twice the accident rate as exists in the United States. Now the government is reinstating jobs and operating money that it should never have cut in the first place.

Health and welfare, especially the health protection branch, is being cut when the costs of health care are increasing dramatically.

Employment and immigration is being cut while the Auditor General is criticizing the government for its mishandling of immigration and refugees, security clearances and its virtual lack of verifying the performance of entrepreneur immigrants.

We have cuts to unemployment and immigration when right now the Canada Employment Centres can do no more than hand out cheques. They cannot help people at a time of high unemployment to find jobs because they cannot help employers to find people who can fill their jobs.

We have the whole area of the environment in many departments which is suffering from cuts announced on Friday, despite the words of this government. We still have no clear explanation of why these cuts are being made. We have no clear explanation of why our armed forces at full strength, being paid for and equipped in Canada, suddenly are costing us hundreds of millions of dollars more because they happen to be in a different location.

The report of the Auditor General says there has been a steady drift to larger and larger numbers of officers and NCOs with fewer and fewer lineal units to lead. The senior ranks now appear disproportionately larger in

comparison with the over-all size of the forces and the number of line units. The Auditor General criticized the medical support system for the Canadian Armed Forces. It is not much wonder if Canadians and the Liberal Party view with suspicion any financial management bill that the government brings forward in light of its performance to date on these issues.

I want to mention a few specifics of this bill. The government is increasing the application of user fees to virtually anything that government or any agency connected with government touches. Yet it protects itself from fees. I noticed in the bill that where the government is charging more and more fees, the adjustment to those fees is automatic.

Now I do not imagine the bill is talking about downward adjustment of fees. The adjustment of fees is automatic, but we have discussed time after time in this House bills and challenged the government to put an automatic adjustment of benefits to Canadians into legislation or regulation without any success.

The clawback of old age security will affect more and more Canadians at lower and lower incomes because the government has failed to provide any automatic indexing to protect seniors in Canada against the growing clawback. As their incomes go up, as inflation goes up, those at lower and lower incomes unfortunately will be paying the clawback. Families with smaller and smaller real incomes will be paying the clawback.

But when the government brings in legislation that allows it to impose fees, it sure knows how to protect itself against inflation, but not Canadians.

In this bill the government charges interest on money owing to the government, even where the payment of that money has been an overpayment or a straight error by government. It wants to be able to go back, regardless of how long ago it was, and gouge that money back from the taxpayer and charge interest on top of that.

It wants to have penalties when bills are not paid within 30 days. But ask anybody who does business with the government how often they get paid within 30 days of submitting their bill.

This is the same government that has chosen to ignore whether or not laws are passed in imposing costs on Canadians. It is out there selling a tax that has not even been passed through this House. It is out there across the land collecting higher unemployment insurance fees from Canadians, back to last January, when it had no legislative authority to do so, and yet refusing to back-date the benefits for which those higher fees are supposed to pay.

It refuses to give mothers, parents, adoptive parents the benefits that the new bill entitles them to have, it refuses to give the training benefits that the new bill entitled workers in Canada to have, despite the fact that it has been charging those higher fees since January and it is now November.

The government has pocketed millions and millions of dollars out of the pockets of Canadian workers, money that was supposed to go to pay for unemployment insurance when they are out of work. There are hundreds of thousands more of them out of work now. The government has pocketed that money. It has not improved their benefits. It has not improved payment. It has not improved training programs. It has had 11 months of collecting increased fees without providing one bit of increased benefits to workers. It has left families wondering whether they will qualify for parental benefits based on whether or not they have a child on November 15 or November 16.

• (1610)

If the government can go back and retroactively collect fees totally illegally, everybody out there fails to understand why they cannot go back and also pay benefits to which Canadians are now entitled.

The government can pretend if it wants that this is a simple, technical housekeeping bill. It is far more than that. It is an instrument of the same right wing agenda that we have seen now for six years. That agenda has left us in a recession, with rising unemployment. It has left Canadians without the ability to hang on to their own homes in times of high interest rates.

Perhaps the member opposite would like me to sit down so he can get up and speak for a little while. He is making an awful lot of noise over there, but not an awful lot of sense.

We have growing bankruptcies. For the first time, we have a government that has deliberately driven this country into a recession, that has deliberately deprived people of a livelihood, that has deliberately made it

difficult or impossible for people to feed, clothe and house the family.

Finally, I want to repeat again what I said at the beginning of these comments. I do not see how this government expects those people to pay taxes and support the Government of Canada, expecting that they are paying for services that Canadians want, any level of trust whatsoever from the Canadian public when it deals with user fees, taxes, interest rates and Crown corporations, because this government is systematically dismantling the institutions of nationhood in this country.

The next election cannot come soon enough, and the defeat of this government cannot come soon enough.

**Mr. David D. Stupich (Nanaimo—Cowichan):** Mr. Speaker, may I say first that I appreciate the action of the minister in speaking to me briefly before he presented this legislation, telling me of his plans to introduce it and saying some of what he said today, that is, the bill is almost entirely housekeeping.

I am indebted to the research branch of the Library for having produced a study in quick order which endorses what the minister had to say, that is it is largely housekeeping without, of course, going into some detail.

I have taken the opportunity in the time that we have had to check with one of the labour organizations that represents a large number of government employees, and with the exception of a question relating to one of the sections, to this point, it has found nothing that would worry it as employees of the Crown.

Because of those facts and because of what I have heard about this minister to date from anyone who has had any dealings with him, I accept what he said at face value; that the bill is mainly housekeeping. This was confirmed by Library research, the opinion of the union members and, of course first and perhaps most important, the statement of the minister himself in a discussion that we had one afternoon and another evening.

I have some questions. This is sort of legislation that one cannot deal with really at second reading, because it just deals with, as the minister said, 70 different sections of the Financial Administration Act.

While I want to talk generally about it, I also want to raise some questions about some of the sections.

The minister mentioned not only that it deals with 70 sections but also that there was lengthy consultation. He did not say with whom he held the consultation. I would expect, from reading the legislation and the report that I have, that the consultation was entirely within the department and within Treasury Board staff itself.

I am not suggesting that there is anything wrong with that, but there will be an opportunity, I am sure, to ask at some later date when the bill is in committee just who was involved in the consultation and what kind of discussion there was.

During the course of his remarks, he suggested that when it comes to changing fees, for example, there would be further consultation with the people being affected. I am not sure just how meaningful that consultation will be. I expect when the minister or whoever makes a decision to change a fee—and on this I would agree with the member who preceded me—that if there is to be an adjustment of the fee, in all likelihood, it will be an upward adjustment. Any meaningful consultation will not really be engaged in, but it will simply be a matter of telling people why the government feels that the fee in this particular instance must be adjusted upward.

With regard to increasing the efficiency of service delivery, I do not believe the minister said that he was referring to the various recommendations that he has had from the Auditor General over the years. For some five years, the Auditor General has made recommendations and the Public Accounts Committee has made recommendations. I would suspect, from the reading I have done and from what I have heard, these recommendations have been more to urge increasing the efficiency of the delivery of service, than to try to adjust upward government revenues. Although, in the course of his remarks, the minister said that certainly one of the purposes of the legislation was to make a significant contribution to government revenue, he did not quantify that. I am wondering just exactly what that means, a significant contribution to government revenue.

I am aware of the province of British Columbia making some adjustments to fees over a period of about three years. When we added them all up at the end of the three years, we found out that these adjustments to fees were bringing in an extra $500 million a year. Significant

is, indeed, the word to use in an economy or a government in a province the size of British Columbia, compared to the Government of Canada. If we are looking at $500 million in the upward adjustment of fees over three years, what kind of a total we are looking at for the Government of Canada? It could be extremely significant. In that case, of course, I am sure there was discussion with the people being affected, as well, but it did not have any downward effect on the increases that were being made.

I just do not know about the changes in land management. I suppose, from the reading of the proposed legislation and the library report, it is simply doing as the minister said and as the report says, providing in legislation for what is currently the practice. If that is the case, then I think it is welcome and it is time we did it. I have no reason for thinking that it is anything other than that.

When it comes to charging interest on overdue accounts, it is hard to argue against that. People should pay their bills on time. We have to pay interest everywhere else, why not pay interest to the government as well? I am not thinking of individuals such as you and I, Mr. Speaker. I am thinking of the large corporations which make a practice of cash management to the benefit of the corporation and stretch everything as far as they can, particularly when it comes to paying the government and they take advantage of that. In these cases, it could be a significant contribution to government revenue and one that I would be in support of.

Again, as I have said earlier, to the extent that it is dealing with recommendations from the Auditor General, we can all be happy that the government is finally moving to legislate the changes. Some of the changes have already been made over the last two or three years, but the legislation has never caught up with the changes that the Auditor General or the Public Accounts Committee recommended. It is good housekeeping and it is good to have it done so the government will be acting in line with the Financial Administration Act and the Financial Administration Act is in keeping with government procedures.

Clause 6 deals with the increases in fees for services. Of course, my question there is, just how much money are we talking about. With $500 million in the province of British Columbia, here it could be several billions a year that the government is talking about getting out of the economy.

We do not know where these fees are going to be increased and who this is going to affect. There are some fees that can be increased, and quite properly, from a commercial point of view. A Crown corporation or a government service that is strictly commercially oriented should be paying the cost of that, and an increase is reasonable. But sometimes, it is hard to differentiate between a public service and a commercial operation.

• (1620)

For example, while Canada Post is not one of the ones listed in the schedule in the notes I have, there is a difference within the corporation of the service that it provides to the extent that, for example, it distributes and handles junk mail. That is strictly commercial. That kind of operation should be covering the cost of delivering so-called junk mail. To the extent that it provides rural mail delivery, then there is a service involved. It is not a service that necessarily should be carrying its own way in every division. For Canada Post to be operating the way it does with a policy of closing down rural post offices, of cutting back on rural mail delivery, and of privatizing the provision of the service of rural mail, I think is not in keeping with a crown corporation that is designed at least in part to provide a service to the public.

VIA Rail is another good example. The operations of parts of VIA Rail were cut down or done away with when it was providing a service, not necessarily a commercially successful service, but nevertheless providing the transportation service of people and/or goods. That service is important to a country such as Canada, a country that stretches from east to west for some 4,000 miles and that needs that kind of a link to keep us an east-west country, as opposed to one where the transportation links might very well become north-south links without the tying together effect of a national railroad or a couple of national railroads.

Therefore, there are differences. We cannot say that a Crown corporation has to provide that service at a profit unless we look at the various sectors of the operation of that Crown operation. While we might admit that some services can be delivered at a price that will provide a profit, there are others where that should not be the case, where the government should be prepared to provide that service as a means of doing something for

the people of Canada. I do not accept the principle that every Crown corporation has to operate at a profit.

When the government refers to adding corporations to Part 2 of Schedule III and that the corporations must be ones that are operated in a business way and that there must be a reasonable expectation of dividends, I have to wonder what corporations it is looking at. Does the government have in mind bringing in any particular corporations that are currently not being operated that way and making them profitable, first, by charging Canadian taxpayers enough for those services that those corporations will earn a profit? Does it have that kind of a program in mind or will it instruct those corporations to pay dividends to the Crown? If it does, it is simply another way of raising the taxes imposed on Canadians.

Some ten months ago in bringing in a budget, the government made much about saying that there were no tax increases in the budget. It forgot to mention it had imposed tax increases the year before, and even the year before that, that did not come into effect until 1990. While it did not, by legislation, bring in new taxes in 1990, it had brought in new taxes in previous years that became effective in 1990. Now, to say that it is going to do something else that, as I have suggested, could mean several billions of dollars of additional revenue for government, if it is going to take it away in dividends, while saying it is not increasing taxes, is not really telling the whole truth.

If one pays a little more for a postage stamp, in one's mind one is paying more to the government, even if it is a Crown corporation. It does not have to be called a tax. One knows that the government is taking more money and not giving anything back. Indeed, if we use Canada Post and VIA Rail as examples, it is taking more money away and giving less back. To say that it is not an increase in taxes is not telling the whole story.

What other plans does the government have? I do not think this particular section is simply doing something that the Auditor General recommended. I do not know, but I do not think it is. It seems to me that the government must have some specific plans for making certain Crown corporations profitable to the extent that they will be required to transfer dividends to the Crown, with a view of the Crown making more money without increasing taxes and yet taking that money out of the pockets of Canadian taxpayers.

I am pleased with one change that is being made and that is with regard to giving the government the authority to make payments by electronic means. It is makes it possible to make the payments more up to date, to be prompt with the payments, if you like, and to cut out some of the paperwork. It just makes it that much more efficient. I expect that that could well have been one of the recommendations of the Auditor General.

Among the important provisions are the requirements for regular reporting in corporate plans, budgets and annual reports, and extensive auditing requirements, including comprehensive and value for money audits known as special examinations. This was, of course, one of the recommendations of the Auditor General and on more than one occasion. It is well that this is now being provided for in the legislation. Let us hope that the government goes the next step, if it has not already—it may have done so in some instances—and actually does what it is saying it will do here in proposing this change in the legislation.

With respect to dividends paid by Crown corporations, I have a list of corporations that paid dividends in 1988 and 1989. Canada Ports Corporation in 1988 had dividends of $100,000; and in 1989, $70,000. To me, that is an example of a commercial operation that could quite properly be expected to operate at a profit and to return at least a portion of that profit regularly to the Crown.

Another one is the Canadian National Railways which is being required by law to make dividends of a certain amount. This legislation is being changed so that it will not be that tightly tied to what the dividend should be. Dividends in 1988 were $56.5 million and in 1989, $41.2 million.

Canadian National, it would seem to me, more so than the CPR, has been in the business of providing a service because of the very long linkages of tracks to remote areas that it inherited when it became the CNR when it took over all the companies that went under. It was part of a national policy to provide rail linkage to a lot of

communities throughout Canada, on the Prairies and in other provinces as well.

To say that corporation must provide specific dividends annually to the Crown is not playing fair with the Canadian people. If it is able to operate at a profit without decreasing the service to the people who it is serving, then, yes, I agree with it paying dividends. But a law previous to this change that is being made now required the CNR to pay these dividends every year. The only way it could get that money was to borrow it or to increase the charges on people who were expecting to get a service from this Crown corporation, rather than to have it operated at a profit.

The Halifax Port Corporation is another one. I think it is proper that the Montreal Port Corporation be expected to operate profitably and to make dividend payments.

Petro-Canada, nil. Of course, Petro-Canada has been discussed at some length in this House and probably will be again. It was an instrument of public policy. It is important that we develop energy resources in Canada. The government has chosen to bring in legislation to turn it over to the private sector. I am sorry this happened. I appreciate that I cannot reflect on a decision of the House. Petro-Canada did not pay any dividends. It was not in any financial position to do so, but it was making a significant contribution, on behalf of the Canadian people, of developing and helping to find and promote the development of energy resources. That was something that we needed in Canada, being the kind of country that we are, with the need for energy, and the fact that we use more per capita than any other country in the world. It was important to have an instrument of public policy that could be used in the energy field, in particular. It did not go far enough. It should not have been tied totally to petroleum energy. There were many other things that it should have been doing, but it had a record of not paying dividends, and it is small wonder.

• (1630)

The Royal Canadian Mint paid no dividend in 1988, but a dividend of $60.4 million in 1989. That is a good example of a commercial operation that could well be expected to operate at a profit and should be paying at least some of that profit to the Crown by way of dividends. I support that.

I am not opposed to the idea of Crown corporations paying dividends. I am opposed to legislation saying that they have to pay regardless of what they are making. I am opposed to them not being able to provide a service as part of their activities, but I am not opposed in general principle to some Crown corporations paying dividends. Clause 7 of Schedule III provided for the set dividend rate for Canadian National. This amendment would change that.

I have raised some questions about it. The most interesting one from my point of view is the one that I will be pursuing. No doubt this bill will be going to committee where we will have an opportunity to get into the details of the various clauses. The one I am really interested in is what the government is looking at by way of what the minister called a significant contribution to the government deficit. I believe that is the way he phrased it.

If this is a sneaky way for the government to raise a lot more money without bringing in legislation specifically saying that it is going to do some housekeeping with respect to the Financial Administration Act, and by that means trying to make a significant contribution to the government deficit, then I am opposed to that principle of the bill, if that is indeed the principle.

It is not spelled out. I cannot vote against the bill on the basis that it is designed, not to be housekeeping, but rather to make a significant contribution to the government deficit. I must say that I regret very much if the government is bringing in legislation such as this which in general is good housekeeping, but at the same time is going to use it in a way that it hopes will make a significant contribution to the government deficit.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Before resuming debate 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 area as follows: the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands—Environment; the hon. member for London East—Housing; the hon. member for Winnipeg North—Health.

Resuming debate.

**Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke):** Mr. Speaker, commenting on Bill C-91 today I have a number of points I wish to make, many of them pertaining to financial management or mismanagement thereof. Bill C-91 is an act to amend the Financial Administration Act and other acts in consequence thereof. If the average lay person is to read the contents of a bill of that nature and size, all I say is thank goodness for good researchers and advisers in this business.

Many of the improvements that are listed here have been recommended by public accounts committees over the years of their sittings in this House. A number of those have been accomplished recently by our public accounts committee. For example, there is the addition of sovereign loans that are unlikely to be paid are added to the national debt of Canada. Before they were just sitting there. Everybody knew that we would never collect many of those debts from foreign countries. It is a good move to bring those into the financial structure of the country, showing them as a national debt because undoubtedly we are going to have to cover them at some time in the future anyway. That has been a good move. It is one that the Auditor General has wanted for some time.

I have many comments that I want to make about this bill. While it brings out all the good points of government, we do not want it to be a cushion for the government to be spreading what it considers to be its good news and its updates and so on without also bringing in the basic and broad underlying weaknesses of financial management in Canada today. This bill is an act to amend the Financial Administration Act. It is a housekeeping bill in many ways on matters of a technical nature that have been evolving for the last five years in financial management and control practices of the government, recommended on many occasions by the Auditor General and the public accounts committee.

Many of these amendments are being made on recommendations of those two bodies. I congratulate the Auditor General on his very constructive remarks over the past number of years. I know that when you are in government you do not like the reports of auditors general sometimes. I sat on that side of the House for a number of years and I know what it feels like. It is very necessary in government to have a good auditor general and a good staff behind him. I think we are well served by the auditor general's organization, from all members of his staff and the way they serve the House of Commons of Canada.

There is nothing inherently wrong with this bill. As I said, it is a housekeeping bill. It is in most cases merely legitimizing into legislation the things that are current practice anyway. Therefore, the Liberal approach to this is that we are quite happy to see these changes formalized, but there have been many areas of mismanagement on the part of this government and it has no reason to pat itself on the back.

The public debt has doubled in five years from $170 billion to $351 billion. The scary part of it is that in spite of all the increases in taxes and the rhetoric of this government, we are now on our way to tripling the national debt in this country. That is a very scary thing indeed.

The government missed the opportunity to make meaningful reductions in the deficit during five years of world-wide economic growth. This government had five years of the best economic growth in the country. Even at that, the deficit and the national debt in this country continued to grow by leaps and bounds. Yet they campaigned in 1984 by telling all Canadians how simple it was going to be to bring the national debt of Canada under control. They have succeeded in their six years in power in increasing the national debt in this country by more than it has been increased in any period of time since Confederation. Not much of a record to be proud of, Mr. Speaker.

The deficit is increasing, not decreasing as the government would have us believe. Let us take a look at the figures. The deficit has risen from $28.1 billion in 1987-88 to $28.7 billion in 1988-1989 and to $30.5 billion in 1989-90. Many efforts have been made to save the face of the finance minister. This is about the third major round of cutting the Public Service of Canada and there is a feeling out there that when they do that, they are hitting Ottawa and area.

Just to clarify that point, I want to say that three out of four public servants in Canada live outside the National Capital Region. They are spread all the way across this country from Halifax to the west coast and from the south of Canada to the Arctic circle. It is very easy to attack public servants because they cannot stand up and defend themselves.

When you attack the Public Service, decrease the numbers of the Public Service, you can go around to those who believe that that is a great thing. You brag about it and say: "What a great fellow am I". Then they turn around and hire contractors to do much of the same work that public servants were doing before. They say: "We are saving money by doing this". Well, Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago we had the Treasury Board, the Privy Council and the Auditor General before the public accounts committee. I asked them specifically for a comparison of the costs of contracting out as opposed to the amount it would cost had those public servants been retained. They said: "Oh, yes, we can get you those figures."

• (1640)

It was not very long until I got a reply from them to the opposite. This is what Treasury Board had to say: "In connection with the information requested on personal services contracts which replace the use of public servants, the Treasury Board Secretariat does not collect such data. As far as we are aware, departments have not been gathering statistical data of that kind. We do not have data on what portion of the contract statistics that have been collected per the paragraph above would have replaced the use of public servants. Furthermore, our statistics would not likely incorporate all contracting out of services but only those captured by the criteria of the two special areas of interest."

On what grounds does any member of this government go around Canada saying: "We have decreased the Public Service from such a figure down to such a figure and boy, are we doing a good job." They say by contracting out they are saving money. Yet, they do not have any statistics to prove their point. That is just a bunch of rhetoric. It is really amazing what you find out. You are promised information. Then you find they do not have it.

When you cut the Public Service, you are not only downsizing the Public Service. You are downsizing the morale as well because people do not know when the hatchet is going to fall on them. This is not the way to get the best work out of your employees. The Public Service of Canada has been the scapegoat of this government on many occasions. This government is going to pay dearly for those attacks.

Federal tax revenues have increased by $50 billion since 1984. This government has increased its tax revenues by $50 billion since it gained power six years ago. The finance minister has had more than enough tax increases to reduce the deficit, but he has failed to do so.

Because of high interest rates, the deficit will be $4 billion to $6 billion higher in 1990–91, unless the government takes additional action to raise taxes or cut spending. It is after everybody to impress upon them how important it is that it cuts the deficit and how important it is to downsize the national debt. It then turns around and brings in a high interest rate policy that results in adding $4 billion to $6 billion to the national debt of this country. It then brags about its great success in financial management.

The high interest rate policy is keeping interest rates in Canada more than 4 per cent higher than they are in the United States. A public debt of $351 billion is equivalent to a personal debt of $25,000 for each Canadian taxpayer. Each Canadian must now pay $2,500 in taxes each year just to pay the interest on the federal government's debt. The government is on its way to tripling the national debt, and it has only been in power for six years.

The proportion of the debt owed to foreigners—and this is a crucial point that many Canadians will not take any heart in—has doubled under the Conservative government, from 10 per cent to 20 per cent. Before these people came to power, 90 per cent of the national debt was owned by Canadians and interest rates were being paid to those Canadians. Now, there is another 20 per cent being paid outside the country.

High interest rates have caused Japanese and European investors to purchase Government of Canada securities. This means that more of Canada's future wealth will have to be paid to foreigners in interest, and the government calls this good financial management.

The Conservative policy has been to shift its deficit systematically to the provinces and to other levels of government. This is a serious situation. You are not cutting anything in Canada when you simply shift your problems over to another level of government.

Cuts to transfer payments to the provinces for health care and post-secondary education squeeze provincial budgets. Cuts to unemployment insurance push more people on to welfare, which costs the provinces and the municipalities more money. Federal spending cuts even-

tually result in higher provincial taxes and higher municipal property taxes.

When people across Canada have a major increase in their municipal taxes and an increase in their provincial taxes, it may well be due to the fact that the federal government is unloading more of its debt and more of its administrative difficulties on to the provinces and on to municipalities in order to try to make itself look good.

On Friday in the House the Minister of National Defence said the government had no plans for emergencies or crises. Yet in 1988 this government passed the Emergency Preparedness Canada Act, which has been legislation now for over two years. We know and all Canadians know that this government does not prepare itself for any crisis. It is running helter-skelter from one crisis to another. The fact is this government has become the crisis in the eyes of Canadians.

Canadians have a plan in place to look after that crisis and will put that plan into operation in the next election. We will see a lot of changes on the other side of the House. I feel sorry for some of the back-benchers on the other side of the House because there are many good people over there. They will be drowned in the mismanagement procedures of this government, because they stand every day and support this government. If they stand and support something that is wrong, then they must be wrong too.

There is another item I want to mention. I have gone through the Public Service. We do not know how many more contracts will be let to do the work of the public servants who will bite the dust as a result of last Friday's announcement by the government. That is sad. This government should be ashamed of itself.

Just before it got the free trade agreement signed with the United States, the then Minister for International Trade, Pat Carney, who now in the other place, signed the memorandum of understanding bringing in that infamous 15 per cent export tax on Canadian softwood lumber going into the United States. She agreed to it, and she has recently been awarded a Senate position as a reward for her actions in attacking the forest industry in Canada.

That has hurt the Canadian forest industry since day one because American financiers assisted their forest industry in the northern United States, lent them money to build up their equipment and to improve their operations, and today they are able to compete very successfully. They are taking over what used to be traditional Canadian markets in the United States. We used to sell lumber as far south as Tennessee. That is not happening any more. We are having difficulty even getting it across the border. Thousands and thousands of people have been laid off in the forest industry in this country. There was a time not very long ago when 11 per cent of the Canadian labour force was employed in the forest industry of Canada.

• (1650)

Many companies have tried selling their products in Europe, in countries like Britain, France, Germany, and Italy where there is a good market for Canadian forest products. The problem is that it has been 90 or 120 days before they have their accounts receivable, get their money back. They have to go out and borrow money for their operations at the high interest rates of the Minister of Finance and the Governor of the Bank of Canada, Mr. Crow, who have no consideration for these people at all.

The government is pulling the rug from underneath one industry communities in this country. When that goes, the other infrastructure or the other service industries around it start going down too. Of course, by propping up these high interest rates, an artificially high value is being created for the Canadian dollar, which is hurting that export market as well. This is what the government calls good management.

I just want to say here that in the last meeting of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, we went over an item with regard to external affairs, wherein the existing organizational structure and processes in the Department of External Affairs do not provide adequate control of moneys advanced to employees. The amounts involved, according to departmental records, have increased from $15 million on March 31, 1986 to $25 million on March 31, 1990. There is no management there at all. The Auditor General found that there is no

clear accountability for monitoring, following up, and recovering amounts due to the Crown.

I have before me here a list of some of these accountable advances that have not been repaid, accounted for or recovered, and then details of accountable advances outstanding as at April 30, 1990. These are advances that have not been paid back. On that list is a P. Carney with a 2 after it. What External Affairs is telling the Auditor General is that that person has two outstanding amounts of money owing to that department. Of even more interest, down at the bottom is the name J. Clark with 8 in brackets after it. That means he has eight accountable advances that have not been recollected. Some of these things are three years old.

**Mr. Worthy:** Read them all out.

**Mr. Hopkins:** If I wanted to read them all out, I would be here until ten o'clock tonight; they are all in there. A lot of this, I am pointing out, is due to inefficiency of accounting. The Auditor General says that there is no real accounting. Do we really know that these people owe the money? That is the question.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Hopkins:** Mr. Speaker, I have succeeded in getting them going over there. I want to talk about farm marketing boards because if we lose our farm marketing boards in Canada we lose our farmers. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for your patience. I would like to go on and talk about the importance of our own food production and our own health controls in our food production in Canada. We cannot destroy our food production and then have to import artificial foods and all other kinds of things from abroad, where we do not have the direct control of the health services when those foods are processed.

We have it now in Canada. We have our farmers. For heaven's sakes, let's keep them.

**Mr. Dave Worthy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs) and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to the last hon. member, and I have to say I was very disappointed.

His last couple of comments were not something that I would normally expect from him. To single out a former minister and a current minister of all the names that may be there with no explanation and to use it in the House is not something that I would have expected him of all people to be party to. I just have to say that I am disappointed. There has been a number of comments today by the last speaker as well as by several others on financial management. I sit here in horror when listening to how they describe it and end up somehow or other saying that this government is guilty of mismanagement, especially when it pertains to our deficit and our debt.

I remind hon. members opposite that when the Progressive Conservative government took office in 1984 the difference in the operating statement of the country—and I am not a fancy man with figures but I understand operating statements—between the revenue brought in and what was spent was $16 billion in deficit. The government of that day was $16 billion in a year more than it brought in.

This government has progressively tried to make a difference in that regard. The difference this year between the revenue we bring in and what we spend on operating programs is a $10 billion surplus. From a $16 billion deficit to a $10 billion surplus is called good management. It has been done through a combination of restraint on government spending as well as a judicious increase of taxes. There is no question. That is what this country needs.

I am not going to blame the Liberals for all the debt that was built up before, although they were the government. I believe that if as Canadians we are prepared to let a government continue to spend more and more, year after year, than it brings in in revenue, we as a Canadian people are responsible.

For a period of 15 years the people and the Government of Canada spent progressively more and more every year than they brought in in revenue. Since the Conservatives took office that trend has been reversed. In fact there is some hope for this country, some light at the end of the tunnel. That in fact is what I call proper financial management.

There are many more things to be done. There are many more things that can be done, but we have to give credit to the government that took the tough action to do what was necessary to have a $26 billion turnaround in six years. That is good, sound financial management.

**Mr. Hopkins:** Mr. Speaker, I cannot get over the self-righteous attitude of the hon. member opposite. I am surprised at him. He talked to me about putting names on the record. I sat over there for a number of

years and I know what was said over here, but I will tell him this.

The entire list of all these figures was before the public accounts committee less than a week ago. We discussed all this. As I said at the end of my speech, the accounting processes are such that we do not know whether they are paid, whether they are not paid, but they are there. There are pages of names, and we have to bring this out. But they are public knowledge. Anybody across Canada can read them, so the member should not say that is a terrible thing to do.

He says that they are making great progress with over a $30 billion deficit this year, much of it—$4 billion to $6 billion of it—caused by their own high interest rate policy. He should not start to scream and blame everybody else on a self-righteous basis.

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke missed the point of my hon. friend, and I am going to bring it up again. The hon. member has been the chairman of the public accounts committee. He knows very well that the list he read from, when speaking about people who have outstanding accounts on travel advances, is a snapshot at any one time. I know he just mentioned J. Clark, when speaking about the Secretary of State for External Affairs, but he knew damned well who he was talking about and he did it on purpose. The minister goes on many trips on behalf of the government and at the time the account was audited there were outstanding accounts. The inference was that these were not being paid.

• (1700)

If the hon. member was honest with the House, he would also read the names of the members from his own party who happen to be on that list. My point is this. I would not name them anymore than I would name anybody else because, at that particular time, there are outstanding advances. I think we all, as members of Parliament, at some time have outstanding advances. A number of members of Parliament take three or four airplane tickets at a time so that if they have to make a trip in a hurry, they have an airline ticket. That is charged in advance. The hon. member should be honest with the House. He left the impression that these people are not paying their accounts. That is very unfair, he knows it and I wish he would correct it.

**Mr. Hopkins:** Mr. Speaker, obviously they have been so enthralled with their self-righteous attitude across the way, that they missed the entire point. I said that the accounting procedures are so bad that they do not know whether the bills are paid or not. One can read these names all night long. Even the minister knows these are public knowledge. The minister says that one should not do so, but is it wrong to discuss something that is public knowledge? Is it wrong to say that some of these are perhaps paid and some may not be. I said that at the end of my speech. The accounting procedures are so bad that they did not know which ones are paid and which were not.

**Mr. McDermid:** I see.

**Mr. Hopkins:** The hon. minister is so busy shouting and screaming that he does not have time to listen. If he had been listening, he would have heard that. But the minister's comments always lead him astray. I do not see anything wrong with discussing in this House what is public knowledge.

**Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale):** Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member tell us if he has any evidence that the Minister of Finance is borrowing money. If not, would he assume that this is because, even the minister, himself, feels interest rates are too high?

**Mr. Hopkins:** Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Finance puts interest rates so high, they become attractive to investors in Japan and other countries that they start coming in here and buying up our securities then, naturally, we are going to have all this debt transferred to the foreign marketplace. This is dangerous to Canadians. If you are paying interest to Canadians that is one thing but, when you pay interest to foreigners, that is a different thing.

Canada was in a much better position on this than was the United States. Just a short time ago the Americans were paying far more interest to foreigners than they were to Americans. We, in Canada, do not want to continue that procedure here because, if we ever get into a position where we are paying more interest out of the country than we are paying to Canadians inside of the country, then we are in serious shape. At the time this government came to power, 10 per cent of our debt interest was being paid outside of the country and now 20 per cent is being paid outside of the country. By

increasing the interest rates, the Minister of Finance is destroying his own case.

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** Mr. Speaker, I want to take the opportunity to speak to this bill because I think that this particular piece of legislation is much more important than has been indicated and is much more than bare housekeeping. Within this bill is the expanding of authority or power, giving it to the Treasury Board, taking it from other ministers and other acts. It is put into the area of an Order in Council and regulations under the Treasury Board.

When the minister let slip that this was going to be one of the pieces of legislation that was going to help to eliminate the deficit, he really meant that, because within this particular piece of legislation is the authority for Treasury Board to define what is a service. There is no definition of a service or a facility in the bill.

If that is looked at a little more deeply, it will be found that that can mean a considerable amount more than would appear on the surface. The umbrella legislation is the Financial Administration Act. It affects every department and every movement of funds between departments. It is umbrella legislation under which the government is supposed to be able to control the financial structure of its operations.

If the operations which are presently the responsibility of every one of the departments are centralized under the Treasury Board, and the government decides it wants a 15 per cent or a 20 per cent increase, it can do it right across the board without any problem at all. It does not have to go to each minister or act to get the authority under that act to change the regulations because it can now be done centrally.

I think that is the danger of this particular piece of legislation. It puts into the hands of the Treasury Board and the cabinet much more power than they have had in the past. It is the kind of power which allows them to fleece the citizens of Canada without coming to Parliament, or without going to the department which knows the most about the particular charges that are being made. It gives the Treasury Board the authority to define what a service is and how much should be charged for it.

A little later on, Mr. Speaker, I will point out the kind of things that I think this may turn into if the government wishes it to.

I want to spend a little bit of time going over a couple of things in the bill that I think prove my particular point. Clause 6 which amends section 19 of the act says:

> The Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Treasury Board,
>
> (a) by regulations prescribe the fees or charges to be paid for a service—

No definition of a service.

> —or the use of a facility provided by of on behalf of Her Majesty in the right of Canada, by the users or classes of users of the service or facility; or
>
> (b) to authorize the appropriate Minister to prescribe by order those fees or charges, subject to such terms and conditions as may be specified by the Governor in Council.

In other words, if I read this correctly, it takes out of the hands of the minister and puts into the hands of the Governor of Council and the Treasury Board the right to collect any fee on any service and any facility that has anything to do with the Government of Canada.

I wonder if we realize how many times we have touched the Government of Canada and if this kind of power is given to the Treasury Board they can charge us for it? I do not think it is nearly as much of a housekeeping bill as the minister has indicated.

• (1710)

I want to spend a minute on the schedule relative to interest. It is interest on money owed to the government. This bill gives the authority to the government, to the Treasury Board, to charge interest on any fee or debt that is owed to the government by any citizen of Canada or any corporation that owes the Government of Canada.

At present that ability, as far as the government is concerned, is in the Income Tax Act as revenue but it is not part of any other act. Mr. Speaker, if you have tried to collect interest from the government, you will find it is impossible. I hope that this particular indication that the government is now giving itself authority to charge interest on something that is owed to it, that it is going to reciprocate. If one has waited for six months or six years, as sometimes happens, for the government to pay a bill, one should be able to charge interest on it. Try to do it now, Mr. Speaker, there is no way that you can charge interest on a bill, regardless of how long the government has had it in hand and not paid it.

I have cases in my files where the length of time has been years. I have one case where the government did not pay a bill for six years. In this case, a corporation which did some turfing for the government has collected only the basic bill after six years. If the government is going to have the right to collect interest on money owed to it, then it must also give the right to Canadian citizens to collect interest.

I am a little worried about the section on collection agencies. Knowing the basis under which this government has given out contracts to work for the government, if one is a private individual, it would appear to me that this opens up a tremendous area for the friends of the government. This could result in more patronage without any control over how much the government is going to pay for that service.

The government is going to give the collection of money over to lawyers or collection agencies. I mention the Farm Credit Corporation. Only a government supporting lawyer may apply. I have a feeling that when it comes to a collection agency or a lawyer working for the government, only if one is a government supporter may one apply.

In the Farm Credit Corporation the lawyers know the business so well that the day the government changed, the lawyers turned over their files. I think that that needs to be looked at very thoroughly and we must look at it very closely in committee.

The right of remission is also in this bill. The right of remission is always there, of course, in money that is paid to the government, at least in most cases. It is there statutorily. For instance the automobile companies in Canada used to pay duty on parts coming in from the United States. Statutorily, once they had fulfilled the requirements of the auto pact, they got back the duty that they had paid. What happens in this bill is much more open again to finagling, manipulation and patronage because the decision as to whether or not there shall be remission is not statutory, it is in the hands of the minister. We should look at that very thoroughly.

My friend from Renfrew has gone, but I want to point out that section 20 of this act may be put in there for a particular reason. Section 20 gives Treasury Board the authority to collect from people who fail to pay back money owing to the Crown. That list of people who had advances and neglected to pay them back can, under this act, be collected from, so it is not all bad. I must say when I get to that point, that it is not all bad.

There are a lot of things in here that I, and other members of the Public Accounts Committee have pointed to over the years as needing to be cleaned up. A lot of that has been done in this act. I have not had much time to go through it, so I hope that in that sense the minister is correct and that there is a lot of housekeeping in the act done to allow the government to operate a little more effectively than it has in the past.

On page 11 of the act, there is a clause on lapsing. The Financial Administration Act in the past required that if a department still had money in its coffers at the end of the year, then that money lapsed and was returned to the General Revenue Fund. For a civil servant or a director of a particular department, that is annoying and causes a tremendous amount of expenditure during the last month which is usually not good expenditure, but it did have a certain quality in that the control of the financing was there all the time.

Many civil servants will be very pleased with this change, but I wonder about its value and whether it should really be in here. It states that at the end of the fiscal year the money will not lapse in quite the same way. Money unexpended at the end of the fiscal year, after adjustments for the recording of debts incurred and other amounts due and owing, referred to in Section 37(1), shall lapse. It lapses except for the amount that you can show you owe. There is no department, corporation or agency that is going to go into the next fiscal year without making sure that anything that is possible to be charged for last year will be put on that account.

There is only one other area I want to cover, and that is the section on Schedule III. Earlier, I suggested that the definition of services and the definition of the fee would be left up to Treasury Board. The definition of the service covers a much larger area than you would expect. I will only use some of the examples in the act because there is no limitation to these particular areas of control. The act allows any department any kind of service, but they are not exact.

• (1720 )

It allows the establishment of fees under the Aeronautics Act. In flying around in the northern part of the country, either in the provinces or in the Northwest Territories, one depends entirely upon the navigation assistance available to one at no charge. Is that going to be charged? Or, is any kind of flying assistance going to be charged? At the moment, no, but if the government decides that it wants to eliminate the deficit fast enough, it may charge for the air one uses, as it has some responsibility for it.

There are multiple services that are made on agricultural products. With regard to inspection fees, if one is selling grain, there are grading responsibilities and the grain commission. There are inspection fees for meat and seed grain, the certification of seed grain, the certification of particular breeds of animals, and the importing inspection. All of those are services which have been sometimes charged for, but, most often, not. This would allow Treasury Board to start charging for all of those services. It should charge at the level that it thinks the traffic can stand.

I am sure that the government thinks it is being reasonable, but the people who really know what is going on are the people who are working with these agricultural products. The Department of Agriculture would be the logical people to do it. I would hope that it would do it jointly. When done under the Department of Agriculture, it is required to put it as part of the appropriation bill. This does not even require that. If I understand this correctly, it will no longer have to be made part of that appropriation bill as it is presently.

Under the Canada Pensions Act, the Unemployment Insurance Act, the Financial Administration Act and the Petroleum and Gas Act, Part III is repealed. This leaves me at a loss because I do not know what Part III is. That is the kind of thing we are being faced with. This bill came out a couple of days ago. No one has been able to go through it as thoroughly as we should have been able to do.

One section refers to the national parks and determining or describing the manner of determining fees, rates, rents and other charges for use of resources and facilities in parks for issuance of licence and permits for the provision of service materials and works. That is going to become part of the responsibility of the Treasury Board. Is the Treasury Board the place where that should be? I think not.

In the case of the Canada Shipping Act, for instance, is de-icing a harbour going to become one of the things that is chargeable? Is search and rescue going to be one of the areas that is going to be chargeable? If one's husband disappears while out at sea, is the seaman's wife going to be charged for search and rescue? Under this act, it is possible.

**Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to participate in this debate on Bill C-91, the amendments to the Financial Administration Act and other acts in consequence thereof.

I recognize, as do other members of my party, that this bill is primarily a housekeeping measure. Essentially, it implements in the way the federal government manages its finances, its cash, and its billing procedures and collection of accounts, recommendations which have been already made over the last few years by the Auditor General, the Comptroller General, and the public accounts committee. Therefore, it modernizes and brings up to date various aspects of the financial management activities of the government. In that respect, we are certainly not opposed to that practice.

However, there are a number of aspects of the bill which lead to questions, particularly as they interact with the whole regulatory process of the government. Here we have legislation through which the government presents its policies, some of which involve increased taxes or increased charges of user fees and which are debated here on the floor of the House of Commons, and in many other areas, particularly those that have the designation of Governor in Council or approval through Treasury Board, through Governor in Council or which, in effect, involve regulatory changes. They do not get debated on the floor of the House of Commons necessarily, but in fact are introduced quite surreptitiously by pre-publication in *The Canada Gazette*. Following a short notice period, they then become regulations and have the force of law for those people who are affected by them.

Some of these regulations can be very complex and can be very difficult for the member of Parliament and for professionals, let alone the ordinary Canadians, to un-

derstand their import and to be able to comment on their impact before the regulations come into force.

One provision in particular that I have noticed in the bill that we are discussing today, combined with these regulatory powers that are available through the Treasury Board and through the Governor in Council, has a major effect on a program and a charge which applies to a large number of municipal units and voluntary agencies across the country. It is on that point that I would like to develop my argument this afternoon.

The clause that I am dealing with in the bill is clause 6, which amends section 19 in the Financial Administration Act. It broadens the application. Clause 6 would repeal Section 19 and substitute the following for it:

> "19.(1) The Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Treasury Board,
>
> (a) by regulation prescribe the fees or charges to be paid for a service or the use of the facility provided by or on behalf of Her Majesty in right of Canada by the users or classes of users of the service or facility—

There are other clauses that essentially broaden the range of services and user charges for which the Treasury Board or the Governor in Council may prescribe regulations. One of the additions in the bill, as I understand it, is that while broadening the category of user charges, the bill also includes rights or privileges conferred by the Crown by means of a licence, permit or other document, and these also may be subject to user fees and charges and subject to regulation which would be introduced without going through Parliament, but merely through Governor in Council on recommendation of the Treasury Board.

• (1730)

There is a case now that will have a devastating impact in my constituency in particular and many other constituencies of a rural nature in Canada which has to do precisely with this point. I am speaking of an act which was introduced in the last Parliament, the Radiocommunications bill, Bill C-3 which in effect made changes to the Radiocommunications Act to increase user fees and licence fees for those in the public sector who used radio services and had radio licences.

What the Act did was enable the government to charge fees in a broader category of users of radio licences. The minister, at the time, assured this House that these additional charges would only apply to provincial and federal government agencies. They would not apply, for example, to municipalities that have radio licences for their use for local police protection, search and rescue, fire protection, emergency measures and they would also not apply to voluntary agencies, agencies like fire departments which are comprised of volunteers and perform the same types of services on a voluntary basis often over a wide area and for which there are no charges for these services.

The then Minister of Communications exempted municipalities and voluntary fire departments from those additional charges. What has happened since the election is through the regulatory route, the Minister of Communications has introduced by regulation, by Governor in Council, through the *Canada Gazette* in January of this year, and with very little contact in particular with the voluntary fire departments, which are most affected by this measure, provisions to the Radiocommunications Act regulations, drastically increasing licence fees for municipalities, voluntary fire departments and imposing an incredible burden on those organizations which are composed of volunteers in rural areas and do not have the funds to meet those obligations, but require radio licence fees to perform their essential tasks.

This regulatory change, which was permitted one month of pre-publication through the *Canada Gazette*, is a most arcane and complex piece of regulation, combined with a schedule which would require a whole company of accountants a month to figure out, let alone the fire departments that were affected. Of course, it went right by the voluntary fire departments that were most affected. They have discovered since then that they are now saddled with an enormous increase in their radio licence fees.

For example, the Strait Area Mutual Aid Association, which is a group of 25 volunteer fire departments located in the area around the Strait of Canso, paid licence fees last year which totalled $236. With the passage of this regulation in February, without their knowledge, they are subject since April 1 of this year with a licence fee for their radios of $8,574 for this year. That is something like a 3,600 per cent increase in their radio licence fees. Next year, that is to say the 1991 fiscal year, they will have to

pay an additional $8,574 or $17,148 for their radio licence fees. They are unable to meet that charge.

What is going to happen, and this illustrates the false economy which this government in slavishly attempting to apply this principle of user pay across the board to voluntary fire departments, voluntary mutual aid associations, local police forces, and municipal governments, is this will shut down municipal fire protection and search and rescue in rural areas, such as my constituency.

These services are essential. These people, for no pay, at considerable expense to themselves and risk to their lives and a major time commitment, provide fire protection for people's homes and for the few federal government buildings which exist in rural Canada, Search and Rescue which means safety for many people who are lost, and a whole range of other services.

What is going to happen if this is allowed to go forward is that these services are going to dry up. The government is going to have to replace them with paid services made up of paid firemen and paid local search and rescue organizations. The cost of these services is going to skyrocket and the fabric of these communities will be weakened. This is happening through a regulatory process which will be made easier by the amendments in this bill. I want to underscore the importance of this particular proposed measure being withdrawn and, if it can be done through this legislation, it has to be done.

I want to give a personal example of how important this is. In 1981, long before I was a member of Parliament or had even contemplated being a member, I was home for Christmas. On Boxing Day, I went cross-country skiing with my brother. We got lost in the woods. If it had not been for the voluntary efforts of our local search and rescue organizations in the area of Margaree Forks, from where I come, and the surrounding communities of Cheticamp and Inverness and the voluntary fire departments, using radios to communicate and to search, at night, in the woods behind our place to find me and my brother who were completely lost in the woods, we would be dead, frozen corpses, and I would not be here to make this point today.

That is the kind of service which these voluntary agencies provide and which is going to be completely scrapped if theses exorbitant radio licence fees are allowed to go through. These licence fees applications have been introduced and mentioned in *The Canada Gazette*, without being considered at all in the House of Commons. They went through the regulatory process. I do not, in principle, object to the fact that the government permits the Governor in Council to issue regulations. That simplifies the legislative process and, of course, there are many things which cannot possibly be put into legislation. I am not objecting to that principle but I am just saying, relative to Bill C-91 in particular, the new expanded clause 19 in the Financial Administration Act, which that bill will allow for, is going to expand the powers of the Governor in Council to introduce the kinds of regulations which the Minister of Communications issued earlier this year. This is going to make it absolutely impossible for mutual aid, fire departments, and rural municipalities to perform basic functions which are essential to those communities and which are now provided on a voluntary basis by these community groups. This relates directly by the channel of the regulatory process to the financial management provisions which are contained in this legislation.

• (1740)

Once again, Mr. Speaker, while I am not opposed to the principle of updating and modernizing the financial and cash management practices of the government, particularly as they have been found deficient by the Auditor General, the Comptroller General or through the hearings of the public accounts committee, I do believe that this particular aspect of this legislation ought to be gone over again in light of those very Draconian fee increases introduced by the Minister of Communications for radio licence fees earlier this year and which are really going to hurt voluntary organizations in communities in my riding and also, I suggest, in many other communities that are of a rural nature across Canada. They cannot bear these fees. They are going to be unable to function if they are going to be saddled with these fees.

That is the main point I want to raise in connection with Bill C-91. I would ask that if this bill goes forward to committee that that clause in the bill be given very careful scrutiny in light of the points I have mentioned.

**Ms. Ethel Blondin (Western Arctic):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased and honoured to rise in the House to speak to Bill C-91, an act to amend the Financial Administration Act.

If any one part of the country is impacted by the Financial Administration Act as administered by the federal government and to be adhered to by the various jurisdictions in this country, it has to be the Northwest territories. The government of the Northwest Territories, as you well know, is governed by the NWT Act and the government of the Northwest Territories is not a constitutional entity unto itself. It is in fact an extension of the federal government and is so managed.

On April 1, 1990, a new formula financing arrangement went into effect between the federal government and the government of the NWT. The immediate financial impact of the new arrangements is the reduction of the 1990-91 grant to the government of the Northwest Territories of about $25 million. Over the next five years, the reductions will amount to about $110 million. Not only are these cuts damaging to the NWT's fiscal position but the new formula contains serious flaws which will limit our ability to develop the northern economy.

It is particularly serious in that the Northwest Territories, at a time when the goods and services tax would definitely be an imposition and the high interest rate policy dominates all discussions on the economy, the new unemployment insurance bill, which definitely impacts the north because of the high seasonal employment situation that exists there, will have devastating effects on people in Canada's north.

Essentially it is to say that any kind of legislation that comes from the federal government definitely has an impact on the north in a disproportionate way than it does in any other region of Canada in that the ties are very close. Although we have an act that we are governed by, we definitely are still an extension and we still have these huge transfers that we have to adhere to strict regulations to manage these resources by.

Having said that, I guess we could assume that in the territories we have been virtually taken off the transportation grid. There have been major cutbacks which will have a very devastating effect on the north, in that the north has a very high cost of travel for its public. Essentially, most of the travel is by air and most of the communities serviced are by air travel. There really is not the kind of infrastructure that exists in other parts of Canada.

As far as the communications grid is concerned, I guess essentially the million dollar cutbacks referred to in the budgetary cutbacks of a few days ago will definitely have an impact on the voice that the north has through this particular mechanism to communicate.

In terms of communications and the Financial Administration Act, I suppose the north would be in a position, as would every other community in the south, to be on an equal playing field in terms of its infrastructure, but the north lags behind.

In the last two months Gordon Wray, the Minister of Tourism and Economic Development for the Government of the Northwest Territories, stated in terms of a major transportation strategy he presented to his legislature: "Our transportation infrastructure lags far behind anywhere else in Canada and must be improved. Our lack of adequate roads, airports, docks and harbours handicaps our economic growth. A better transportation system will create opportunities for mining, tourism, fishing, trade and travel between communities".

This is a major concern of the territories. Finding the investment dollars for communities in the north would be a major consideration for this particular portfolio and this particular minister. It is of the utmost importance for this particular government to have the moneys to administer in a responsible way under the Financial Administration Act. It should be able to get returns instead of always playing catch-up and trying to build an infrastructure at the same time, which is degrading.

What I mean by that is that the strategy includes major program initiatives and a substantial financial commitment. The minister states that at current levels we would spend some $1.65 billion over the next 20 years on transportation. Achieving the four strategic objectives would require expenditures of $4.32 billion, representing an increase of $2.6 billion.

In the fiscal arrangement or the new formula financing arrangement that went into effect on April 1, 1990, it seems very hopeless to put forward any kind of an economic initiative for the north when we have the kinds of arrangements that are essentially going to degrade the future economic prospects of the north by $110 million over the next five years. The reality is that this is

definitely a need. This is something that is undeniable to the economic well-being of the north.

The Government of the Northwest Territories has assumed a significant role in the northern transportation mandates. Northerners will be the recipients of the economic, social and political benefits of the transportation strategy proposed by Mr. Wray. The Government of the Northwest Territories, therefore, must be prepared to contribute a substantial share of the required investment. However it should not be alone.

The minister goes on to say in a further statement that the transportation strategy will be a catalyst for the economic, social and political development of the Northwest Territories into the 21st century. It will benefit current generations of northerners and Canadians and establish a legacy for the north.

He also says that despite the fact that the GNWT has signalled its commitment to transportation as a catalyst for the long-term economic, social and political health of the north, the scale of investment required cannot be made without the participation of Canada, the provinces and the private sector. These partners will be shareholders of the benefits. They must also be prepared to share in the investment.

• (1750)

Having said that about the whole infrastructure of the north, I want to mention a number of other important realities that my constituents in Western Arctic are faced with in dealing with this fiscal arrangement as governed by the Financial Administration Act and the federal government in the relationship they have to deal with these major funding transfers.

The reality for my constituents is that they are faced in their everyday life with the need for economic security. Not only are they beyond the communications grid and the transportation grid, but basically the north is in the pre-industrialized setting. Having reflected on this a bit, I would say that everybody who knows Canadian history knows that it was fur that built this country.

As of late that particular industry or traditional economy has fallen on hard times. It will probably be the lowest return for hunters and trappers in that particular area. They are severely impacted by whatever kind of budgetary decisions are made at the federal level in arrangements with the territorial government. Territorial communities, all 39 in my riding, are essentially in a pre-industrialized area. They do not have the kinds of opportunities that southern communities have. They do not have the same opportunities when it comes to businesses and the infrastructure that is needed. They do not have the opportunities to pick and choose the kinds of services that are contracted and the kinds of goods that are imported and bought. It is all very costly for the people in the north.

Turning to the need for economic security and the need for public infrastructure, all the while with high regard for the environment, and the need to settle some rather major land questions that have gone by the wayside, the Government of the Northwest Territories is fully cognizant of how it should in fact relate to the Financial Administration Act.

In the information released by the Auditor General, it was clearly stated that land use planning in the Northwest Territories had expended millions and millions of dollars, yet there was no clear mandate or policy expressed by the federal government for this particular area. This is something that is totally negligent and unacceptable.

There are other areas to which I should refer. When we talk about the collection of debts on behalf of the government, they say not to make specific reference to taxes, but in my particular area there is a mechanism called grants in lieu of taxes. In this particular area there are communities which have been saddled with debts that have accumulated.

The collector is no longer the federal government but municipalities. Municipalities have been imposed upon and have been asked to be the tax collector. This is quite unfair. This is something that many of the communities are grappling with. Many of the groups are small communities that have never had a tax base.

When you live in a harsh climate where you do not have an appreciation of your property, you do not have adequate infrastructure and you do not have the kinds of goods and services that would warrant that kind of a tax base, it is somewhat of a gradual transition for those people to get accustomed to what used to be referred to as a grant in lieu of taxes situation. The federal government used to be able to give those communities grants as almost an approach of forgiveness for those taxes that

were accumulated by those particular residents. Now that responsibility has been turned over.

In terms of the Financial Administration Act, there is a gradual move with the increased responsibilities that the territorial government is taking on toward it taking over the responsibility for being more accountable.

There has been a number of financial arrangements. The territorial government used to have what I think was termed vote 4 moneys, and it was required to do a very strict accounting. One example was the French language services that were going to be introduced in the Northwest Territories. That particular financing arrangement for the vote 4 moneys was done on an annual basis. It was a very cumbersome process which needed to be overhauled.

In terms of the Financial Administration Act, if we want to have delivery of services in those particular areas and to have those particular programs meet their legal obligations, just last week the N.W.T. Act had to be amended because we could not meet the requirements set under the Official Languages Act to translate all the bills and statutes. Therefore I think that a more practical and a more reasonable approach has to be taken rather than an annual funding arrangement. What has to be engaged in is a multi-year operational program for French language services.

In conjunction with that we also have another area of concern. In 1984 the GNWT had a $16 million grant given to it for the introduction of French language services as a trade-off for the aboriginal languages of $16 million. What has happened with that is that it is coming to an end. After they have in fact reprofiled the unspent moneys and that time has expired, we will need to renew this particular commitment because it has become a world-class model for indigenous languages and the way the services have been expressed in terms of the use of the money responsibly under the Financial Administration Acts *per se.* It is a model, something that the federal government should be proud of and something that the territorial government is proud of.

It is definitely something that is worth the investment. I think it has been worth every penny that the federal government has put into it and has been managed very responsibly. There have been people who have gone in to appraise that work, and I think it will stand the test of time and stand the test of responsibility.

I have a number of other points, if you will bear with me, Mr. Speaker, in the area of transportation. As I indicated, we are off the transportation grid. I hear some very pleasant rumours that perhaps the government is reconsidering the area that is going to have to cancel its medivacs because of a lack of air safety and a communications budget of $35,000. I am sure the government does not want to consider putting a dollar value on the lives of my constituents and those northerners who should be afforded the dignity and the right of travelling safely, especially when there are no other ways of travelling than by air.

Another point in terms of communications is that it was very sadly regretted by many of the air industry officials that the Weather North Program was cancelled. This was a program that was headed up by CBC. It was very much valued by many airline industry officials in the north. It was $400,000, and I must say that investment was worth everything to the people who have to travel and work under the most adverse conditions.

I would say, just as a last statement, that in the area of tourism, in the area of the high cost of travel, and in the area of small businesses any kind of assistance that the federal government could give to the reality of the future of the north will be felt. It would be one of continuing to support the north and continuing to invest in the north.

Canada is a northern country, and that northern country is truly actualized in what exists beyond the 60th parallel. The government has to take a second look and continue its commitment to put money into the transportation strategy as proposed by the Government of the Northwest Territories, to reinstate the Weather North Program, to put money into air safety, and to invest in tourism initiatives which make Canada truly a northern country. So I say to the rest of Canada and to the government that every Canadian and every part of Canada must be given an equal chance to participate fully in our country. The north must not be economically marginalized when it comes to the Financial Administration Act. I think you will know in years past that the N.W.T. was essentially punished for having a surplus. They were fiscally responsible, they managed their

money well, and they set priorities in a way that was quite responsible.

• (1800)

Having just come back from the Yukon, I would say that another area where perhaps the government could express a bit of latitude is the kind of moneys that it puts forward for the implementation of the Yukon land claims. The people in the Yukon would like to have some say about how an implementation plan for their land claims is expressed. Right now they have a working group that works from the top down and expresses perhaps what they feel the communities need because they do not have the resources to go to the community and to express and perhaps extract from the people at the grass roots level what it is they want in an implementation plan.

Perhaps the federal government could express a bit of latitude and generosity of heart in allowing those people to truly define from the grassroots level. The Canadian public at large is calling for participation at the grassroots level. Perhaps this is an opportunity for the government to make a symbolic gesture in both territories to adequately fund these people. I think they will know that under the Financial Administration Act these people are very responsible and very accountable.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Manicouagan):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the comments by the hon. member for Western Arctic. I would like to take a few minutes to draw an analogy, to compare her constituency with mine, the riding of Manicouagan, which extends nearly 700 miles along the coast of the north shore of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, where over three-quarters of the villages and the people who live there are not connected by roads. The only means of transportation is by plane during most of the year and by ship in the summer. There is also the northern part of my riding which borders on both shores of Ungava Bay, where Inuit communities have been living since time immemorial, and there again, communications are extremely difficult.

I must say that I can identify with her comments and her description of the difficult conditions under which many of her constituents were living. This is a situation our government is trying to correct with every means at its disposal.

[*English*]

Would my colleague from Western Arctic agree with me that the best way to assure proper financial intervention by the federal government in all aspects she talked about, such as providing additional sums and means for the population in the northern region and remote areas such as in her riding and in my riding, the proper way to ensure that the government can intervene is through sound management of the financial assets that the federal government has. By managing properly, money that the taxpayers of this country provide to the government will enable provision of additional financial means to the people and to the area she just talked about, an area that we both represent.

Does she agree with me that Bill C-91 is a modest way to go in the direction she talked about? I am sure she would want to support this bill and other measures that this government has taken, is taking, and will take in the future to better manage the taxpayers' money, so that it can distribute more wisely and more equitably the sums of money the federal government has.

**Ms. Blondin:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member opposite for his question. It is a rare day that I am able to compare notes with members opposite who agree, to any extent, on any issue that I bring forward. I am quite happy to hear that we have in common, I guess, the remoteness of our communities in terms of transportation and communication. The sad part is that those services need to be met. I cannot speak for the communities of the hon. member opposite and the jurisdiction that he comes from, but I have to say that I know that the territorial government has been very responsible.

The territorial government has acted quite responsibly under the Financial Administration Act. Essentially, their budget has been cut back because they had a surplus. They were very cautious not to overspend their budget. There is no way under any fiscal arrangement that the territorial government would be deemed to be irresponsible.

As I indicated, as of April 1, 1990 the new formula financing agreement that went into effect is, over the next five years, going to cut back the N.W.T.'s budget by $110 million. In light of their needs, because of their remoteness from prime North American markets and from southern centres that offer a better price for service and product, they are going to be punished. They are not going to be rewarded for being responsible. This does not mean that I wish them to be irresponsible. Under any arrangement, the government and the jurisdiction that I come from have been extremely responsible.

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak for the second time today. After the break we had two weeks ago, I guess I thirsted for the battle. I am getting my fill today.

It is a good day to get up and speak on this bill, which is primarily a housekeeping bill. It enacts very technical changes and requirements to the Financial Administration Act. Before I start my speech, the hon. member opposite who just asked the last question, asked my colleague from Western Arctic a question. What he was looking for were some bouquets on the government's financial management ability of the fiscal resources of the nation. He might have been fishing in the wrong direction. I cannot say that this piece of legislation is bad. It is a technical piece of legislation. It tightens up some loopholes. There are a few things I find terribly wrong with it. I will deal with that because it reflects an error in policy direction that the government has taken.

The hon. member opposite asked my colleague from Western Arctic whether or not she thought that this government had made some modest steps towards proper financial accountability and proper management with the fiscal resources of the nation. I would like to put a case forward to prove that it is not just technical amendments to law that indicates what should be a benchmark of whether or not a government is fiscally managing itself properly, but other things like ACOA. ACOA is an agency that is not directly dealt with in this bill. The bill deals with Crown corporations and the like. I want to talk about ACOA and by doing so, perhaps I will answer my hon. colleague's question.

ACOA is a Crown corporation. It has a budget of $1.05 billion. When it was created, it was supposed to be new money. In a subsequent budget about a year ago, the Minister of Finance indicated that in the area of fiscal responsibility, the government was going to extend the mandate of ACOA from five to seven years, which effectively is a 20 per cent cut. It could not get the word cut out of their lips, although everyone who looked at the amendments or the changes knew that it meant that Atlantic Canada, over that five-year period, would have 20 per cent less money to spend on economic development. Over and over, in my previous capacity as regional development critic and the critic for ACOA, I would ask the minister responsible for some accounting of how he and his officials were spending that $1.05 billion.

• (1810 )

Repeatedly we got bafflegab and every type of distortion and diatribe so that the questions would not be answered.

Here is a case in point, a company called NSC Diesel. It was funded through ACOA. That is taxpayers' money. Do you want to talk about accountability? I asked the minister, many times, questions on NSC Diesel. Before it even got the superstructure up on its building, it went belly up and left dozens of small contractors on the eastern shore of Nova Scotia owed literally millions of dollars.

I could not get any answers from the government on financial accountability. I figured that since it was funded with public money and since it did not seem to have a market, the public had a right to know how that project got funded.

I had to go to the unusual length of asking the Auditor General, since the ministers on the front benches refused to answer. For goodness sakes, the government should have a look at whether or not this project was properly approved and whether or not there is some financial management accountability in the system.

In his report the Auditor General said that the project in question, which may end up costing taxpayers in this country over $10 million and probably cause the bankruptcy of a whole number of small firms on the eastern shore of Nova Scotia, was approved outside the program criteria. The ACOA offices in Atlantic Canada did not do the proper evaluation of the project.

Where is the accountability, I will ask my friend opposite. Where is the accountability in a system like that? Mr. Speaker, if you are asking for examples, or if you want to put forward examples of technical account-

ability or strengthening the laws, perhaps this bill addresses them.

The true question that has to be answered is why is this government not accountable for the way it spends the money of the people of Canada? An example would be the NSC Diesel fiasco for which the minister should have resigned and for which there should have been a full and complete police investigation. Perhaps we will have that yet.

There are a couple of points that need to be raised concerning this piece of legislation. I want to speak to some specific issues. I am going to start off at the back end of the bill and work my way forward. I want to talk about clause 40.

Clause 40 causes me great concern. We have a history in this country of equalization and of understanding that the country cannot be run as a business. It has to be run as a nation.

In order to run a country as vast and as great as Canada and have equity put in the system, it sometimes costs money. Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, you have to invest in infrastructure and admit that there is a cost for producing equity in this country, no matter where you live.

Mr. Speaker, if you live in Atlantic Canada you still have the right for quality health care. If you live in British Columbia, you should still have access to post-secondary educational institutions. We have entrenched in our Constitution the great liberal principle of equalization. It is there. It is what has made the country great.

Clause 40 tampers with the right of this Parliament to debate fundamental changes and directions in dealing with some Crown corporations.

I want to quote what it is going to do. Clause 40 effectively is going to do the following. It would effectively require commercial Crown corporations, those listed in Schedule III, Part II of the FAA, which operate in a competitive environment and not ordinarily dependent on appropriations for operating purposes, to incorporate dividend planning in its annual corporate plan.

In itself, that does not seem like a bad idea. If it is making money, it should put in its corporate plan that it expects to make money, and account for those revenues.

The bill goes a little further and says that the Governor in Council would be empowered to set, waive or vary dividend payments for any schedule Crown corporation.

There is something fundamentally wrong here. What happens if, by Order in Council—which means a cabinet decision—it decides to have incredible user fees or a very high dividend from a Crown corporation like Ports Canada. This would decrease the effectiveness of Ports Canada to be a competitive alternative to ports on the U.S. seaboard.

Look at the port of Halifax.

The Port of Halifax is responsible for nearly $750 million worth of activity in the economy of Atlantic Canada and, more particularly, in the Halifax-Dartmouth area. Ports Canada is fighting for its life against subsidized activity from the port of New York and from rail lines like the D and H, which Canadian Pacific recently acquired. It will be able to draw goods currently destined for the central Canadian market away from Canadian ports and draw them in through the U.S. and up through the Atlantic Seaboard with a line like D and H.

That Crown corporation is there for a reason. That Crown corporation is there because previous governments have decided that the ports of Canada were a national resource that should be operated by a national government. This government has changed all that. As I said a little earlier, the government does not understand. It thinks that everything has to turn a profit and, if it does not, it is bad and it has to be dismantled and thrown out.

We have seen what a few years of that kind of policy has done. This country has never, ever, faced the crossroads of confidence that it faces today, because this government does not understand national unity and it does not understand the important role of national infrastructuring in keeping the country together.

The Port of Halifax is facing incredible competition from the ports in New York and New Jersey. There is no question that when the inter-state trade commission of the United States was examining the application by the Canadian Pacific Railway to acquire the bankrupt D and H line, which will be able to take goods right from the Port of Halifax straight up to the Quebec border, a

short-cut route for Canada-destined goods to get in through the United States, one of the largest shippers going into the Port of Halifax with containerized traffic indicated that it supported this application. It gave it an alternate and cheaper route for cargo going to the central part of Canada.

What does the Canadian government do? It forgets about the mandate of Canada Ports Corporation and, in the last budget, demanded that there be a dividend paid. This, at the very time that the people who are running the Port of Halifax have been doing everything but lying in the middle of the Macdonald Bridge and screaming to get the attention of the government that it is going to lose its competitive edge in trying to attract or keep container-based traffic going to the central part of Canada.

What does the government do? It forgets the mandate. It does not come to Parliament. It says in a budget that Ports Canada is going to have to pay a dividend. It forgets that it is there to do a job. It takes the money that Ports Canada needs to upgrade facilities, such as those at the Port of Halifax, and it says it has to be given to the government as a profit. The government takes the ability of the Port of Halifax and other ports to plan properly and, when they are efficient and make money, to have that money in reserve to reinvest.

I read here in Clause 40 of the bill that that may not be the case. The dividends that will be forced upon some of these Crown corporations can be made by a bunch of the guys and a few of the ladies who are on the opposite side, in the Cabinet, sitting down and deciding: "Well, I guess we blew it again. I guess the budgets that we had, the projections that we had for spending, went out the window again. We need an extra $100 million. Where are we going to go? I know, Ports Canada. Tell them they do not need $100 million this year. Tell them we need $200 million."

Before long, the debate that should take place in the House about the fundamental change in direction and philosophy of those Crown corporations will be muted and the government will be able, by that simple tool of Order in Council, that undemocratic tool, perhaps to dismantle even more of the national infrastructure and to do even more damage, not just to the economy of regions such as Atlantic Canada, but also to national unity. These are the underpinnings of national unity and anybody opposite who thinks they are not is crazy.

There are one or two other things I want to deal with. One of these, my colleague from Cape Breton Highlands—Canso dealt with and it is not a small issue. I hope that there are a whole lot of people out there watching, who have faith in their local fire departments. I hope that they are watching us as we speak.

I think it is Clause 6 which deals with user fees. Mr. Speaker, the government is absolutely crazed. It says: "Turn a profit, turn a profit, turn a profit." It does not matter what it shuts down, just turn a profit.

• (1820)

Let us not forget that it raised more personal income tax, I think 24 per cent or 27 per cent more, in the first half of this year than last year. By God, it is milking taxes out of us like we are a cow, an engorged cow. It just squeezes, squeezes, squeezes. It gets more and more cash. That is all it wants. It is so ashamed of what it has done on taxation that it has to find new ways to tax, and a tax is a tax is a tax. No matter how it takes it from someone's pocket, it is still taking it. But, it is dealing with something pretty dangerous here in user fees.

In 1986 the government changed the Telecommunications Act. The minister at the time was the former member for Kingston and the Islands, a former Cape Bretoner. I read the debates. There was a great debate, even in the Tory caucus, and the debate still goes on. It tells me that there are still a few people over there who are close to their constituents, not many, but a few. The minister at the time in the debate answered a question from the then member from South West Nova, who is now sitting in the other place as a senator. He was defeated by a Liberal, like most of those people were in Atlantic Canada at least. She said in response to a question from the former member from South West Nova that volunteer fire departments would be exempted. I do not have to embellish it. It is right there in the record. She said they would be exempted from those new licence fees.

What did the government do? It waited until it got another term in government and then it nailed the very organizations in communities, the people of which give of their time freely and risk their life and limb and security to ensure that the public safety and security is being looked after. I am talking about volunteer firemen,

for goodness sake. What did it do? This government, to milk a few more dollars, has gone after volunteer fire departments with unconscionable licence fees. Volunteer fire departments are not Liberal, Tories or NDPers. They are people in the communities and they feel very diminished. The minister opposite is nodding, and I hope he can tell his colleagues in cabinet that they should change this foolishness.

On user fees, the government would even hit volunteer fire departments. This means that in some cases there is over a 1000 per cent increase in the fee. A volunteer fire department, whether in Eastern Passage in my riding, or in any other ridings all over the country, has to raise its money. It gets a little bit of a fee from the municipality, but it has to hold bean suppers and fall fairs so that it can purchase equipment to protect the people in the community. What the government does is say work a little harder because it is going to charge a licence fee for every piece of communications equipment they have, not just one fee to cover the fire department, every single fee.

We started a petition drive. Every fire department in the country that I have been in touch with has indicated that these fees are not only regressive, but that they have been misled. In 1986, a very honourable member, the former member for Kingston and the Islands, said, as reported in *Hansard*, that the volunteer fire departments would be exempt. Again, because of user fees, the government thinks it can go in because there is nothing sacred. It does not matter if there is a fire department in some far-flung reach of this great nation that may have to forgo purchasing a new piece of equipment. Do not forget that they do not have bank accounts. They have to raise their money. Mostly, volunteer fire departments are in poor municipalities. These people are doing their part. For God's sake, the least the government can do with user fees is keep its hands out of their pockets.

I have talked to members opposite who have said the same thing. If there is one thing that the government could do to show that it has a little bit of compassion and understands how the country operates and the important contribution of volunteers like firemen and firewomen right across the country, is to say it made a mistake. It should live by the word and the commitment of the former Minister of Communications and withdraw those fees. That is what it should do.

Every fireman, fire department or individual watching this tonight should write to their member of Parliament and tell them that. More particularly, they should write to the ministers on the front benches. It is one of those small things when you talk about user fees. It is easy to say it will only cost a few bucks. But when looking at the potential damage to get that few extra bucks, it could be a little bit more financially responsible and ingenious on that side of the House. The few dollars the government will pick up on that may result in a slower response to an emergency in a community. It should withdraw the fee. That is why I have a little bit of a problem with the user fees.

I used to think that democracy worked in a certain way, that no matter if a government came in with a piece of legislation, if it saw that for whatever reason there was a flaw in it, it would change it. The government has developed a siege mentality when it comes to this type of initiative and it simply will not do it.

We on this side of the House are going to continue. I will be up every day, if I have to, presenting petitions from volunteer fire departments until the government comes to its senses and realizes there are certain things that cannot be touched and cannot be milked from the country because of its financial irresponsibility and mismanagement.

The last thing deals with transportation and infrastructure generally, user fees again. We have seen the government, with its quest for the bottom line, dismantle many pieces of the national infrastructure. Well, we do not all live in a Toronto, or Hamilton, or Vancouver, or even Halifax. Some of us have to live in other beautiful parts of the country where we do not perhaps have infrastructure that supports itself.

I talked a little bit earlier about the principle of equalization. It is enshrined in our Constitution—it is there. It means that the government, the people in the country, believe that we have to make level playing-fields, that there is a cost in keeping this nation together. It does not mean that we squander our money, but it

means that we recognize that there is a cost and that we budget for it.

The government is now toying with full recovery fees, full implementation of cost recovery in the air transportation sector. Well, Mr. Speaker, do you know what that means? If we want to talk about destroying national unity, here is what it means. I am reading from a document from Air Nova in Atlantic Canada. I hope you will be a little patient because this is pretty important. It states that under full implementation of cost recovery, Halifax will be the most expensive of the nine major airports in the country. For example, a Dash-8 landing in Halifax will have to pay a fee of $121.60. The same Dash-8 landing in Vancouver, because it is a larger airport with more traffic, pays $37.60. A Boeing 747 landing in Halifax will cost $2,675.20. The same 747 landing in Toronto is $616.

This government has gone bonkers. It is going to try to implement full user fees, forgetting the fact that this is a regional economy, that we have many regions here, and it is going to try to take the levelling effect out of many of the user fees that we have in this country. It is going to pull another spike out of the track of national unity. Eventually, it will have Canadians so distraught at the way it has mismanaged us that, when it comes to the next great national unity debate, it will be hard to muster the forces in many parts of the country because of this government's financial mismanagement plan.

I could speak for days about what the government is doing, but suffice it to say that I will be on my feet again to complete my speech under another piece of legislation.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Manicouagan):** Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to what was said by the hon. member for Dartmouth. I had trouble accepting some of the points he raised, especially when he claimed that the Government of Canada should spend certain amounts of money and transfer amounts hither and thither. My impression is that he would want the government to do all this without considering its ability to pay or the taxpayers' ability to pay.

Mr. Speaker, I may remind the hon. member that Canada has a very substantial cumulative deficit which we must start paying off as soon as possible. If we don't, and if we don't succeed in putting into place various ways to control government spending and bring down the deficit, the equalization principle mentioned by the hon. member will be a commitment this government will no longer be able to meet because it will not have the money to do so. There will not be enough money to do this, and Canadians of course will not have the ability to pay.

To get back to his comment on user fees, I think the hon. member would agree that a great deal can be done in this area. Obviously, the government must try to recover the costs of infrastructures, whether we are talking about marine facilities, airports or other areas where it is entirely normal that users should pay a certain amount of money.

We can question the amounts, we can question the tariffs and we can question the principle according to which the prices are set. However, I think the principle that users should contribute to the cost of infrastructures put in place by taxpayers is a universally recognized principle that should help, on the basis of revenue the government will raise, to absorb the costs of these infrastructures and maintain them in proper condition.

• (1830)

So I think the hon. member should have the honesty and common sense to admit that the principle of charging users certain amounts for the infrastructures made available to them by taxpayers is a fair principle and a sound one, and aside from the amounts to be charged and the tariffs to be set, I think the hon. member will agree that the principle of charging users certain amounts for public infrastructures should be acknowledged and maintained.

[*English*]

**Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth):** I certainly do realize that in some cases the government has to be efficient. Let us be fair. This government came into office and all was going to be wonderful in la-la land the day after it got in. It is finding out that that is not the easiest thing to do.

**Mr. Milliken:** Six years later and it is worse.

**Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Six years later is much worse, as my colleague for Kingston and the Islands said.

The member opposite wants to talk about fairness. I will give him a little lesson from his own books about fairness. We witnessed on Friday the government coming in, saying that first of all it needed more money and it

was going to trim bucks from all over the place, but it was going to be fair.

I want to tell you how fair they are going to be, Mr. Speaker. They came into the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, that quasi accountable agency that I referred to earlier, and do you know what the government did? It took about $650,000 from administration. Okay. Maybe it is going to have to do a little better with a little less money.

The government went over to the Western Diversification Fund which is the agency to deliver regional development in the west, like ACOA is the agency to deliver regional development to business and business assistance in the east. What did it do? It took $20 million in deferred grants and contributions from ACOA and did not take one penny in deferred grants and contributions from the Western Diversification Fund.

What the member opposite has to understand is that you cannot go about abusing the trust and misusing the resources that this country has and treat one part of your family differently than another part of your family. If the cuts are to be effected, then it should have effected it across the board. There should not be one member from Atlantic Canada on the Tory benches, not one member opposite who agrees that any part of the country, be it east or west, should suffer more under government cuts.

Do you know what they are saying opposite, Mr. Speaker? A great nationalist that I am, I believe everybody in this country should be treated equally. I guess I squeal a little bit when I see people from my part of the country who had the good sense to vote Liberal getting the boot from this government every time it comes in with its fiscal knife.

**An hon. member:** Howard is laughing.

**An hon. member:** Howard is laughing at us.

**Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth):** The member for Halifax West is laughing. But the member for Halifax West also laughed when I raised in the House the problems about the decreased competitiveness for the port of Halifax. He also laughed when we held up the strike-breaking legislation that his government brought in against the ships' crews and he also laughed when our party supported the end of a wage inequity through regional rates of pay for dockyard workers. That member will be laughing on the other side of his face the next time the electors have a chance to deal with him.

**An hon. member:** That's right.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague for Dartmouth with a great deal of interest. I think he has expressed quite well the plight in which this government has placed Atlantic Canada. It is absolutely devastating to our economy, this idea of complete cost recovery of all government expenditures.

I fully expect that this is not the end of it. I think we have an awful lot of user pay without it being designated as user pay. One example of this is in small craft harbours where this government is ignoring the plight of the fishermen in allowing the wharves which the fishermen need so desperately to fall into disrepair. Also, they are not doing any dredging in the small harbours.

That is not only a question of hurting the fishing industry, but it is also a question of allowing the silt to fill in the mouths of the harbours so that in rough weather fishermen cannot re-enter their harbours. They are in the position of being at risk of their lives out in the Atlantic Ocean.

Also, this government is actually diverting business away from the ports of Halifax and Saint John by refusing to put into place the repairs to infrastructure needed for Canadian National and actually encouraging Canadian cargo to be shipped into New York and transported by train from New York to Montreal and Toronto.

I would like to ask the hon. member, because he has spoken about this often, to comment on these and give us his interpretation as to whether these are as damaging to Atlantic Canada as I believe or whether I am being an alarmist in this regard.

**Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Cape Breton—The Sydneys, somebody who has stood up over and over again not just for the people of his riding but for all the people of Atlantic Canada and for a vision of this country where equality of opportunity exists no matter where you live.

In response, I think this government has no sense of where it is going. It rules from the centre. It rules for the centre and rules to where the numbers are at. That means that if you can withdraw fiscal support to create a level playing field in places like Atlantic Canada, so be it. If it means that you can pit one part of Canada, east against west, you do it because all the Conservatives are concerned about is pleasing their buddies down on Bay Street and they do not know the first thing about national unity or the role that national infrastructure like railways, ports and small craft harbours play in keeping this great country together.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have an opportunity to participate in this debate today because I noticed the President of the Treasury Board on his hind legs this morning telling us about the virtues of Bill C-91. I thought that it was appropriate to indicate some of the disasters.

I note that the bill is an act to amend the Financial Administration Act. Really, for this government to introduce a bill that has to do with good administration was an incredible sight. We had the minister standing there telling us how much more efficient this bill was going to make the government. Well, anything would be an improvement. There is no doubt about that. I have grave doubts though. When the minister talks about efficiency, he talks about nothing more than gouging and screwing tax dollars out of Canadians, which this government has shown itself to be so good at.

**Mr. Worthy:** Be positive. Don't be so mean spirited.

**Mr. Milliken:** The parliamentary secretary suggests that perhaps I am being mean spirited. I suggest that is not the case. The minister beamed and smiled his way through his presentation. He did very well, considering the material he had to work with. I suggest that what we have to do with this bill is have a good long look at it and look at the very bad administration that Canadians have been treated to under this government.

I want to turn to the supplementary estimates which the minister tabled the other day because I think they reveal something of the ability of this government to administer—

**Mr. Sobeski:** Is this a point of privilege or debate?

**Mr. Milliken:** If the hon. member listens for a moment, I think he will enjoy these comments. Page 32 of the supplementary estimates has some of the costs of the goods and services tax which this government is applying to Canadians. It is establishing a goods and services tax consumer information office. If you do a little arithmetic, Mr. Speaker, not complicated, a little arithmetic, you can see that they are hiring 20 new people, 20 person years are authorized. If you divide that into the amount of money for personnel that is shown in the estimates you get an average salary of $54,150 per annum for those individuals. That sounds a little high, but I will come back to that.

If we turn to page 84 the hon. member will see that in the Department of National Revenue, Customs and Excise, 1,163 lucky Canadians are going to be hired as tax police to enforce the new goods and services tax at an average salary according to these estimates of $41,490. You will notice that is down a little from the previous group that is working with the corporations.

Then if you look across the page you will see in the Taxation Division of National Revenue they are preparing and planning for pre-payment of the tax credits. In other words, this is the group that hands the money out to Canadians that we are all supposed to be so thankful for. The average salary of the 642 people being hired in that department is $33,124. Why would it be so much lower for the individuals who are going to pay out the revenue to Canadians, the great bonanza that they are getting back, than for the ones who are going to gouge and screw the tax out of Canadians? I know why. The government is more interested in getting the money than it is in paying it out. Why pay someone a lot of money to give money back to Canadians? Pay it to get it out of them. That is the priority of this government. That is what it means about better administration under the Financial Administration Act.

• (1840)

If that is not enough to convince the hon. member, he can turn to page 100 of the estimates. There we have the people who are actually going to send the cheques. "Preparation and planning for the prepayment of the GST credit to taxpayers", that is the people who actually write the cheques, I presume, in the Supply and Services Department, since that is where cheques are issued. The average salary there is the lowest yet. They are expecting to hire 45 people for this work at an average salary of

$31,471. In other words, who are the highest paid in this group? The ones who are advising the corporations, the ones who are in the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department to advise the corporations, presumably, on how to make their tax payments most efficiently. They are being paid the most. Then we go to the Department of National Revenue where they actually go around and tax police and gouge Canadians for their money. They are going to be paid the second highest. The ones who make the refunds are the lowest paid on the totem pole.

I ask the hon. member to ask the minister for details on this. I am sure the minister would be more than happy to fill him in on how many senior bureaucrats are going to be hired at higher salaries in the upper end of the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department. Take a look at the figures. I urge the hon. member to read the Supplementary Estimates. Perhaps he will find that he agrees with my analysis of this situation and will realize that when the President of the Treasury Board talks about better administration, what he is talking about is screwing more money out of Canadians.

I was happy to receive a press release recently from business leaders. This came from the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and the Business Council. I know that the minister got a copy too. These business leaders all called on Ottawa and the provinces to curb spending. These people were simply appalled at this government's spending record, its out-of-control budget deficits, its inability to do anything effectively to control the deficit.

Some of these people may like the GST, but the bulk of the small businessmen who I know in Canada are dead set against this tax. The hon. member knows that too. If he were doing his job, he would be filing petitions from his constituents who are signing them by the hundred and who are, I have no doubt, opposing this tax. He should not sit there worrying about whether these people are opposed to the GST. They are opposed to the tax. Over 80 per cent of the population is opposed to this tax. I will give that fact to the hon. member. If he were listening to the 80 per cent of Canadians who are, he would be up voting against this tax, and sitting on this side of the House with his former colleagues who have had the good sense to get out of the Progressive Conservative Party and sit on this side of the House.

I turn to the allegation of the minister this morning that this bill is supposed to be good for Canadians. He said that it would be good for Canada because it would make the government more efficient. I want to look at some of the evidence of the government's efficiency over the past few years. I have a calculation that I did from the Public Accounts of Canada. I thought that we might usefully see what kind of increases in taxes Canadians have had to face in the last few years.

Doing a year-on-year comparison of the increases in revenue, I was able to determine that from 1984-85, or in the 1985 financial year, there was a 10 per cent increase in revenue in the Government of Canada. 1985 was the first big Tory year. It was the first year after that disastrous election in 1984 that crippled the Canadian economy.

I can remember the Diefenbaker government. I remember and I am sure hon. members opposite will agree with me that it was probably the worst government Canada had ever had up until that time. Everyone acknowledges that the Diefenbaker government was a complete disaster for Canada.

The only one that I can imagine is worse is the present one. These figures bear that out. For 1984-1985 revenue increased 10 per cent, that is 1985 over 1984; the next year, an 8 per cent increase; the next year, 11 per cent; the next year, a 13 per cent increase; the next year, 6 per cent; and this year, 1990 over 1989, it is projected at 9 per cent.

That is the kind of revenue increases we have had under this government. We have indicated it has increased taxes over 31 times, and now think what it is going to be like under the GST. Think what it will be like under the GST. And here the minister is concerned about efficiency—

**Mr. Sobeski:** You'll have no room on your credit card.

**Mr. Milliken:** The hon. member says he has no room on the credit card. That is because the government has failed to live up to its responsibilities and its promises. That is the reason for it, and he knows it, and he should get this government out at the earliest opportunity.

Now we could turn to the percentage change in personal income tax and corporate tax revenue. Let us look at the personal income tax changes over this period, that is the amount of revenue the government derived from that source. In 1984–1985, that is the 1985 year over 1984, revenue from personal income taxes went up 8 per cent; the next year, 12 per cent; the next year, 14 per cent; the next year, 19 per cent—19 per cent in one year, Mr. Speaker. In 1989 over 1988 we have the big decrease. It only went up by 2 per cent.

Guess what? Maybe there was an election. Maybe it reduced taxes because there was an election. Is that possible? I would not have thought this government would be that politically motivated, yet it appears that is what might have happened. From 1989 to 1990, that is this year over last year, because of the tax increases and the recent budget, 12 per cent. Is that not an extraordinary story: 8, 12, 14, 19, election year 2, and the next year 12. That is what this government has been doing to Canadians. It has been fiddling around with the public accounts, the taxes, and so on, in order to make things easy for Canadians when it is time to re-elect it but darn difficult in all the years in between. That is what has been going on.

The corporate tax increases reflect a similar pattern but not the same. The first year, 1985 over 1984, there was a 28 per cent increase. It must have been a profitable year for the corporations. The next year it was 2 per cent; the next year, 7 per cent; the next year, 10 per cent; the next year, the election one, 7 per cent; the next one, 11 per cent. Modest increases by comparison. Compound them and I will bet you will find they are lower, and indeed all the figures suggest exactly that.

What this government means by saying that it wants to make financial administration of the government more efficient is that it wants to get more money out of Canadians for more things. You can look at the act. You will see that it applies interest on all kinds of obligations that citizens have to the government. It enables the government to use a collection agency so it will be more efficient in collecting money from Canadians and in collecting arrears of taxes. That is the purpose of this bill. Let us not kid around.

While we will say that some of the changes are quite laudable and probably worth while, the fact is this government is a real pro when it comes to squeezing money out of Canadians and failing to deliver on the return side.

The other thing I thought was important and interesting as I perused this little bill the government has introduced was the fact that it left something out. We all know that this government has shown repeated, continuous contempt for this institution. It is showing it in the other place this very day, I have no doubt. I do not know what has happened down there this afternoon, but I am sure that the Conservative majority and its puppet, the Speaker, is busy doing what it can to deprive the opposition in that House of an opportunity to debate this bill. I suggest that what is going on there is another indication of the contempt this government shows for Parliament.

We saw it before because of course government members got into a mess when they called Parliament back after the 1989 election for two weeks and then decided that rather than face the music in this House they would help themselves to the public money by Governor General's special warrants. They abused these warrants in a way they had never been used before in Canada, by grabbing billions of dollars out of the public Treasury by warrant between sessions of Parliament, something that had never happened in this country before on anything like that scale and which I submit—and I submitted it at the time—was entirely improper, so much so that I felt I should—

• (1850)

**Mr. Sobeski:** You lost the debate.

**Mr. Milliken:** Yes, I did, because I was overruled by a large majority in this House. That is why I lost this debate; not because there was any element of fairness. The Speaker said that he would not rule on the issue.

When it was raised in committee, the Conservative majority in the committee silenced the issue very promptly. The hon. member for Halifax West was there. He ranted and raved. He said that I was being partisan in raising the issue. It was a completely improper use of the authority granted to cabinet and to the Governor General under the Financial Administration Act, this very Act that we are now seeking to amend.

Wonderful thing. Mr. Speaker, you look through this Act in vain for any change to the provision relating to the use of Governor General special warrants. I would have thought the government might want to put some restriction on its future misconduct in this field, because I

suspect we are about to see its misuse again before too long in spite of the grumbles from the hon. member for Halifax West.

I know this subject is a sore point with him. I believe he has some considerable experience in legal matters. I am sure he understands perfectly the arguments that I made in respect of those Governor General's warrants. I expect he agrees with every argument I made that in fact there was a flagrant abuse by the government of the use of those means of obtaining public money. It helped itself to the Treasury in a way that was completely unprecedented and wrong.

I introduced a private member's bill, Bill C-211, which sought to restrict the use of Governor General's special warrants. That bill is still sitting on the Order Paper. I am optimistic, as I am sure Your Honour is, that sooner or later it will be drawn in the famous draw that takes place every few weeks in Private Members' Business. Maybe we will get to discuss it in this House some day.

In the meantime, I would have thought that the government might have incorporated my amendment, or something like it, in Bill C-91. I went through the bill and I was dismayed to see not a word or mention of any change to section 30 of the Financial Administration Act, which might have corrected these bad habits on the part of the government.

It could easily have made it unlawful for it to do what I submit is improper and unlawful, that is, to abuse these warrants the way it has. Yet the amendment is not there.

I would invite the hon. member for Halifax West, who I know agrees with me in this regard, to raise this matter in caucus on Wednesday morning and see if he cannot get the minister to agree to an amendment to Bill C-91 so that we can fix this mess up now and not have a recurrence of the disastrous events of early 1989.

I can say that if the minister is worried about the amendment to the bill, I would be happy to have my bill read for the second time, by unanimous consent, and referred to the legislative committee with Bill C-91. The amendment could be incorporated into the bill. I do not want to claim pride of authorship. I am not worried about that. I just want the law fixed.

I know hon. members opposite would be more than happy to ensure that their government did not act improperly or wrongly again, because it must have been a very embarrassing day for the hon. member for Halifax West and others to have to vote with the government when the government had acted with such obvious impropriety.

I submit what we have in this case is a bill that the government has introduced with one purpose in mind: To get more money from you, from me, and from the Canadian taxpayer. What it wants to be able to do—and the minister said it this morning—is collect money more efficiently. It wants to be able to manage the accounts of Canada more efficiently.

He made some reference to the fact that this would help the Auditor General and made a few other what I could only describe as pious utterances, to try to make the bill more palatable. It really is—and I think a quick glance through the provisions of the bill indicates that—an attempt to get more money out of Canadians in a faster, more direct, and perhaps more simple manner for the government.

I submit that while perhaps that is a laudable aim, it is not particularly a fair one for Canadians. We will want to examine the provisions of this bill on a clause by clause basis when the bill gets referred to the legislative committee.

I think the other part of the equation that I did not mention earlier is important. I talked about the increase in revenue, but I neglected to talk about the increase in expenditures. The businessmen who issued the communique I referred to a moment ago, the joint statement on the national economy from the Chamber of Commerce, among others, mentioned that spending was out of control. I have some figures to show just how much spending went up in the course of time.

The only reason I did not mention them was because the spending did not go up as fast as the revenue did. The revenue increases have been fairly astronomic, as the House has heard. Expenditures were a little more modest. I say a little more modest: 13 per cent the first year, 1 per cent the next, 4 per cent, 7 per cent, 5 per cent, and 7 per cent. So, you can hear, Mr. Speaker, that they are lower than the revenue.

The revenue, of course, is the taxes we are all paying, but it did not cut—

**Mr. Sobeski:** What was it for the election year?

**Mr. Milliken:** No, no. It was 7 per cent the year before. The hon. member will be glad to know it was one of the highest.

I should also tell the hon. member that the national debt increased fairly significantly throughout this year. In fact we all know it doubled; 22 per cent in the first year, 16 per in the second, 12 per cent in the third, 10 per cent in the fourth, 9.9 per cent in the fifth, and 8.8 per cent in the sixth.

**Mr. Sobeski:** It is getting smaller.

**Mr. Milliken:** It is getting smaller, yes. As the hon. member says it is getting smaller. The increase is getting smaller because the debt is so much bigger. If the hon. member would study the figures sometime, he would find that what this government has done is allow the national debt to increase at a record pace in spite of all the phoney claims to the contrary. The idea that the operating budget is in surplus, what nonsense. You do not run an office and not pay the rent. This government is trying to claim it has a surplus because it is running the office and it is not paying the rent. It has to pay the rent. Canadians are having to pay the rent. This bill is one more indication of the government's desire to gouge and screw the Canadian taxpayer. We object to it.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, I was interested in my colleague's comments regarding the debt and the deficit. We do know how the debt has grown in the last six years. Not only has it grown, but the percentage of the debt that is being financed abroad has grown.

In 1984, when this government took office, the debt was around $170 billion and about 17 per cent of Treasury bonds were financed outside the country. Now the debt is $380 billion and 37 per cent of the debt is being financed outside the country.

It would be nice to have free trade with the Americans where we would be on an even footing. Of course interest rates are now 500 basis points higher than the Americans. Before the free trade agreement we could say: "If you are going to do business in Canada you have to manufacture in Canada". The free trade agreement did away with that, so it now seems that there is a haemorrhaging of businesses away from Canada into the United States. There is really very little we can do because of the government's financial fiasco other than bring out new financial policies, which this government refuses to do.

Has the hon. member, as a member from southern Ontario, experienced this trend of businesses leaving Canada and going to the United States as a result of the disastrous financial policies of this government?

**Mr. Milliken:** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to respond to my very learned and distinguished colleague from Cape Breton—The Sydneys.

I want to confirm that in fact there have been closures of businesses in my riding. I know of two that closed for the sole purpose of moving to the United States. There have been extensive lay-offs, particularly in the last few weeks as the recession for which the government claims credit—it claims it created it as a result of its policies—takes hold on the Canadian economy, throwing Canadians out of work.

On the other side of the coin, which my hon. friend mentioned, was the difficulty we face in borrowing abroad and the significant borrowings we have. Of course the higher the government deficit is, the more it drives Canadian investment out of Canada. Canadian companies cannot get capital on the markets at a reasonable rate, so they are forced to go and borrow abroad, which means we have more foreign investment in Canada and more Canadian industries being sold.

When this government said that Canada was open for business again, it really meant Canada is up for sale again. That is what it was talking about.

---

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

• (1900)

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

### THE ENVIRONMENT

**Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to expand on the question which I asked the Minister of Transport on May

15, regarding a barge carrying three million gallons of bunker oil. At that time it was projected to travel through the Gulf Islands of my riding and into the waters of Saanich Inlet, on which a number of people are working hard to have become a federal marine reserve park. My question related to the regulatory vacuum that existed in respect of oil barges and tanker traffic in that area.

I want to take the opportunity now to expand on that because we have, since that question was asked and the government responded, received the report from the public review panel on tanker safety, marine spills and the response capability. This panel was appointed on June 9, 1989 by the Prime Minister. The report's short name is the Brander–Smith report. I would like to take the opportunity to highlight some of the report's findings, because they are quite critical and point out some of the regulatory vacuum which I highlighted in my question of last May.

One of the panel's major findings was that the capability to respond effectively to a spill of any significant magnitude did not presently exist anywhere in Canada. This shows the reality of the situation.

Another finding was that a much greater volume of oil enters the marine environment as a result of routine tanker operations such as loading, offloading, tank washings, and waste water discharges than as a result of accidents. Almost all of these operational skills can be avoided. Only 8 per cent of the oil tankers operating world–wide have double hulls or bottoms. Of Canada's 31 tankers, only one is double hulled and ice–reinforced.

Over all, foreign tankers pose a much greater threat to our shores than domestic tankers. Almost one–quarter of the foreign tankers inspected by the Canadian Coast Guard in the Atlantic region, over an 18–month period ending December 31, 1989, were found to be defective. There is a requirement, because Canada is a signatory to an international agreement, that Canada inspect one–quarter of the foreign tankers. Only 8 per cent of those foreign tankers are inspected, because there is not the capacity to inspect the others.

I read in *The Toronto Star* of November 24 about an incident which occurred just off our Atlantic coast. I think it shows the mindset of some of the members of the Department of Transport. We are talking about a major spill off the coast of Nova Scotia, and a Transport Canada spokesperson said that it was really out of our jurisdiction because the spill occurred in international waters and it was a foreign tanker, a Norwegian ship.

"It is really out of our jurisdiction" is almost like the "it is not my department" kind of response which I find and I think all members of this House find very irritating when we have to deal with any bureaucracy. It is our department, it is our jurisdiction, because we all live on one planet and it is in our interest that this issue is looked at. I know that the government is trying to use shrinking resources in order to do a job, but we have to reassess our priorities to make certain that people really understand what the danger is. When we are told that there is no capability to respond effectively in the case of any major spill, that is a pretty significant finding.

I would like to point out some other findings. There is also a glaring need to standardize and upgrade dockside chemical loading and offloading requirements, as well as the design, construction, and inspection of chemical tankers and barges.

I think this is the key recommendation or the key finding. In my riding, the Coast Guard receives a lot of criticism for its inability to respond. This finding is that the Coast Guard is seriously under–resourced and cannot provide for the level of monitoring, inspection and surveillance required to adequately protect our waters.

The people who work for the Coast Guard are probably doing their best but they are just not given adequate resources. I think it is up to the Minister of Transport to go to cabinet and say, "In order to do our job properly, we have to have these resources".

I will quote from the report. I think it is important that I get this right.

> The Coast Guard's investigative and prosecution efforts are seriously inadequate and do little to deter polluters. Indeed, the chances of polluters being caught are small; of being caught and prosecuted even smaller. If polluters are prosecuted, the chances of being found guilty are minuscule and, if found guilty, fines are paltry. In the few instances where prosecutions are attempted and prove successful, fines are unacceptably meagre: between 1979 and 1988, the average fine under the Canada Shipping Act was $4,700.

That is hardly a deterrent.

Mr. Speaker, you are giving me the sign that I have only one minute left. There is a lot more I could say on this. What the government has to do is to start implementing these recommendations. The regulatory vacuum that exists is frightening for anybody who cares about the environment; anybody who lives on the coast line; anybody who has a business that depends on a pristine marine environment. That is a lot of people. We have to be able to integrate our economy and our environment. We have to start putting sufficient resources into protection of our environment so that the environment is protected.

**Mr. Dave Worthy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs) and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands. I know she is extremely serious in her questioning, as she should be when it comes to the environment, especially to something that could permanently damage and irrevocably harm any part of our environment. She has to be especially serious because of the coast line in the area in which she lives. As she points out, it is the job of all parties to be questioning and critical. It is the government's job to respond, and I will try to do that now.

Sharing the hon. member's concern, as all of us do, our Prime Minister announced the Public Review Panel on Tanker Safety and Marine Spill Response Capability in June of 1989. This was the David Brander–Smith report. It was released November 2 of this year and it is far–reaching. The recommendations have been accepted by the department and will assist in the improvement of Canada's spill response capability.

Some of the initial actions now under way by the Coast Guard include the developing of barge regulations and the planning for the improvement and upgrading of equipment.

In addition, the Canadian Coast Guard has a number of contingency plans in place to attempt to deal with ship or barge source oil spills. The master plan is the National Marine Emergency Plan which covers all Canadian waters. On the west coast, this is supplemented by the Western Region Contingency Plan.

Furthermore, should a spill impact on boundary waters, the Canada–United States Joint Marine Pollution Contingency Plan would be invoked. This calls for the combined Canada–U.S. pollution countermeasure response. These contingency plans are exercised, of course, with our American colleagues on a regular basis.

In terms of resources, the Canadian Coast Guard has major pollution countermeasures equipment depots at Victoria, Vancouver and Prince Rupert. A recent one has been established in Sandspit and another is being established at Ucluelet.

There are also a number of private sector resources that can be called upon. In addition, of course, Canada can call on the U.S. Coast Guard in case of emergency.

• (1910 )

The Canadian Coast Guard monitoring vessel monitors Canada's traffic movements on Canada's coast on a continuous basis and provides a reporting point for spills of oil or noxious substances. While my comments have been specific to the hon. member's region, needless to say all regions of Canada are being upgraded and similarly equipped.

Mr. Brander–Smith's study was in depth and far reaching in its implications. The panel's hard work is greatly appreciated and, as the hon. member indicated, it will go a long way to improving our marine response capability if we in fact can follow up on it.

## HOUSING

**Mr. Joe Fontana (London East):** Mr. Speaker, in answer to my previous question to the Minister of State for Housing as to whether or not we will have a co–operative housing program in 1991 and additional units built for people waiting for co–op housing, the minister was not as forthcoming as he could have been. In fact, he sounded rather unsure of himself and sounded rather unsure of his government's commitment to co–operative housing. I do not need to remind the minister that this government never made good on its initial commitment to 5,000 units per year. What it delivered is shamefully and irresponsibly much less than that: 13,000 instead of the 25,000 promised.

CMHC's evaluation of the current co–op program in the past five years indicates that the co–op housing has worked, is well received, and is meeting its social goals. By using its unique and innovative index linked mortgage

instrument, it can produce cost effective and affordable housing for this country.

However, mysteriously and suspiciously, CMHC has attempted to discredit some of the key areas of the co-op housing program by twisting statistical information. In its evaluation CMHC has made the conclusion that more targeting is needed and that security of tenure is not necessarily better served by the co-op housing than the private rental market. The evaluation also claims that the benefits of a mixed income cannot be proven.

Despite the fact that half of all co-op units is occupied by people in core need of housing, only 4.2 per cent of all households and co-ops perceived that it was very likely that they would be forced to move because of affordability problems, compared to the 11 per cent of private renters. Therefore it can be concluded that co-operative housing units do provide better security of tenure than regular rental units.

The minister said that the evaluation also revealed that a number of co-op tenants paying market rents can afford home ownership. Granted, there might be a few, but approximately 63 per cent of all co-op residents have annual incomes of less than $30,000 and approximately 80 per cent of co-op residents have incomes of less than $40,000 a year. The evaluation never tells us that in 12 cities across Canada a family with an annual income under $40,000 still will not be able to afford to buy a home. Given the incomes of its residents, these statistics suggests that co-ops are well targeted and are serving low and moderate income households.

By focusing solely on the income of the residents, CMHC evaluation limits the scope of its assessment. Affordability is just one housing issue addressed by co-ops. CMHC also indicates that 60 per cent of all co-ops have units targeted to accommodate single parents. Half of the projects accommodate the elderly and half also have units for the disabled. These targeted groups would have difficulty finding comparable housing accommodations regardless of their current incomes elsewhere.

The concept of mixed income co-op projects has great social value. Eliminating the possibility of constructing low income ghettos, it also allows for co-ops to be targeted to specific groups which have particular needs. Improving targeting to reduce the subsidies to moderate and high income earners in co-ops can be achieved but without jeopardizing the mixed income element of the program. The evaluation does not explore ways in which this can be achieved.

A report completed by Nick Van Dyk of the Canadian Housing and Renewal Association shows how the co-op program delivers affordable housing more effectively than other housing programs, including those that subsidize private developers. An evaluation of the co-op program's targeting must include a comparison with other housing programs to determine which is more effective. The information contained in the evaluation report clearly leads to the conclusion that the index link financing of co-operatives has successfully made the programs economical. This is beneficial in dealing with Canada's housing problems. The ILM should be used to refinance all co-operatives constructed prior to the introduction of the ILM in order to make them more economical. These savings should be used toward the construction of the new co-ops.

It is clear that the Conservative government has not used the evaluation to examine new possibilities for co-op housing in this country. Instead this government has allowed only three weeks of so-called consultation with the Co-operative Housing Federation and other co-op resource groups to help with the new program. Meaningful consultation means working with the groups. It is little wonder that I and others questioned the sincerity of this government. Do they really want to quietly and secretly kill co-op housing in this country?

Given that the co-operative housing program has provided an economical and successful form of housing, and given that the demand for this different type of tenure is high, will the government again commit itself to the construction of 5,000 co-op units annually in order to meet the broad-based need for this housing program? Will this government and this minister announce tonight, commit, to renewed and a rejuvenated co-op housing program for 1991 and beyond? Or will affordable housing for needy Canadians be also sacrificed for a military effort in the Persian Gulf?

I ask once again that this minister let these co-op people in the waiting lines and the co-op resource groups know exactly what the government's plans are for

the next five years for a worthy program that has succeeded in the past 25 years in this country.

**Hon. Alan Redway (Minister of State (Housing)):** Mr. Speaker, I want to make it quite clear to the hon. member that I am a very strong supporter of co-op housing and a very strong supporter of a continuing co-op housing program.

I know that the hon. member is aware that the federal government has been involved in a co-op housing program of one sort or another since the 1970s. In fact there have been three separate co-operative housing programs dating back to the 1970s. Each one has had different criteria, different aspects to it but all of those programs together have produced some 45,000 or more units of co-operative housing over the length of time there has been federal co-operative housing programs. Since 1985 when the current co-operative housing program was put into effect, over 13,000 units of co-op housing have been included and added to that total.

Back in 1985 the federal government, as you know, Mr. Speaker, and as the hon. member knows, conducted some consultations with respect to its housing policies in order to determine where we should go from that point. At that time there were consultations broadly held with the entire housing industry, all groups involved, including the co-op housing movement and everyone associated with it. Out of that came a consensus that the government would try from that point forward to target all of its housing dollars to those people in our country who were most in need of housing.

The hon. member is well aware that there are an awful lot of people in that category who are not being served today. In fact, about 1.2 million households in this country fall into that category.

The difficulty, as the hon. member is aware, is the fact that the co-operative housing program fact is not entirely targeted to low-income people. It is in fact, by definition, and by philosophy a program which is a mixture of incomes and therefore, as a result of that, is an exception to the government's housing policy targeting all housing funds to low-income people.

This housing program that was put into effect, being an ILM, an index-linked mortgage program, for five years was carried out in consultation with the co-op housing movement. It was to achieve some 5,000 units of co-op housing a year, but in fact failed to do that, not because there was any intention on the government to not produce that amount of money, but because there was an agreement made to put $5 million a year into producing units of co-op housing. We were unable to achieve that target because of the differing real interest rates on ILM mortgages and because the subsidy per unit cost rose from $1,000 to over $3,000 per unit at the current time. We have been endeavouring through our consultation process and our evaluation process to come up with a new program and some new recommendations in good faith. I will be making those recommendations to cabinet before the end of the year. I can assure the hon. member that I am certain he will be pleased with the results of those recommendations.

• (1920)

## HEALTH

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, the issue that I continue to raise with the Minister of National Health and Welfare concerns ethics in biomedical research. When may clinical testing of drugs be done on humans and how should subjects be enrolled in the clinical study? Does it matter whether the sponsor of drug testing is a medical school, a hospital, a doctor's clinic or a medical establishment?

On November 5, Canadians saw on national television a revelation that Canadian subjects had been enrolled in a clinical trial of the drug HI-6, an antidote against nerve gas poison, sponsored by the Department of National Defence, without them being fully informed that the drug could cause cancer, apparently despite contrary advice from the ministry of health.

Hence, my first question to the minister on November 6 was: "Could he explain why this study went ahead despite non-compliance with our Canadian ethical standards? Was he surprised and would he halt the study unless it reveals all known side effects to volunteers and thereby ensure informed consent?"

The minister in essence replied that in subsequent trials, that is during phase two, he will insist that a specific reference be made as to the possibility of carcinogenicity notwithstanding the fact that no direct evidence suggests the drug can cause cancer.

On November 7, I again posed a question to the minister. I challenged him to admit that the necessary tests for cancer in animals have not yet been done. I called to his attention that the drug is prohibited from

being manufactured in the United States because of danger to the employees and the community.

Earlier, during Question Period at that time, the Minister of National Defence had admitted that one ingredient used in the manufacturing of the drug is bis-chloromethyl ether, which is a known carcinogen, that is, it has cancer-causing properties.

The minister for health, in his reply, indicated that tests done in other jurisdictions showed the drug is safe. If one did not specifically test for cancer-causing properties of the drug and one did not have so-called purity data, that is the extent of chemical reactions during manufacturing, one takes the risk the carcinogenic ingredient could transmit its danger.

In fact, allowing such a practice would set a bad precedent for testing of new drugs for cancer in animals before trials in humans. To say that HI-6 could possibly cause cancer without animal data is meaningless and unethical.

On November 8, one of the subjects for the clinical trials was quoted in the press as having agreed to participate mainly because he was "broke" and he stayed in the study because he needed the money.

I therefore asked the minister whether enticing Canadians who are poor with extra dollars to serve as subjects is ethical. Examination of the consent form reveals some inconsistencies with respect to this matter. Page 3 of the form states: "Discontinuation from the study will involve no penalty", yet, page 4 states: "the subject will only receive percentage of the full fee—" unless the subject completes, "all aspects of the study."

Page 2 of the consent form alluded to one clinical study in Yugoslavia to sustain the claim that there were no untoward effects to date yet page 3 of the form alluded to "previous clinical studies", thereby suggesting more than one. My question is, why the discrepancy in numbers?

The form also indicates that the drug "may damage sperm cells which could result in birth defects." While advice was given to subjects "to practice contraception during the study and for 90 days following the study," no clear information was available as to possible damage that may occur as a consequence of cumulative doses as this particular study would allow.

I further challenged the minister why the clinical testing on humans should proceed before testing for cancer is done on animals. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I thought the government had the sequence backwards.

The issue before us is indeed most important. I would like to conclude by reading into the record of this debate a brief letter to the editor of *The Globe and Mail*, the issue of last November 11, from Dr. David Roy, Director of the Centre for Bioethics and Clinical Research at the Institute of Montreal. He writes:

> Respect for human beings and the protection of their health and lives, dignity and rights have formed the core of the many codes and guidelines governing the ethics of research with human subjects since the Second World War. The Nuremberg code marks a turning point. It crystallized the essential characteristics of consent required to protect the autonomy of human beings in biomedical research.
>
> Consent is not voluntary if people are seduced by money to submit themselves to potentially dangerous tests of new drugs. Consent to such tests is not adequately informed if those seduced to participate are not told about the effects previous tests of a new drug have had on animal and human bodies. Consent cannot be adequately informed if previous testing was insufficient to deliver reliable information about possible toxicity. Consent cannot be comprehending if warnings are couched in terms so vague they blind participants to the possible dangers of testing.

He continued:

> It makes no difference whether the sponsor of drug testing is the medical establishment, a drug company, or the military—the ethics of research with human beings remains the same.

He concluded his letter:

> We must not now, or ever, abandon the ethical progress we have made with and since Nuremberg.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, the HI-6 drug testing in question has failed to fully comply with the established ethical guidelines that now govern the conduct of biomedical research in human volunteers. Therefore, this particular study must be halted until the required animal studies for the concerns that I have raised have been done.

I trust and hope that this government will respond accordingly.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Lise Bourgault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for raising this question during the adjournment debate and for giving me this opportunity to repeat the guidelines for testing new products.

I am sure you will understand, and I assume the hon. member is aware, that the Department of National Health and Welfare takes this very seriously. It does not take lightly the risks to human beings who test new products.

Obviously, Health and Welfare Canada considers the risks and must weigh the pros and cons, before it finally authorizes human testing.

In the case of HI-6, Health and Welfare analysed these aspects, and at the time it was concluded most emphatically, on the basis of the evidence, that its benefits as an antidote for organic phosphate gases outweighed the potential risk.

There have been allegations that it would be harder for a company than a department to reach that conclusion. Not so. In this particular case, the Department of National Defence had to conform to the same guidelines and then some, before Health and Welfare Canada would allow this product to be tested.

Of course there is also the matter of compliance with the Food and Drugs Act and Regulations. Mr. Speaker, it has also been alleged that the regulations themselves are not strong enough. That is not the case. In fact, we are told the exact opposite is true. Often companies launch new products they are sure will be good for various diseases, including AIDS in one case. We heard a lot about this in connection with a drug for AIDS.

Mr. Speaker, I may add that the Department of National Health and Welfare has the authority under the Act. It is all very regulated.

There is also the ethical aspect, and I agree with the hon. member that it must be very strictly observed. Canada signed the Helsinki Convention. This aspect is very strictly enforced, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that with the help of the hon. member, we will continue to ensure that our standards are the very highest and protect the health of Canadians who test these products.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 7.30 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Tuesday, November 27, 1990**

The House met at 11 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

[*English*]

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, you will find, I believe, that there is unanimous consent for the House to waive the 48-hours notice required to debate the following motion in the name of the Secretary of State for External Affairs on Wednesday, November 28, 1990:

> That this House, noting that the Government of Iraq has not complied with the United Nations Security Council Resolutions concerning the invasion of Kuwait and the detention of Third Country nationals, supports the United Nations in its efforts to ensure compliance with Security Council Resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, due to the exceptional circumstances, having knowledge that the government wanted to table with the Clerk that motion yesterday so that we could comply with the 48-hour notice, and given the circumstances of the Secretary of State for External Affairs being outside the country—there was a relapse of time between our time and the time in Jerusalem—we would certainly accept that we waive the Standing Orders requiring the 48-hour notice in order to have this debated tomorrow.

**Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the New Democratic Party, we are in accordance with the suggestion made by the parliamentary secretary to the House leader.

**Mr. Speaker:** The House has heard the motion and the expressions of consent.

Motion agreed to and so ordered.

The hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier.

**Mr. Gauthier:** On that same point, Mr. Speaker, it would be helpful if the government could indicate if we could agree also to possibly extending the hours to allow for more members to participate in this debate, and if so, to set a time for tomorrow night, perhaps 11 o'clock or midnight, for the debate to last.

**Mr. Cooper:** I want to indicate that we on this side are more than willing to co-operate in any way that we can. May I just apply a couple of caveats. One is that we have a House leaders' meeting at 3.30 p.m. today which would allow us to discuss this in detail. Second, we could have a discussion, perhaps, of voting that may come out of the motion and how we would handle that. I would like to signal our co-operation, but to leave the final discussions of that to 3.30 this afternoon when the House leaders meet.

---

# ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1110)

[*English*]

## PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table in both official languages, the government's response to 78 petitions.

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

* * *

## INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION

PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF CANADIAN GROUP OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

**Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South):** 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 84th meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Punta del Este, Uruguay, on October 15-20, 1990.

[*Translation*]

## PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

### PRESENTATION OF TWENTIETH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the Twentieth Report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, concerning procedures and practices relating to the conduct of Private Members' Business, in both official languages.

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

* * *

[*English*]

## PETITIONS

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant):** Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to Standing Order 36 to present a petition signed by several persons from Nova Scotia.

They call upon the government to cease with its proposed shift of the tax burden on to ordinary Canadians through a regressive consumption tax instead of through a real tax reform.

In other words, they call upon the government to withdraw the GST legislation.

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table two petitions that add to the former petitions dealing with the imposition of the new sales tax on reading.

These petitioners take strong exception to the government's intentions to impose a GST on books. They state clearly that since Confederation no government has dared do this. This government is certainly to be condemned for its measures.

The petitioners say that the uninhibited dissemination of the printed word as a corner-stone of democracy, culture, education and a literate and productive society will be negatively affected by the GST applications.

The undersigned pray and call upon Parliament to re-affirm the historic principles embodied in the free status of all taxes for the printed word by retaining the zero rate applied for years to books and publications.

**Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie):** Mr. Speaker, I have a petition duly certified from members of my constituency in Punnichy, Saskatchewan.

They call upon the government and Parliament to reject the current proposal for a goods and services tax, to reform the taxation system so there is an effective minimum tax on wealthy individuals and corporations, in short, to engage in real tax reform instead of the regressive reforms proposed by this government.

[*Translation*]

### PARLIAMENT HILL

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to table a petition from residents of Senneterre, in Abitibi, who call upon the Government of Canada to scrap the so-called Hill project, which, at a cost of $68 million, would provide for the construction of an underground parking garage and shopping mall under the Parliament Buildings. Your petitioners recognize the need to preserve the environment and historic character of the Parliament Buildings and Parliament Hill in Ottawa.

Your petitioners also maintain that members should continue to park in the spaces behind the Parliament Buildings, and park outside like our factory workers in this country, and that the Government of Canada has better things to do than to provide an underground parking garage and shopping mall on the Hill for members of Parliament.

[*English*]

### CANADA POST CORPORATION

**Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to file a petition with the House, under Standing Order 36, from the people of Port Alberni, British Columbia.

The petitioners say that they are fed up with the service cutbacks at Canada Post and fed up with management and direction by government that places customer service at the bottom of the priority list. In particular, they request of Parliament that Canada Post reopen the drive-through postal drop-off service at Port Alberni, and also that Canada Post Corporation be instructed to keep existing outlets open, to operate longer hours, to expand revenue generating services, to stop privatizing,

and to start increasing services in order to retain revenues.

CABLE INDUSTRY

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from the residents of Coquitlam, Port Coquitlam, and Port Moody, British Columbia in my riding. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have been fighting a battle to get cable companies regulated.

These petitioners say that cable companies are making an average 32 per cent profit on fixed assets, whereas phone companies are making half that. The petitions humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt Bill C–284, which is my private members' bill, to apply rate of return regulations so that the cable industry will be regulated like the phone industry and Canadians will have lower cable rates.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to present a petition signed by numerous residents of the city of Toronto who are opposed to the goods and services tax and particularly to the tax on books and the printed word.

These persons would be outraged, had they been in the Senate the other day, to witness the spectacle of the Conservative majority in that body vote down a sensible, sound amendment proposed by my colleagues there which would have scrapped this aspect of that tax. Unfortunately, these senators, under instructions from the government, felt that they had to vote down this very reasonable amendment.

These petitioners call upon the government to reject the goods and services tax.

* * *

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 369 could be made an Order for Return, this return could be tabled immediately.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is it the pleasure of the House that Question No. 369 be deemed to have been made an Order for Return?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.



[*Text*]

IMMIGRATION

Question No. 369—**Mr. Berger:**

Since January 1, 1989, what is the number of deportations to the United States of non-U.S. citizens by (a) country of origin (b) province from which they were deported?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Shall the remaining question be allowed to stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

## BROADCASTING ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Thursday, November 1, consider of Bill C–40, an act respecting broadcasting and to amend certain acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunication, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee; and Motions Nos. 12 to 15 of Mrs. Finestone (p. 14979); and Motion No. 42 of Mr. Edwards (p. 14979).

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, as you have just indicated, we are resuming debate on motions which include the excellent motions of the hon. member for Mount Royal which are before us for discussion. The motions presented by the hon. member for Mount Royal reflect, in essence, the deep dissatisfaction with the substance of Bill C–40. We have to register such a feeling in the context of report stage.

The dissatisfaction flows from the key issue of the removal from the 1968 mandate given to the CBC to contribute to the development of national unity and to provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity.

• (1120 )

The removal of a national unity reference in the CBC mandate was recommended by two initiatives. One was the Caplan–Sauvageau report in 1986 and the other

subsequently came from the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture the year after. Both were concerned that this particular mandate of contributing to the development of national unity might, and I quote from their report, "interfere with the CBC's ability to ensure that its programming reflects and interprets as fully and fairly and accurately as possible Canada's cultural, social, political, economic, linguistic and regional reality and diversity".

I submit that this is rubbish. It is unadulterated nonsense. It is an abandonment and almost a betrayal of the original purpose and mandate that appropriately was given to the CBC in 1968 when its linguistic, cultural and social role was given a modern interpretation and a badly needed one.

A former president of the CBC, Pierre Juneau, when he appeared before the Standing Committee on Communications said that the phrase "national unity" had not caused any problems during his years as president of the CBC. It is worth noting that the CRTC noted that its interpretation of the term never precluded a free political discussion from all points of view.

In that context, we are very distressed to see that the Minister of Communications, who is in the House today, also drank the same bathtub water produced by the Caplan–Sauvageau report and subscribed to that rubbish as well. I am very disappointed because I always thought that, in philosophical and political terms, he was very much in favour of developing and maintaining strong bonds across Canada.

It is not just the fact that the CBC's appropriation was cut by $240 million over the last six years by the government that is creating unhappiness on this side of the House. The motions before us surround this dissatisfaction. It is the dropping of the national mandate given to the CBC. There is no amount of outrage that can reflect sufficiently the profound distaste for this measure contained in the bill proposed by the Conservative government. However, it comes as no surprise, considering the composition of the caucus and the recent transfers across the floor of the House from the government caucus to the independent benches.

Evidently, their interpretation of national unity is a very shaky one. It is a very shaky political alliance anyway, and it has given in recent time indications of falling apart.

We believe, as it was very well put in *The Ottawa Citizen* in May of this year, that the CBC is an agent for Canadian unity and that it must remain that way, that it is a bulwark against various decentralizing forces. It was in September of this year put very well in the *Globe and Mail* by Steven Godfrey who, among others, wrote on the CBC that Parliament should reject this bill as the cynical piece of work it is, making specific reference to the question of the dropping of the national unity clause. It seems as though the government has abandoned the basic principles that have determined the action and the spirit of this very important institution.

I would like to put on record some of the principles as restated in recent weeks by the Friends of the CBC movement, which is a coalition of artists, writers and the like, and who have somehow pledged their commitment to the CBC in the following terms. First, they see Canada as a place for a lively broadcasting industry which should have a strong and healthy balance between the public and the private stations. They believe that the CBC, both radio and television, is the most important element of the Canadian broadcasting system, and so do we. They believe that the CBC must continue to be a public service broadcaster and a dynamic alternative to the commercial networks and stations. They oppose the introduction of advertising on CBC radio and stereo, and the recent trends of increasing publicity and commercialization on the CBC television network.

In addition, they believe that the CBC must provide a balanced program service, a service which informs, enlightens, entertains, and meets the particular needs of a variety of specialized audiences. They believe that CBC programming should reflect and serve all parts of the country. They support a level of funding for the CBC that permits it to carry out its statutory mandate and here, of course, we come to the question of cuts and, therefore, a requirement to increase its funding. It is, with regret, that we know that our network in Canada is lagging behind other national networks, particularly the European ones, where there is a network one, a network two, and a network three, which try to meet the needs of different audiences.

Finally, the Friends of the CBC support an increased Canadianization of the airwaves. This eight-point set of principles was produced and distributed by a well-known Canadian author and writer, Peter Newman.

At this stage, of course, it is late to reorganize and to modify appropriately Bill C-40. Nevertheless, it is important to put on record these views because this bill, if passed, will hopefully be proclaimed, implemented and enforced only for a short time, that is, between now and the next election. At the time of the next election, I am sure that an electorate, enraged for a variety of reasons to which Bill C-40 has to be added, will take care of the wrong directions in which the government is leading Canada. Then we will see to it that the CBC is restored to its original mandate.

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak to this Bill C-40, an act respecting broadcasting, especially at a time when major decisions are going to be made, within the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, that will drastically affect not only the quality of our programming but the variety of services that we have been proud of for so long. I refer, specifically, to Radio-Canada International. RCI has been in existence since 1942 and, although some changes have been made to the service, the principle remains the same. That is, and I quote: "to convey objective information and balanced comment, thus reflecting the fullest possible freedom of expression".

• (1130)

Motion No. 15, the motion of our Liberal critic, the member for Mount Royal, and Motion No. 42, the government motion, contained, if you will, the future of an effective service.

If the information regarding CBC's projected $100 million budgetary shortfall is correct, there is nothing in this act to protect Radio Canada International from being eliminated altogether. Under Bill C-40, CBC is not required to operate an international service. It may do so if it so desires.

Motion No. 15 would prevent that, and I would like to share it with the members in the House:

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-40 be amended in Clause 3 by adding immediately after line 20 at page 5 the following:

(m) the Corporation should provide an international service subject to such applicable statutes and regulations as the Governor in Council may deem necessary;

Since you, Mr. Speaker, have grouped Motions Nos. 15 and 42 for debate, I would like to make a few comments about the government motion.

The government motion says:

(2) The Corporation shall, within the conditions of any licence or licences issued to it by the Commission and subject to any applicable regulations of the Commission, provide an international service in accordance with such directions as the Governor in Council may issue.

It is not very often that I praise the government, but in this case, I do praise the government because its motion is even stronger. It said:

(2) The Corporation shall—provide an international service

Whereas the Liberal resolution says:

(m) the Corporation should

I think we should all support Motion No. 42 where it says:

(2) The Corporation shall,

In other words, it must provide such a service.

Mr. Speaker, before I forget, I do want to mention that I do not like the words at the end of the government motion which say:

—with such directions as the Governor in Council may issue.

I will bring in an amendment to that motion at the end of my debate.

Usually, when programs have to be cut or reduced, they are phased out over a period of time. RCI does not even have that protection. To protect our international image, if reductions have to be made, I hope RCI will play an integral role in the decisions, and that any decision will be allowed a period of three to five years to take effect.

Hopefully, we will not even need that period.

My other concern has to do with the risk inherent in RCI being funded from the cultural envelope. The priority for the cultural envelope is servicing Canadians.

The priority for Radio Canada International is to reflect the spectrum of Canadian life and opinion to an international audience, although RCI does provide some programming for Canadians abroad.

I would suggest that the funding for RCI be left to those who understand what best serves Canada's national interest. I would not, however, go as far as suggesting that the Department of External Affairs manage the service, because it is the very independence of the service from the government that gives it the unique characteristics to make it as credible as the BBC.

I was impressed in the sixties when we had student exchanges with an American college, Alliance College in Pennsylvania. The president of Alliance College told us that he listened to nothing but CBC, Radio Canada.

I felt very good as a Canadian. Here is a president of an American college not listening to any American programs, but listening to our CBC.

I would suggest, however, that the responsibility for funding be moved to the external affairs and international trade envelope. This argument is especially important today. We are spending literally millions of dollars on trade delegations all over the world to make international markets more aware of Canadian trade opportunities, and millions on supporting trade with the Soviet Union and eastern Europe as encouragement in their struggle for democracy.

Yet, we are actually considering taking away one of the more effective and inexpensive means to reach and achieve exactly those goals.

I have on numerous occasions expressed concern about the government's commitment to following through with programs that it established. Just over three weeks ago, we debated the new and expanded role of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. We talked about the need to exchange technologies, information and the importance of discussing long and openly, if need be, to reach consensus among all countries involved.

We are still awaiting the return of Bill C-88, a bill that deals with Canada's contribution to the European Bank for reconstruction and development. Once again, they are the same concerns about the political will to follow through.

I do not think you would find too many objections to any of these initiatives if there was confidence in the motives for all these initiatives. But we keep seeing the introduction of new ones, while others lay by the wayside, forgotten.

One way to show that the government is serious about all these endeavours is to commit directly to keeping Radio Canada International alive so that the people in the Soviet Union and eastern Europe know about our desire and our efforts to see them through these difficult times.

I broke away from a three-day conference held here in Ottawa. The name of the conference is "The Changing Soviet Union: Implications for Canada and the World". I was impressed how the organizers found funding in a very creative way. They did not have enough money in one envelope from one department, so they found money from National Defence Canada, Industry, Science and Technology Canada, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, External Affairs and International Trade, the Disarmament Fund, Parliamentary Centre for Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade, and the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security. So there are creative waves of coming up with funding. Maybe it is time that RCI be funded from the external affairs envelope, rather than the cultural envelope.

I cannot emphasize the importance of the free and independent Canadian international service. I stress "Canadian" because —although the way this government is going, I am not sure how long this will last—we may find that to tune in to Canadian opinion, one need only turn on *Voice of America*. Hopefully this will never happen again because to date there is still great affection and respect for a news service that is Canadian. It is still felt that a Canadian news service is impartial and by being impartial it is encouraging to those populations in countries where censorship and news are synonymous.

One of the more recent examples that typifies this particular situation is the events that took place in Tiananmen Square. We were able to reach the students and convey to them our reaction to the tragic events. We were able to let them know that Canada was not going to send Chinese students back to China, that we were going to offer them refuge.

You are giving me the signal, Mr. Speaker, that the time is up. I have a lot more to debate here, but I do want to table an amendment to Motion No. 42 which would read:

That motion 42 be amended by removing the period after the word "issue" to be replaced by a comma and inserting the following:

provided such directions do not limit its journalistic, creative or programming independence.

I think the amendment is self explanatory.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The Chair will take the motion presented by the hon. member for Parkdale—High Park under advisement.

Resuming debate.

[*English*]

Is the House ready for the question?

**Mr. Flis:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Can I give the rationale behind my amendment?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Yes.

**Mr. Flis:** The rationale is that the members of the Liberal Party are concerned that the words "such directions as the Governor in Council may issue" are too broad and inconsistent with clause 35, subclause 2. This provides and enhances the freedom of expression and the journalistic, creative and programming independence enjoyed by the corporation in the pursuit of its objects and in the exercise of its powers.

• (1140)

Canada has shown through Radio Canada International that it has a dramatic role model to the world and in particular to those countries where democratic institutions are developing. Because of this role it is crucial that Radio Canada International not be seen as a tool manipulated by the Canadian government.

[*Translation*]

SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Upon brief consideration, the Chair has concluded that the motion presented by the hon. member for Parkdale—High Park is in order.

[*English*]

MEASURE TO AMEND

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to participate in this very important debate at report stage of this very important Bill C–40.

I want to keep my comments to a number of the proposed amendments, the motions before us in the grouping. There are five motions in this grouping, three of which I want to speak to in particular.

At the outset I should say that I support each of the amendments in this grouping.

The first one, Motion No. 12, deals very specifically with the parliamentary service. In a modern democracy, especially when we look at what is happening around the world, countries such as Yugoslavia, which I visited recently with some other parliamentarians, are experiencing for the first time a multi-party democratic election. We see that all over eastern Europe. Countries have to work as best they can to deliver the institutions to the people. What I mean is that in a place like Canada, this body here which is the highest court in the land, the Parliament of Canada, must take every means possible and use everything at her disposal to ensure that the people of Canada have access to their parliamentarians and can watch Parliament in action.

One way that that can be done, very clearly, is through the parliamentary channel. The parliamentary channel has been a great experiment in Canadian politics. I think now we have over 440,000 households on average watching Question Period every day of the week that this place sits. That is important because in a modern democratic state, televised proceedings of the legislature of the Parliament is a check on abuse by governments. It means that the people of Canada can watch their parliamentarians in action and when governments choose to abuse or override the rules or have the tyranny of the majority—which happens many times in this place—the people of Canada can tune in on their television, unobstructed, without editorial comment, without filtering by a news agency, and watch Parliament in action. That is very important.

The motion that we have before us, Motion No. 12, is very important because it would mandate CBC under this legislation to provide a parliamentary service. I know there is a committee of the House that is looking at better ways to deliver the proceedings of this place and of the committees of this place via the air waves. At some point it will make a report and the report will be debated. But I would hope that we understand that the CBC has a mandate and it is a mandate of national unity. Part of its new mandate, I believe, is to ensure that

never, ever, will commercial considerations or time considerations between conflicting priorities of the cable company overtake the ability of the Canadian public to watch Parliament in action. The CBC is such a body. The CBC is the vehicle that should be mandated specifically by statute to ensure that Canadians everywhere have a right of access through their televisions to what happens in this Parliament.

We know that many times a government, not just this government but more particularly this government, would like to ensure that the record of the House is not properly distributed to everybody in the country because sometimes governments make mistakes.

**An hon. member:** Especially this government.

**Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Especially this government. It is notorious for it. A parliamentary channel mandated through a vehicle of national unity like the CBC is the way to ensure the independence and access of every Canadian to the proceedings of the highest court in the land, the Parliament of Canada.

I would like to address Motion 14 because it really concerns me. This motion is one that I really hope all members in this House will support. It is an important motion. I come from Atlantic Canada. Unfortunately or fortunately, we have had to grow up watching the reporting of what goes on in this great nation from a central Canadian bias. The CBC, Global, and CTV obviously have to play to the ratings. They have to pay the bills at the end of the month. Those news organizations have mastered and got into the five-second or the ten-second clip, the sound bite, for the evening news because they only have a fifteen-minute or half-hour newscast.

What happens perhaps in Cape Breton Island or Newfoundland or Fogo Island may not be of such national importance in the view of the editors of those newscasts that it is going to show up on a national news report that evening. I do not fault them for that. That is the reality of the modern world. They have to pay their bills. If they are broadcasting news that does not appeal to the millions of people who live in this unbalanced country, because too many people live at the centre and too few outside the centre, they are not going to get their rates for their advertising and therefore they are not going to be competitive.

All of a sudden what appeared on the scene was CBC Newsworld in English. CBC Newsworld in my view—and I have said this to the director out of the Halifax operation—has provided a tool for national unity and understanding in this country. CBC Newsworld does not have to master the 15, the 10 or the 5 second clip for a 30-minute newscast. The mandate of CBC Newsworld is to report the news from around the world but, more particularly, from around this country.

I have learned more about Alberta from watching CBC Newsworld than from reading any newspaper in this country or any combination of newspapers. I have learned more about the problems of the farmers in Saskatchewan by watching CBC Newsworld because its mandate is different. Its mandate is to try to give a balanced view of news from across the country; not a biased view focused toward the centre, which is Ontario and Quebec, where most of the people live. It has done something different.

It started out as perhaps a Canadian version CNN, that great American all-news network that gives us a great American slant on every piece of world news, national news, or local news that it puts out. However, it has developed into something much more than that. It has developed into a piece of national infrastructure that promotes national unity and understanding in this country. I do not think anybody in this country or on any side of this House who has watched that service would disagree with me. It has been a refreshing break from the divisiveness and the isolationism that are all too often practised by Canadians in their regions and in their local areas. It is something that absolutely must be protected.

Motion No. 14 which says that there should be a French CBC all-news network is something which is very important. Nobody in this House has to be reminded of the difficulties we have between English Canada and French Canada. They are real and they are severe. Any vehicle that can appeal or deliver itself to the masses, which will increase the level of understanding between English Canadians and French Canadians, should be something that we should support whole-heartedly. We should find the money, no matter where we have to scrape it up, because it is an instrument of national unity.

This motion makes sure that at some future point, because of economic considerations, CBC Newsworld does not have to go out of business. This motion makes sure that CBC Newsworld does not have to alter its

format because of commercial considerations, because it has to make a profit. This motion ensures that CBC Newsworld and the benefit that we get in English Canada where it is shown of understanding the diversity and the richness of this country in its cultural, ethnic and regional diversity, are also available to people of the French language who live in Quebec and in other parts of Canada. Examples are the Acadians in Atlantic Canada and the French in the west.

• (1150)

I would hope that this motion in particular be really seriously considered by members opposite. I know that all too often in this House we vote strictly along party lines. If there is an amendment to the government bill, government members opposite think: My God, the House is going to come down on top of us if we agree that an opposition motion makes the legislation better. This is one of those cases where it not only would make the legislation better, but it would make the nation a more tolerant, hospitable and unified country in which to live.

In closing, I would just like to say that these motions that were put forward by my colleague from Mount Royal are thoughtful motions. They have been put forward in the spirit of keeping a national institution a national institution, and that is the CBC. Instead of shrinking its mandate to expand it by statute to ensure that when budget considerations come, as they currently are right now with massive cuts at CBC, some of the important aspects of Canadian unity and Canadian unity infrastructure such as the CBC are not tampered with by a budget axe but are mandated by the Parliament of Canada.

I would hope that members on all sides of the House would see fit to support these motions.

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken on this group of amendments, but the Liberal Party member has seen fit to amend one of the amendments, so therefore I am entitled to speak again. It is very interesting what has happened here, because the amendment was originally a government amendment, subamended by the Liberal Party. The government amendment states:

> The Corporation shall, within the conditions of any licence or licences issued to it by the Commission and subject to any applicable regulations of the Commission, provide an international service in accordance with such directions as the Governor in Council may issue.

What the government has put in the bill is to guarantee really an international service. We have just heard this week that the government proposes to cut Radio Canada International. I say to the minister that he cannot put that in the bill and at the same time turn around and eliminate Radio Canada International.

Why does the government want to cut Radio Canada International? It is part of a pattern to cut back and to threaten not only the independence but the very existence of the CBC. We have seen throughout the Mulroney government's mandate the systematic attack on the budget of the CBC. I have said it has leeched the CBC. It has also meeched it too, but we will come back to that when we debate the national unity clause.

The CBC has cut back its regional programming. It has been forced to behave like every other private broadcaster with an eye to the bottom line. The CBC has been stripped of its ability to do good regional programming. Now it will be stripped of its ability to do international programming. We will get a CBC, at least for English television, that is concentrated in Toronto. All the money will be in the Peter and Wendy and Barbara show and so on. I suggest that members might want to read Rick Salutin article in *Saturday Night* magazine. It is a devastating criticism of what is happening to the CBC.

I want to focus on something else when I see the minister here. I want to focus on real dollars. What I have done is have had a look at what has happened to the CBC's finances, and I just want to go over that. I am talking about allocations in 1988 dollars. I am going to give some figures for appropriations for operations and for commercial revenues, because my submission is that the CBC is becoming more and more commercial, becoming more and more like any other network. Therefore, when we see the CBC logo on television, it just becomes like any other station, and it is not distinctively Canadian.

The CBC, for example, has been forced to abandon its goal of having 95 per cent Canadian content in prime time. It has been forced, as I have already said, to

abandon its goal of having regional programming, which has been cut back 30 per cent.

I remember that years ago the CBC used to reflect Canadians to Canadians all across the country. Ten or fifteen years ago, we could see on prime time television *The Plouffe Family*, a family in Quebec. It was reflected to those of us who live in western Canada. We could see western Canadian programs that were reflected to other aspects of the country. We could see *Don Messer's Jubliee* from the Maritimes, which took some of that culture and reflected it across the country. There were four, five or six prime time shows from different regions in Canada that reflected the regions to Canadians. Now we do not have anything like that, and I will tell the House why.

In 1984 to 1985, the appropriations budget—and I am doing this in 1988 dollars—was $943.3 million and the capital budget was $93 million, for a total of about $1 billion. The commercial revenues were $265 million. That was 20 per cent of the budget. In 1985 to 1986, the appropriations operations go down to $879 million and commercial revenues go up to $268 million, some 22 per cent. In 1986 to 1987, $849 million for operations and revenues of 23 per cent. In 1987 to 1988, $828 million with revenues of 26 per cent. In 1988 to 1989, $814 million with revenues of 28 per cent. In 1989 to 1990, $812 million and commercial revenues of $374 million. Almost 30 per cent of the CBC budget is now in commercial revenues.

The minister over there just put everyone in a panic when he came before the committee and said: "Maybe we should get rid of ads". If we got rid of ads, the CBC could not even operate at all. Now the government has backtracked. *The Toronto Star* has quoted a policy proposal that in fact advertising come to CBC Radio. I like CBC Radio. I like listening to the *Gzowski Show* and the other shows. I like the fact that it is not beholden to commercial revenue. Leave that for the private sector and keep the CBC unique. This government is meeching and leeching the CBC. The radio network has been especially hurt.

The CRTC said in its most recent licence renewal that the CBC could not fulfil its mandate at current funding levels. Since then funding levels have declined further. In response to the questions before the standing committee on broadcasting last May, CBC Vice-President Michael McEwan said: "You are right. We are getting squeezed and each year. We have to factor in how we are doing to do that. This year, 1989–90, they lost a 1 per cent real cut across the radio system". They managed to sustain their activity for one more year. As the president, Mr. Veilleux, said: "If we keep going, something is going to have to give, and then you start talking about making decisions. Do you change the nature of how you express all your services? Do you lose some service? Do you lop off an arm rather than deleting the whole thing? These are the issues we are going to have to deal with if we keep heading down this road".

The government is sending contradictory signals. In its broadcasting policy *Canadian Voices, Canadian Choices*, the government said: "To capture an audience share consistent with the size of its parliamentary appropriation and to be able to generate sufficient commercial revenues, the CBC needs to reach large audiences". Yet, at the legislative committee, the minister emphasized CBC's cultural role and, as I said, he caused a near panic by suggesting that the commission might give up its commercial revenue.

The government has got to get a consistent policy. It has brought in an amendment to the bill to say that it is going to institutionalize Radio Canada International. Then it announced a couple of weeks later that it was thinking of cutting Radio Canada International.

It says it wants a national system; then it cuts regional programs. The minister says: "Maybe we should cut commercials". On the other hand 30 per cent of the CBC budget, as I have shown by figures, is in fact through commercial appropriations. This government has no consistent policy. I am glad the minister is in the House today, but it is about time that he paid some attention to what is going on in communications. I call him Oscar Masse, accepting Oscars in Hollywood or jetting off to Rome.

• (1200 )

I am glad the minister is here so he can deal with the real question of communications policy. The role of the CBC in international, national and regional programming is absolutely vital in this country. This is part of the glue that keeps Canada together.

That is why we, in the NDP, have proposed amendments with respect to national unity, the make-up of the

CBC, keeping the CBC independent, getting it well funded and putting it in the right direction.

In the next year, we are facing a constitutional crisis in this country. We are going to need a strong CBC that reflects fairly the major issues in this country. We are going to need to reflect Canada to the world. That is why I am glad the government has brought in this amendment.

I say to the minister that he should not be inconsistent. Do not bring in this amendment and then turn around and cut all the funds in the CBC, especially the funds for the international service.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take part in today's debate, and I am delighted to see the minister in our midst. Some words of welcome are in order, and it is a great pleasure to see him back in the House. I must say we missed him, and it is indeed a pleasure to see him here today.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the minister has had time to read the amendments with the requisite care, especially those put forward by our colleague, the hon. member for Mount Royal. The hon. member put a great deal of time and effort into these amendments and came up with some excellent ones which I will now mention, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member for Mount Royal wants the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to provide an all-news service in French and English, a service that is badly needed. There is, of course, Newsworld on the English network, which I think is very good and which provides a 24-hour service. However, although this is excellent for Canadians, at the present time we do not have a similar service in French, although the need is there.

Mr. Speaker, during the crisis at Oka last summer, for instance, we could get a steady stream of information on the English channel, while no similar service was available in French. I think Canadians, whether they are French-speaking or English-speaking, had the right to be informed about a matter of this importance, whatever their position happened to be on this question.

The fact remains that we had the right, as I see it, to be better informed on this question, and when I say we, I mean the French-speaking population. In fact, we were not getting the same level of service in French as we were getting in English because of the lack of a 24-hour tv news channel.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of the members in this House who had the privilege of learning both official languages of our country at a very early age, and I regularly watch the news on television in French and in English. I often wonder whether several times a week, we could perhaps translate the French news on Radio-Canada into English and take the English news on the CBC and translate it into French, so that Canadians would know what is happening on the other network, because the news we get on the English network is often quite different from the news we get on the French network, reflecting a different perspective.

As far as the regional question is concerned, I think the French network concentrates far too much on central Canada and tells us very little about remote areas, unlike the English network which does a better job.

I think it would be an interesting exercise to let French-speaking Canadians see the English news, translated into French of course, and vice versa, as I said earlier. I think Canadians need more exposure to the news broadcast in the other official language.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I think we should also compliment the hon. member for Mount Royal for proposing to this House that there should be an inclusion in the bill regarding northern service and, of course, regarding Radio Canada International. When we speak about the northern service, again we are talking about an amendment that was proposed by our colleague from Mount Royal who, very thoughtfully, proposed that there be such a reference in the bill. I say to the minister, across the way, that he should stop being so partisan and look at things objectively.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** He is not listening.

**Mr. Boudria:** I know the minister is listening; he is listening attentively, I can tell. With the close attention that he is paying to this debate, I am sure that he will want to consider the amendments proposed by the hon. member for Mount Royal. I see him nodding, right now, in favour of those amendments. I am sure that that nod

indicates that the minister wants to approve those amendments of the member for Mount Royal.

Now in the unlikely event that he is so biased that he refuses to consider those amendments, I will say that it is to the peril of this government. More importantly, I think we must entrench in legislation the need to have the CBC and Radio Canada not only transmit programming to Canadians but transmit information to Canadians which will assist the theme of national unity.

I know that will be addressed in a later amendment but I still wanted to take this very brief opportunity to raise it now because the need to promote national unity is an important component in the job of the CBC and Radio–Canada. I think it should be part of their mandate. I intend to support the amendments of my colleague, the hon. member for Mount Royal, to that effect and to support her tremendous initiatives in improving this bill.

In conclusion, we must not only continue to ensure that the CBC operates well and in the interests of Canada, we cannot take chances with the government across the way, and we must include in legislation some of the components of the CBC mandate to ensure that in a fit of privatization or cutting back, such as the Tories take from time to time, the government does not sacrifice some very valuable programming of the CBC.

I want to make one further point which relates to the parliamentary service. Again, that is set out in Motion No. 12, proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Mount Royal. I know that the parliamentary service is available to a large number of Canadians at the present time, but access to the parliamentary service should be made even easier. I say this because a number of cable distributors have made it such that the parliamentary service is only accessible by means of a television converter. I cannot see why it cannot be one of the basic channels for at least one parliamentary service.

I would even go further and say that all three channels should be on the converter so that Canadians can listen to the House of Commons in the language spoken from the floor, as well as in their choice of English or French, but all three could be on cable and at least one of them should be available on the basic service without the converter.

I conclude with those comments and I ask the minister, across the way, to support the amendments of the hon. member for Mount Royal.

• (1210 )

**Mr. David Walker (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by following up on the comments of my colleague who raised a very good point about availability of the CBC Parliamentary channel on the regular service. Several cable companies have put it into a channel which cannot be reached by low–income Canadians.

I know in my riding where people have an older TV and cannot afford to buy a new TV, they cannot watch the proceedings of the House of Commons when they are carried on a channel in the 20's. This coverage is one way we have of communicating with Canadians.

There are a whole range of problems. I wish the government, through the CRTC, would show more concern about this removal of service. It is not a small issue for Canadians, just one of those issues that gets lost in the shuffle. There are many low–income Canadians who wish the opportunity to participate in these debates through watching them and writing letters to the members when they agree or disagree with us. That simply is not available if it requires a new TV or a converter.

I would like to talk in this debate about the role of CBC in these particular areas. When I was listening to the debate a few days ago, I was struck by the number of members from all parties who stood up in support of the CBC and recognized that this government was not showing to Canadians the support that it has traditionally shown to the Crown corporation.

Throughout the last 50 years of broadcasting in Canada, the CBC has been a cornerstone of how we communicate. It has become a greater preoccupation as we enter into the debate on national unity. Every day the newspapers have one story after another about the near collapse of the country, the depression that we feel, our inability to communicate with each other. We realize that for any party to put this country back together, it must find the building blocks. The CBC, now as in the past, is one of those building blocks.

I know there has been a great deal of criticism, as alluded to by another member, and that journalists had been attacking the CBC, but that is part of the game. There are times when the CBC does a good job. There

are other times, like any other Crown corporation, when it does not do such a good job. Nevertheless, taking an historical perspective, CBC is one of the few building blocks that we have for communicating among Canadians.

In order to begin to set out a national dream and find a sense of purpose for Canadians, we need a vehicle by which to to communicate. The drive behind that communication cannot simply be commercial interest. There also has to be a non-profit, public purpose organization which can drive us into a forum which allows us to communicate through the regular broadcast of news services and the specials that can be put on in the public affairs area give CBC a role to perform.

Perhaps one of the most important services that is provided to us is the CBC English and French radio services which provide a commonalty of communications through all the remote areas. It does not matter whether you live in Toronto, like my colleague, in my riding in Winnipeg, or in the Northwest Territories as other colleagues do, there is a commonalty there.

If you accept that CBC is one of the building blocks that we should be protecting and enhancing, we have to make sure that the CBC services which are of value to the country are protected. For example, the parliamentary service, which I already discussed, is considered to be a key window for Canadians to view Parliament. Canadians deserve access to its proceedings.

The challenge for us as parliamentarians is to ensure that the new legislative framework and funding arrangements will make adequate and appropriate provision for the full and effective use of the parliamentary channel. I think there can be a great deal of expansion if it is properly funded. That should not be left silent in the legislation. There should be an amendment to show our support for the parliamentary service.

In light of what is happening in the Middle East right now, one of the most important services is Radio Canada International. Our critic, the member for Mount Royal, yesterday asked the government if it was still supportive of Radio Canada International particularly in the Arabic services in the Middle East.

When you see how quickly propaganda can be used to put us on the edge of war, a peaceful way of communicating to a captive audience—captive in someone else's hands rights now—is very important. Again we just cannot assume that the corporation will protect those in times of cutbacks. We have to say through Parliament that this is one of the services that we want it to protect and we are willing to pay for it.

Third, there is the all-news service. One of the great experiments in Canada in the last year has been the development of Newsworld. I can attest as a parliamentarian just how dramatically it has changed the coverage of Parliament and the coverage of other events.

Canadians now participate much more closely with world events because they are brought to us in an immediate fashion. It does not matter whether we are talking about the justice inquiry into aboriginal affairs in Manitoba or the inquiry into abuse in Newfoundland. No issue is too small and no issue is too big to be shared by Canadians.

What Newsworld does in terms of communications is that it pulls away the cost factor of big-time television and, more important, it removes the time factor to allow for the greater explanation of events and permit people to see things unfold, rather than be compacted into a 15-second clip, or compacted into a 90-second item. The subject can be expanded so that people who are really interested in an issue have an opportunity to see it take place.

For example, on *Newsworld* out of Winnipeg there is a call-in program on which Canadians have an opportunity at noon each day of the week, except for weekends, to phone in and to speak about issues of the day.

We as parliamentarians get a little lazy, I think, because we accept that we have an opportunity to stand up in the House whenever we want to express our opinions. For every one of us there are 80,000 Canadians who do not have that opportunity and it is our responsibility to give them every avenue possible so their views can be expressed. They have a way of talking about the problems facing this country without going through politicians. They should be able to do so just by picking up the phone and talking to people, or watching television to see somebody talking about Parliament, again not

in a 90-second clip, but at great length and in great detail.

These are the sorts of services which are needed. In a country becoming as impoverished as Canada is becoming, mainly because of the laziness of the government in taxation issues, and its inability to manage the economy and where we are faced with such an overwhelming debt, people begin to feel that they cannot afford to do this or cannot afford to do that. They feel that maybe television and radio are not important. It is time to stand up right now and say that these services are important and that the purpose of Parliament is to protect those services from people who do not understand their importance.

Obviously, in this debate the government does not understand the importance of the CBC. Perhaps it is because the Liberal Party is so proud of its tradition of building national organizations, of supporting national institutions, that we naturally rise up to the occasion to defend the CBC. We are astonished by the silence in the other parties.

As I sit in the House today I cannot believe that the NDP cannot contribute more to this debate. They should be rising to speak on this issue too. I think the reason they cannot do so is because they do not know where they stand on national unity. They do not know what the role of a national institution should be. When we hear more from them we will begin to understand whether or not they want to be a national party of purpose or just some rump group sitting over in the corner of the House of Commons.

These are very serious issues, not partisan issues. They are issues that we should all be addressing and we look forward to their contribution and I am sure that sooner or later they will have something to say. I look forward to the government being receptive to the amendments being proposed by our critic who has done a first-class job of bringing to the attention of all Canadians the importance of the CBC.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I return to the subject of Radio Canada International which I brought to the attention of this House yesterday. I know that the minister was not able to be present yesterday but I did ask for serious consideration of the assurance that Radio Canada International be maintained as an integral arm and a broadcasting voice to the international community as a voice of reason, a voice of a middle-western power, and something that the world scene requires.

• (1220)

It is not enough that the BBC, which is an important voice, or the Voice of America be heard, this middle power which is Canada and which is so highly respected across the land must also be heard.

I pointed out yesterday that CBC is in a very serious and difficult position because it is constrained. It cannot deficit finance, as the minister knows, and it cannot borrow.

I addressed my comments to the President of the Treasury Board, because in the final analysis the money that is allocated to CBC is determined by Treasury Board jointly with the Minister of Communications.

It is through their allocation of funds—actually through the starvation that they have undertaken of CBC— that we are, at this point, concerned about the maintenance of Radio Canada International as a viable voice of Canada to Canadians overseas and to countries that are looking for this middle level, democratic voice, that expresses cultural values in the two official languages here in Canada, English and French, and close to 1,400 other languages, which is an absolutely important function.

I have added this amendment because of our experience with the newly emerging democracies, the newly emerging democratic societies of this world who look to countries like Canada to understand democratic process.

I think that this House and the general public should know that the Speaker of the House of Commons asked that Mr. Philip Laundy be named as one of the officers of the House to enable Canadians and the Canadian democratic process to be understood by these newly emerging democracies.

Radio Canada International is in a similar position as the Speaker—the new one who is sitting there right now—and the Table Officers, men and women who in a non-partisan way help the instances of democracy work.

Radio Canada International is in the same position. The problem, perhaps, is that society does not understand the key role that is played by this service at a cost of $20 million a year to Canadians.

Not only does it bring a voice other than Saddam Hussein to Iraqis and Kuwaitis, enabling them to hear democratic views, it also brings the voice to our men and women who are soldiers playing a peacekeeping role on the front in many parts of the world.

I want to point out that 1990, which was a watershed year for freedom, came about in many ways because of the impact of voices like Radio Canada International.

I remember when we were discussing Tiananmen Square, we sat in this House until 3 a.m. Perhaps I was remiss but I thought it was very important to speak not only about the strength and the character of the young students who were in the square or the people's wish and hope for democracy. I spoke about the cameramen and the journalists who were in there bringing to the world a vision and a view so that we could understand what was going on.

At the same time, that voice—Radio Canada International—was bringing a picture of what was happening in that dynamism, in that moment of hope and then despair that was Tiananmen Square.

Mr. Speaker, the crumbling of the Berlin Wall and the changing dynamic in Europe did not happen without the voice of freedom that was heard on radio through short wave, through international voice.

It was very much the role of Radio Canada International. I wonder how many of us know that within days of the Tiananmen Square massacre, we began two daily broadcasts to China in Mandarin. We placed Radio Canada International material on local radio in three of the east European countries to which we broadcast already by short wave?

Through state broadcasts in Poland, Czechoslovakia and a private station in Hungary, all these countries were hearing the voice of freedom, the voice of democracy, the voice of a middle-sized nation, not one of the power brokers of this world, through Radio Canada International. These countries needed our voice. Now we are arranging training programs through Radio Canada International for nine broadcasters who are here from Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary on topics that range from journalistic policy and freedoms to the administration and sale of commercials, on how to bring the concepts of a democratic and free society together with advertising as a means of income for these stations. We have had staff exchanges through Radio Canada International.

We have an incredible challenge through the international broadcasting voice in the Persian Gulf right now. I think many of my colleagues have alluded to what is going on in a very serious crisis that is at the flash-point in the Middle East. How can we hope that both sanctions will work and peace will come about because Saddam Hussein finally comes to his senses and realizes that you cannot just march in and repress another country? If his voice is the only one heard, how will the citizens start to react? Through the international broadcasting voice we can have an inside citizen understanding and we can work with the people of Kuwait and the people of Iraq and have them understand that our presence in that Persian Gulf is to enable a peaceful solution, not to become aggressors in war as a first step. If we do not sensitize, through a democratic voice, who else are they going to hear?

I am saying that when we put Arabic on the air in the Middle East we were rendering a very important service in the national interest. Although we contributed that $10 million to our forces, as our part of the $350 million that was being sought, we were still contributing to the development of the national interest and the national concerns of Canada and Canadians by explaining Canada's presence in the Gulf, by explaining the role of sanctions, by explaining why Saddam Hussein does not have the right to just walk in and trample on the people and the property of Kuwait.

Those are things that we can do so that we can emphasize the country's motivation in joining the multinational expeditionary force. We have made our airways available to Canadians so that Canadians could try to reach their families and friends in the Gulf area. We set up special telephone lines through Radio Canada International.

Radio Canada International has been very creative because it has not had the means needed to reach all these areas of the world. Although it does, with 14 languages through Montreal and then through their station in New Brunswick, broadcast to many parts of the world, in many parts of the world it has had to undertake joint contracts through Japan, through the BBC. It has been extremely creative.

I would like to really plead with the minister and say to him that he may not want to accept my amendment on the parliamentary channel to ensure that there is always the decision of the Speaker and the decision of this House in a non-partisan way. He may not want to ensure northern services. I think he is wrong, but he may not wish to. He may not wish to ensure all news particularly in French as well as in English as part of the CBC services, but certainly the international voice of Canada should be maintained. I plead with the minister to accept the amendment which was proposed, by the way, by a member from his own side, the member for St. Maurice. I would hope that we can see Radio Canada International enabled to be present on the international world scene because it could eventually be an even more important voice in the international voice for democracy and understanding across the world.

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand in the House today to speak in the debate on report stage of a very important bill. The CBC has given this country the opportunity to reach across the globe for almost 50 years and convey to people what is happening in Canada and abroad. If I am not mistaken, I believe that we initiated CBC Radio International right after World War II. Our people in the Armed Forces were able to listen to what was happening at home and we were able to convey to them the message of support. We were able to convey to them that we at home are very supportive of their efforts and tribulations. Then, we went to the Korean War and our army overseas was again able to listen to the feelings of the people at home.

• (1230)

We have had peacekeeping forces for the past 25 to 30 years serving world-wide. In 1989, I visited Cyprus where I had the opportunity to speak to a lot of our people who are there in peacekeeping forces. They related to me how important it is to be able to listen to Radio Canada International, the short wave of the Canada voice coming to them. It makes sure that we do not forget them, and makes sure that they can participate and be active Canadians while halfway around the world. They can understand what is happening here. The newspapers take about four or five days to reach there, but Radio Canada International can be there simultaneously, the same night.

We have something else which is important. That is parliamentary services of Canada. This government is notorious about a number of things. I say that, Mr. Speaker, n-o-t-o-r-i-o-u-s, "no Tory us". Why am I saying "no Tory us?" We have seen this government plummet to a 14 per cent rating. We are not sure if the government wants to chop off completely the parliamentary service because it does not want the rest of the Canadian people to watch what we are doing in this great House.

I have the opportunity from time to time to rise in the House and speak. My constituents come to me and criticize what I say or give me a pat on the back for what I say. I wonder if the minister sitting across—and I see he is nodding his head—also has the same from his constituents and most of his colleagues in government. We can see from the recent polls that at 14 per cent the government does not want this "no Tory us" nonsense broadcast. I would not be surprised for one single minute if over the next couple of months the proposals the government is putting forward to chop the budget, gut the CBC, is not done on purpose because and I quote: "476 Canadian cable companies have this as of March, 1989 and this is available to 7.7 million households".

My colleague from Glengarry—Prescott—Russell also pointed out that the parliamentary channel should not only be available with a converter, but should be on a regular channel in French and English so that if people who live in the west want to watch it in French, they have the opportunity, or people in Quebec, if they want to watch it in English, also have the opportunity, or vice versa.

It is very important that we keep this service going because we have noticed that this government from time to time to time does not want the public to know what is happening. It wants to hoodwink the public, so it sweeps it under the rug.

I come to the next issue. Why the changes? Are we losing so much money that we want the changes? Are we going to privatize the CBC? Did I hear someone say yes? The minister is sort of nodding his head.

I go back to what we did with CN Express when we privatized it and gave it to Route Canada. The government was going to guarantee three years of service to our people. Eighteen months down the line, bang, we privatized Air Canada and 2,900 jobs were lost. We are moving to privatize Petro-Canada. I wonder how many jobs will

be lost? We are moving to privatize everything. I wonder, is the CBC going to be privatized next?

**Mr. Volpe:** The minister says yes.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** Ah, so there lies the culprit. We are going to move into privatization. Shame on the government, real shame on this government.

The other thing of great importance is CBC Newsworld. In September, Toronto lost the bid to have the Olympics in 1996.

**Mr. Volpe:** It was a shameful decision.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** My colleague from Eglinton–Lawrence says it was a shameful decision. I agree with my colleague because I am a Torontonian, but my heart also felt that the Olympics was eventually going to go back to its birthplace. It is something about celebrating the centenary. I was at a dilemma. What happened took me out of that dilemma.

However, it is important to note why the decision was made that the Olympics went to the United States. CNN was pumping directly into those peoples bedrooms and in their hotel rooms, scenes from where else? Scenes from Canada. Scenes about Oka and the turbulence with the Indians. It was also pumping into their hotel rooms the turbulence about Greece. We have seen how CNN effectively moved for them to get the Olympic games. Toronto lost and my city of birth also lost.

CBC Newsworld promotes national unity. There is no better means than having this opportunity for people, on channel 17 in Ottawa and on different channels across our country, to tune in through a converter box. Rather than requiring a converter box, this should be available on a regular channel so that Canadians can tune in and get more than a 20-second clip of what the Prime Minister or the Leader of the Opposition said. I am sure they are not interested as to what the first said, but I am sure they are interested as to what the second said. Canadians have noticed that we go back to "No Tory Us." The people of this country are tired of listening to what the Tory government has to say. They tune in to CBC Newsworld and they watch with great importance. They look at the news that we have to provide. Yet this government, once it got CBC altogether in 1989—

**Mr. Walker:** Shame.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** Shame, my colleague from Winnipeg says. In 1989, when the Tiananmen massacre broke, we were among the first nations to reach into mainland China with service in Mandarin and Cantonese and tell the people of China that we were supportive. We were among the first nations to reach and applaud the efforts of the students.

We are faced today with the situation in Middle East. We have approximately 2,000 servicemen in the Middle East. These servicemen watch with interest in what is happening in Canada. They watch and listen with interest to what we are doing.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that you are giving me the nod that I have only a few seconds left. I am going to pose this question to the minister. I know it is going to fall on "No Tory Us" because of deaf ears.

Mr. Speaker, I ask through you, and I know the minister is not going to listen. Mr. Minister, what is your real purpose of this? Do you want to privatize CBC? Do you want to gut it, so it shows that it is making money, like you did with the post office and everything else? If that is the real thing, shame on them. This country wants no more "No Tory Us."

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to Bill C-40 which gives the government an opportunity to improve broadcasting services to the Canadian public and guarantee on-going parliamentary services of Radio Canada International, the Newsworld and the northern information services.

Our culture cannot survive without these services. Let us be mindful of the fact that Canada is not a uniform country but one where cultural, linguistic and geographical diversities play a very significant role. This is why the government cannot afford to miss this opportunity to maintain through legislation all the essential services of the all-Canadian CBC network. We simply cannot cut off the communication links which make it possible for Canadians to learn to appreciate their diversity.

• (1240)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, this government will be missing a great opportunity to enshrine in this legislation services that

the Canadian public both needs and wants. That is why I support the changes so eloquently put forward by the hon. member for Mount Royal.

It is clear that the Conservatives are backing down from recommendations that their own members supported in the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture in 1987. Unfortunately for Canadians, it seems that this government refuses to listen to some of the progressive recommendations that come from the committees of this House. Mr. Speaker, as you well know, Canadians across this country have access to this place through one primary mechanism, the parliamentary service.

Canadians deserve a service to view their elected representatives in action. They deserve to have an unbiased and undisguised presentation of how their MPs perform their tasks. The challenge is to make certain that the new legislative framework and the funding arrangements will make adequate and appropriate provision for the full and effective use of the parliamentary service. Millions of Canadians who cannot come to Ottawa or who do not want to rely solely on media reports, tune in to watch us here in this Chamber. For more than a year, this service has been available to more than 80 per cent or 7.7 million Canadian households.

I firmly believe that it is worth while to legislatively ensure a continuation of this window on Parliament. May I add that I would be very interested to hear what objections the Conservatives have to this progressive amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation must cover Radio Canada International because its role has put Canada on the world scene. Other world countries have heard about us through this international network.

Radio Canada International came on the air in 1942 and the first network programs were heard in Europe in 1944. With respect to the international community, the RCI mandate is to reflect Canadian life and the various opinions which prevail in this country, not to mention various programs intended for Canadians overseas.

Mr. Speaker, Radio Canada International has a staff of 194 and listeners everywhere in Europe, Asia, the Caribbean Islands, Latin America, the Pacific, Africa and the Middle East. At least 16 million listeners tune in to Radio Canada International programs on a weekly basis.

Nor can we ignore the fact that RCI promotes employment equity for linguistic minorities. Services in a wide variety of languages are a source of employmnent and contribute to promoting an ever widening multi-ethnic, multilingual and cultural society.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, this service has proved to be a beacon to countries which are emerging into democracy. Within days of the massacre in Tiananmen Square, when the Chinese pro-democracy protesters were suppressed, Radio Canada International began daily broadcasts to China in Mandarin. In October, the service switched to a full Chinese program service with two half-hour transmissions a day.

When a people are oppressed and when they do not have any source of information other than official government propaganda, services such as ours prove to be indispensable. They offer a ray of hope to a people who are starved for information. These people need to know that their struggle abroad is not forgotten.

I feel that this service deserves to be enshrined in the legislation.

It proves to be even more important now than ever. The situation in the Persian Gulf is critical. We have sent over 1,000 Canadians to a hostile area and have asked them to put their lives on the line for us. It is obvious to say that the need to have the service in the gulf is paramount. It is not only essential for our troops but for the people of the region to understand our true intentions.

For example, we should let the people of Iraq know that our quarrel is not with them but with Saddam Hussein. As we all know, effective propaganda on the part of the Iraqi dictatorship scewers the information that may be related to Canadian involvement in the region.

One must also remember that hundreds of thousands of Canadians at home listen to these broadcasts. They assist in promoting our multicultural and multilinguistic character. It provides a unifying voice for all Canadians, be they here or abroad. I respectfully submit that these

facts should help in convincing the government to accept Motions Nos. 12 through 15, as well as Motion No. 42.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation brought in *Newsworld* to provide news with a uniquely Canadian perspective. This channel gives a detailed review of events affecting all Canadians. However, it is disappointing that the service is only available in English. As a Quebecer, I think we should have this kind of services in French as well. I am sure this would lead to a greater degree of tolerance.

[*English*]

Finally, we cannot forget the fact that Canada is an arctic country. Our northern service is important to Inuit, Indian, Dene, Métis, and non-native groups. This service provides our northern citizens with programs in seven native languages. All these essential agencies must be preserved and protected within the legislation.

Liberals are concerned that this government is missing a chance to protect and recognize CBC services in this bill. I sincerely hope that members opposite consider the motions put forward by the member for Mount Royal and support them before passing this bill.

**Mr. Guy H. Arseneault (Restigouche—Chaleur):** Mr. Speaker, I thank you for providing me with this opportunity to speak on a bill which threatens to do irreparable damage to our country's public broadcasting system.

Canada's history is rich and it is testimony to the strength of character and determination of our forefathers. In fact, without such a determination to be Canadian, combined with the guiding hand of government participation in a variety of sectors, Canada would definitely not have thrived nor asserted its national identity so strongly on the world stage.

This country is the fruit of the efforts and the will of our forefathers to build a nation east and west, to unite the land. Successive governments gave us a national railway system, a post office, a national radio and TV network, a national airline, as well as a variety of measures to help develop Canada as we know it.

If you look at what the Tories have done to the institutions I have just mentioned, you will be well on your way to understanding why the country is experiencing such an identity crisis and why so many Canadians have become so cynical about their government.

The privatization of Petro-Canada, the gutting of VIA Rail, the auctioning of Air Canada, and now the undermining of our national broadcasting system. All these policies were designed by a government seemingly intent on turning our country into an empty shelf. Frankly, I do not know how much more of this kind of mindless treatment our Canada can endure.

On a more positive note, Canadians have always been leaders in the field of communications, not only in telecommunications, but we have actually produced two world-class thinkers in communication theory. Harold Innis and Marshall McLuhan have set the standard as far as the study of communications is concerned. It would be an understatement to say that these two men contributed significantly to the affirmation of Canadian identity on the world stage.

It would be sad to see the progress we have made in this area come to nothing. I am amazed that the Conservative government has taken steps to undermine one of the pillars of of nationhood at a time when Canada is seriously questioning its *raison d'être*.

• (1250 )

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the 1968 Broadcasting Act required that CBC contribute to the development of national unity. Unfortunately all reference to this has been eliminated from Bill C-40.

Moreover, the government's proposed broadcast policy stipulates measures which could, as the hon. member for Mount Royal has said, cause the disintegration of the national broadcasting system. The shortcomings of Bill C-40 which include the creation of two separate standing committees for English and French language broadcasting at the CBC, the failure to recognize various CBC services specifically, the regionalization of the CRTC, and the potential loss of federal jurisdiction will seriously undermine a system which has helped unite our country from sea to sea.

Although Bill C–40 is flawed, I believe that the amendments proposed by the member for Mount Royal go a long way in addressing and correcting its shortcomings.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the amendments proposed by the Liberal Party, contained in motions Nos. 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16, are aimed at ensuring the integrity of our broadcasting system. First of all, they would help the Corporation maintain its role of contributing to national unity and being a permanent expression of Canadian identity. Second, they would ensure recognition for and continuity of the following elements: the Parliamentary Service, Radio Canada International, the all–news service in English and in French and the northern Service. Motion No. 42 further refines the provisions concerning Radio Canada International.

Unfortunately, if the government does not act wisely and fails to approve the amendments we are proposing, Canadian broadcasting will be severly affected. And what about the unity of our country? If the Corporation is denied that part of its mandate which is to contribute to the development of our Canadian identity, one of the pillars of our collective consciousness will have ceased to exist.

Mr. Speaker, you will agree this is not the right time to approve such a policy. According to the government, this change in the 1968 Broadcasting Act is justified because the national unity clause would handicap the Corporation's ability to encure that its programming fully, fairly and accurately reflects and interprets the cultural, social, political, economic, linguistic and regional realities of Canada.

This does not stand up under analysis. In fact, Pierre Juneau, former President of the Corporation, stated before the Standing Committee that the phrase "national unity" did not cause him any problems during his mandate. In fact, the CRTC made it clear that its interpretation of this term had never hindered free political discussion.

The Liberal Party feels that the Corporation must maintain its contribution to developing national unity, especially at a time when Canada seems so divided. If Canada is to have and maintain a national identity, we must bring all regions of this country together and create a feeling of belonging, and we can do through a well–shuchired broadcasting system.

Interestingly, even the chairman of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture supports the principle that the Corporation must maintain its mandate in this respect.

[*English*]

The minister has dismissed the CBC's 22–year old national unity mandate as intolerant interference, because the agency was maintaining this political value artificially and it was a constraint on freedom of expression.

I would like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, one of the more serious shortcomings of the bill. As we mentioned earlier, it fails to recognize various CBC services. If you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention some of these services and highlight their importance.

The failure of Bill C–40 to recognize the CBC's all–news network in either English or French is extremely unfortunate, since we have seen that the corporation has made incredible progress in this area. I believe that this extremely innovative undertaking ought to be officially recognized.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, I come from New Brunswick which is the only officially bilingual province in the nation. English and French citizens have learned to live together in my home province. In many ways we have demonstrated to the rest of the country what biculturalism is all about.

It seems to me that the recognition of the CBC all–news network would be important and that it would help create and foster a sense of nationhood. Moreover, the development of a French all–news network would go a long way toward helping relieve some of the tensions which our country now faces.

As for the other services including the parliamentary service, Radio Canada International and the CBC northern service, I believe that the government should heed the advice contained in the 1987 sixth report of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture. It should provide these services with legal recognition in order to help forestall the possibility of abolition in times of budgetary restraint.

CBC is in a very difficult position at this time, as it can neither operate with a deficit nor can it borrow money. The minister well knows this. It is very important that the government and the minister put in this bill the power to guarantee the place for CBC and to guarantee its future budgets.

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I can see that it is approaching 12.56 p.m. I know that I will be stopping at 12.58 p.m. and will be speaking on this legislation after three o'clock.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the hon. member for Mount Royal on her amendment to the legislation, an amendment that we support whole-heartedly. We believe that those amendments are fundamental. They are very important amendments made in good faith. It is our hope that the government will take those amendments to heart and will deal with them accordingly.

As it has indicated before, the CBC is a must. It is not a luxury. It is not something that our society or our country can live without. CBC is a necessity for our society. It does not matter how we look at it, whether we are talking about our culture, Canadian unity, our history, the Canada that we want to build and see 15, 20 or 100 years from now, CBC always has been in the past and still is on the leading edge in promoting Canadian unity and culture.

We only have to look at Newsworld, as one example as my colleagues indicated a little earlier. That is one of the very few broadcasting institutions in our country where 90 per cent of its broadcasting is purely Canadian. That is something we have to pride ourselves in and to commend CBC on providing.

The second service is the parliamentary channel. I have been informed that over 7.7 million Canadians listen to the parliamentary channel on a regular basis. That is another very important service that is provided by CBC.

Of course that is not to mention Canada International, the international news system which we have in place. Nowadays, when Canada has an incredible, excellent and great reputation internationally, I think to turn around and shut down such an institution internationally would not serve our purpose or our country.

As many of my colleagues have indicated, we do support the amendment. I can see the clock approaching 1 p.m. At this point in time, I would like to commend my colleague on introducing those great amendments. I will be speaking on the bill a little later.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** We are voting on Motion No. 12, in the name of Mrs. Finestone. 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 Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on the motion is deferred.

The next vote is on Motion No. 13, in the name of Mrs. Finestone. 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 Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on the motion is deferred.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The next vote is on Motion No. 14, in the name of Mrs. Finestone. 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.

**Mr. Speaker:** 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), the recorded division on the motion is deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 15 standing in the name of Mrs. Finestone. 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 Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded vote on the motion stands deferred.

The question is on the amendment to Motion No. 42. 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 Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded vote on the amendment stands deferred.

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock this afernoon.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

---

**AFTER RECESS**

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*English*]

### POST OFFICE CLOSURE

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday Canada Post announced that it is going to be closing the Yorkton post office on March 1, 1991.

Yorkton is a city of nearly 20,000 people, a trading area of some tens of thousands of people, and despite that this callous government across the way wants to close the post office.

I want is a justification from the government across the way as to why they it is doing it. I also want it to reverse that decision because if Yorkton, with at almost 20,000 people, goes, then what about the other towns and the other small cities across Saskatchewan and across Canada? How long is it before Kamsack, Estevan, or Weyburn are closed as well?

The government across the way does not give a damn about rural Canada. I invite today the back-benchers of the Conservative Party to stand up and join me in a fight to save the Yorkton post office, to reverse that decision, to stand up for rural Canada, and to stand up for some of the historical values and contributions made in the

country by rural people. What is it doing to our rural way of life, to a service that people need, and a service that people want? Justify the decision and reverse it.

* * *

## POSTAL SERVICE

**Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke):** Mr. Speaker, there are many people on Rural Routes 1 and 2, Renfrew, Ontario, who wish that Canada Post would take their complaints about mail service seriously.

On October 1, Canada Post decided to award one contract for the two rural mail routes to a person who does not live on either route. Canada Post unceremoniously dispensed with two well-liked and efficient contractors who knew everyone along the way. In return, it gave the people a service where cheques and other types of mail were ending up in neighbours' mailboxes; letters that were put in mailboxes for the contractor to pick up were left in the mailboxes; a businessman lost the opportunity to bid on a contract because the tender was floating around in the system; and wrongly delivered letters that were put back into the mailboxes with instructions as to where they belonged were being delivered back into the same mailboxes a few days later.

Customers on RR 1 and 2 Renfrew want me to call on Canada Post again to treat their legitimate complaints seriously, to review the contract that was granted on October 1, to talk to the customers about the type of mail service they are receiving and to get this serious problem settled now.

* * *

## AGRICULTURE

**Mrs. Louise Feltham (Wild Rose):** Mr. Speaker, my compliments go out to the federal and provincial ministers of agriculture who recently agreed in Winnipeg to several initiatives recommended by agri-food policy review task forces.

One in particular will lead to the creation of an agri-food advisory council for environmental sustainability. This council will advise ministers on resource base and environmental policy issues for the agri-food sector. This is one element of a three-part strategy relating to the conservation of soil and water and the protection of the environment. The strategy will also involve the private sector which will advise on programs in each province relating to the sustainability of agricultural resources.

Hon. members anxiously await the ministers' next meeting scheduled for February when they will assess the situation following the conclusion of the GATT negotiations and discuss the cost-sharing formula of the proposed safety net system.

* * *

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence):** Mr. Speaker, we can see that the GST is already hurting our economy. For example, under the GST transitional rules all industries, except the housing industry, will get rebates for inventory on hand at December 31, 1990.

With new housing, purchasers of homes started prior to that date will qualify for an FST rebate of 2.8 per cent of the purchase price if they close before February 15, 1991. They get nothing after that date. All inventory standing as of December 31 carries the full FST and is subject to full GST if unsold by March 31. That inventory will suffer a double taxation.

A high interest rate policy and a phenomenon of walk-away purchasers are exacerbating that problem. Those in housing propose one simple, corrective solution. Specifically, will the Minister of Finance extend the deadlines for the FST rebate provisions, or will he allow builders the same rebates available to purchasers, following the March 31, 1991 deadline?

* * *

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. J. W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury):** Mr. Speaker, the concept of regional development is frequently misunderstood by many Canadians, particularly those in regions who do not require such help.

We must always remember that Canada is a confederation of regional distinctions, some of which have economic advantages over others. One principle of Confederation is a fair balance between regions so that economic advantage and disadvantage are equalized.

All too often, regional development is characterized as charity. Nothing could be further from fact. Regional

development is a right in Confederation. That is why the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency is so crucial to the Atlantic region. It is a program of fundamental economic advantage to these four provinces, which is designed to provide the potential for economic balance with more affluent regions of Canada.

It is not only important that we maintain ACOA's advantage, it is even more important that we use it wisely and well to create lasting benefits which, themselves, will help achieve the balance and may, eventually, even remove the need for special regional aid. Until then, regional development is a unique and essential instrument of Canadian Confederation in Atlantic Canada and elsewhere.

* * *

## INUIT RELOCATION

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, we are appalled by an article in *The Ottawa Citizen* today which denies the suffering endured by Inuit of northern Quebec, who were relocated to the Canadian high Arctic in the 1950s as part of a government initiative. It is obvious that the writer has not spoken to any of the Inuit involved, nor does he have any personal knowledge of the circumstances and hardships which confronted these Inuit people.

The writer accuses the survivors and descendants of the relocation of spreading garbage. Perhaps this writer, unlike the people who were relocated, never had to forage through a white man's dump because he was hungry.

The article is misinformed, ill-researched, and pompous. Not only do these Inuit people deserve recognition of their suffering and an apology from the Canadian government, they now deserve an apology from the writer of this disgraceful article.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, from December 3 to December 7, International Trade ministers from 100 or so GATT member States will meet in Brussels to conclude the Uruguay Round and make decisions on the future of world trade. This Round is the most ambitious one we have known since 1948.

The Union des producteurs agricoles in Abitibi—Témiscamingue has made frequent representations during the past few months. It is afraid the Canadian government's strategy consists in gaining access to international markets for our wheat in exchange for dropping subsidies and production support programs in Eastern Canada for milk, beef, pork, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, Canadian representatives must stand up for our farm producers in Quebec and Canada.

* * *

## PREMIER OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, in La Presse, we were again treated to one of those recycled statements by "Lord Screech". Premier Clyde Wells was at it again, and all I can say is that although as Quebecers, we patiently listened to him for eighteen months when there was still hope for renewed federalism, today, our patience has run out. We will not stand for lectures from the Premier of Newfoundland on citizenship or Politics 101, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier of Newfoundland had the nerve to say that the Bélanger–Campeau Commission was unlawful. Mr. Speaker, we have news for the Premier. The Bélanger–Campeau Commission will serve as a guide for all Quebecers in deciding on their common future, and nothing Clyde Wells can do will stop them. Quebecers have nothing to learn from " Lord Screech" who says today it is up to the federal government to decide on our future.

Mr. Speaker, the right to self-determination is internationally recognized. Even Newfoundland called a referendum to decide whether it would join Canada. And today, they would deny us the same basic right? Mr. Speaker, that is unacceptable!

• (1410 )

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** I regret the hon. member's time has expired.

## CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING

**Mr. Mike Breaugh (Oshawa):** Mr. Speaker, today 12 different housing interest groups are on Parliament Hill lobbying for continued support for co-operative housing by the federal government.

They want the federal government to make a commitment now to continue direct sponsorship of the index-linked co-operative housing program in 1991 and beyond. The income mix as it now exists in housing co-operatives has been developed over the past 20 years and allows people from different economic and social backgrounds to build strong, healthy communities together. The index-linked mortgage has significantly lowered the cost of developing non-profit, co-op housing. The current program costs 58 per cent less in the first year and almost 20 per cent less over a project's life than the previous program.

As the Federation of Canadian Municipalities' Big Cities Mayors Caucus has put it, it urges "the federal government to maintain the federal non-profit co-op housing program with the existing income mix component".

* * *

## THE NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston):** Mr. Speaker, more on NDP hypocrisy.

I am deeply concerned about both the Ontario New Democratic Party and their federal cousins here in Ottawa. It seems that they are unable to decide in which direction they are headed. Simply put, they do not know which end is up.

One example is the Ontario government, headed by back-flip Bob, who have reneged on a majority of election promises. Now these self-annointed environmentalists have proposed to extend the already overburdened Keele Valley Dump site, thus threatening the Oak Ridges Marine.

What makes this situation comical is that the federal NDP is putting forth a candidate claiming to be an environmental engineer, if you can believe it, in the York North by-election where the dump is located. This type of confusion is consistent with NDP policy-making. After all, the party to my left is where Big Bad Bob received his political training.

A second example of confusion politics is the NDP stand on constitutional reform. It has managed to cover all of its bases with a federal leader who states that she is a federalist, her entire Quebec caucus which believes in sovereignty-association, and a provincial leader who has absolutely no idea where he stands.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am truly worried about the NDP.

* * *

## PERSIAN GULF

**Mr. Peter L. McCreath (South Shore):** Mr. Speaker, the gulf crisis is not an issue over which Canadians should seem to be divided.

It would seem that it has become the pattern of politics in the country that the opposition is not prepared to agree with the government even on the time of day or the weather forecast.

But Canadians cannot seem, nor should they be, divided on the actions of a Saddam Hussein. We cannot seem to be divided over the actions of a nation that arbitrarily invades its neighbours, or a leader who is prepared to use his nations' children as cannon fodder, or to gas his own troops.

The world is united against such actions and is preparing to send the message that such behaviour will not be tolerated, indeed will be repelled with force, if necessary.

Canada must stand unequivocally with our allies on this issue, and Canadians should stand united.

I urge all members of the House to put Canadian and world interests first, to lay aside their partisanship, and show Saddam Hussein and his ilk that their actions are totally unacceptable to Canadians.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Jean-Luc Joncas (Matapédia—Matane):** Next week, Mr. Speaker, the representatives of 100 countries will meet in Brussels, Belgium, to seal the fate of international trade. For Quebec farmers and dairy producers, this round of GATT negotiations is one of the major indicators of the economic future of the whole agricultural community in Quebec. Since the mid 1980s

the United States and the European Community have been waging a costly war to market their agricultural products, a war whose annual tab amounts to $300 billion in financial support of every description.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our governement to remain firm at the negotiation table so that our agricultural producers may keep what they have acquired through many years of efforts and sacrifices.

* * *

[*English*]

## MILITARY FAMILY SUPPORT CENTRES

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Mr. Speaker, as you know, my riding of Dartmouth is home to many of the men and women who are currently serving under three Canadian naval ships, HMCS *Athasbaskan*, HMCS *Terra Nova* and HMCS *Protecteur* which have been deployed in the Persian Gulf.

It is also home to the families who have been left behind while their loved ones go off to an area of the world in conflict. To say that these people—wives, husbands, children, parents, and friends—are living through a stressful period of time would be an understatement.

Fortunately, they do not have to wait in isolation. Thanks to the work of the Military Family Support Centre, under the direction of Lieutenant Commander Tom Willdey, they have been strengthened through the establishment of special Ships Spousal Support Networks for each of the ships on deployment.

It is a chance for the families who have been left behind to get together and get involved in activities, to be updated on Gulf news, or simply to enjoy the company of someone with whom they share a similar experience.

The idea of the Ships Spousal Networks is not new. They often come about when a vessel is away at sea. However, under these circumstances these networks are special and participants are describing them as a lifeline.

Thanks to the work of Lieutenant Commander Willdey, the staff, and volunteers at the military family support centre, these life lines remain strong. For that the families, the community, and members of all parties in the House of Commons thank them.

* * *

## VETERANS AFFAIRS

**Mr. Lee Richardson (Calgary Southeast):** Mr. Speaker, last Friday, a few veterans in my constituency were left with the mistaken impression that they would be adversely affected by spending cuts included in the supplementary estimates. I have discussed this matter with the Hon. Gerry Merrithew, Minister of Veterans Affairs, and am pleased to tell those veterans and the House that they will not be touched as the Department of Veterans Affairs finds $3 million in reductions.

For instance, there will be no reduction in budgets for disability pensions, no reductions in war veterans allowances, and no reductions in the Veterans Independence Program. The cost of transport for counsellors to veteran clients will not be cut. No cuts are being made in the operation of the veterans' hospital or veterans' homes. Reductions will only apply to operating and capital budgets so veterans in Calgary and across the country will not be adversely affected by spending cuts.

---

# ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

## PERSIAN GULF

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Canadians are aware of a draft resolution currently under discussion among members of the United Nations Security Council. This resolution would authorize all necessary means to get Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait on or before a deadline, likely this coming January 1 or January 15.

Yesterday, speaking from the Middle East, the Secretary of State for External Affairs said, and I quote: "My personal view is that deadlines are artificial."

Will the Prime Minister confirm that the Secretary of State for External Affairs was speaking for the government when he said that deadlines are artificial?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the resolution to which my hon. friend refers contains the words "draft resolution" because it is just being considered by members of the Security Council. It demands that Iraq comply fully with Resolution 660 and all subsequent relevant resolutions and decides, while maintaining all of its decisions, to allow Iraq one final opportunity, as a pause of goodwill, to do so.

I think that the Secretary of State spoke about what all members of the Security Council who seek peace and who seek the respect of the Security Council resolutions and not war, have been addressing. The pause of goodwill would be sufficient to allow the President of Iraq another opportunity to reflect upon actions that he has taken and to do what the world community unanimously has called upon him to do, namely, to withdraw from Kuwait and to return to the borders of his own country.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has not denied that the Secretary of State for External Affairs was speaking for the government when he said that deadlines are artificial.

Therefore, I ask the Prime Minister: Has the government instructed its representatives at the United Nations Security Council to inform the other members of that council that Canada will not support a deadline being included in the draft resolution on Iraq currently being discussed among members of that council?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I have indicated very carefully what the Secretary of State for External Affairs is seeking to achieve, and it is consistent with the participants at the Security Council who on every resolution, of which this will be the eleventh, have supported almost unanimously the requests that the authority and the moral authority of the United Nations be respected and defended. Yesterday, for example, by way of illustration, it is reported that Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev delivered an ultimatum to Iraq last night warning it to withdraw from Kuwait or face the worst consequences. "If Iraq really wanted to settle within the entire region and is interested in avoiding the worst, it must now openly pull out of Kuwait and release hostages, " Gorbachev reportedly told Foreign Minister Aziz.

• (1420)

President Gorbachev said: "He must weigh everything once more. The fate of Iraq is now in the hands of its own leaders and time is expiring". Indeed, this is the language and the substance of the resolution. Time is indeed expiring. What Canada is seeking is the opportunity for the President of Iraq to weigh this very carefully and to make a considered decision, such as the one that President Gorbachev yesterday invited him to make in the interests of world peace.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, we all welcome the interest of President Gorbachev in peacefully resolving this matter.

I did not hear any deadline mentioned in the quotation from President Gorbachev read out to the House by the Prime Minister. The UN resolution does make a specific reference to a deadline.

[*Translation*]

Speaking to an American Senate committee this morning, former American Defence Secretary James Schlesinger said that so far economic sanctions against Iraq have produced the expected results but might have to be maintained for a whole year if they are to have a decisive impact. His opinion is shared by a good many international affairs experts.

My question to the Prime Minister is this: Does he share the views of these experts and, if not, would he explain why?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, sanctions do have an impact on Irak, and this is why the Canadian government approved them and support them with the troops that have been sent to the scene.

Nothing in the resolution proposed for the consideration of Security Council members flies in the face of that reality. However most council members see eye to eye on one point: if the president keeps insisting, they might have to consider other circumstances and other options. But that is as far as the resolution goes. Nothing there clashes with the position taken by the Canadian government, or those of the President of the Soviet

Union or of the President of the French Republic, to name just a few.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, as my colleague just said, according to many observers there is strong evidence that sanctions are working.

It would seem important to listen to further evidence concerning sanctions from our parliamentary delegation now in Iraq. We would like further clarification and to know if the Prime Minister agrees today that sanctions still are the best means to achieve UN goals and a resolution of the conflict in the Gulf?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, we are there in the gulf because we seek to avoid war. We seek to defend the interests and the integrity of the United Nations. We seek to assist in the deterrence of aggression which is consistent not only with our traditions and our history, but also with our position as one of the founding nations of the United Nations.

Indeed, we believe that sanctions have played and will continue to play a useful role. There is nothing in the draft resolution at variance with that.

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, so that all members can participate in a full and informed debate tomorrow on the Gulf crisis, I would ask the Prime Minister to fulfil the promise made to this House yesterday and table today full information on the effectiveness of the sanction policy.

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, indeed there is a motion for tomorrow:

> That this House, noting that the government of Iraq has not complied with the United Nations Security Council resolutions concerning the invasion of Kuwait and the detention of third country nationals, supports the United Nations in its efforts to ensure compliance with Security Council Resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions.

That will be debated by all members of the House. The Secretary of State for External Affairs is on his way back from Jordan and Israel presently. He will no doubt provide information we have available on sanctions.

**An hon. member:** He is not here yet.

**Mr. Mulroney:** Well, he is not here yet but I will ask to see what information is available that might be relevant. There will be this debate tomorrow. Not only will all members participate but it will be interesting to see how all members vote.

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, the resolution which the Prime Minister just read out does not, as the Prime Minister I am sure will concede, expressly commit the Canadian government to place Canadian troops in any offensive action against Iraq, should that be authorized by the United Nations. That resolution which is coming before the Security Council on Thursday, according to the drafts that are now circulating, clearly authorizes the use of force in the gulf after the deadline—whatever the deadline ultimately is—is passed.

My question to the Prime Minister is this, will the Prime Minister make a clear, unequivocal commitment that before Canadian troops are committed to any offensive action against Iraq, the Prime Minister will bring a motion before this House giving this House a chance to pass judgment on whether Canadian troops as such should be committed to offensive action in the gulf?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the hypothesis that my hon. friend raises is one to which I will respond only because it is in the context of a debate that will take place tomorrow.

I personally believe and have said many times that the action that was taken at the United Nations and the action that is proposed is designed to convey an unequivocal message to the president of Iraq that aggression does not pay and that lawlessness is an unacceptable code of conduct in the international community.

That having been said, the hypothesis that my hon. friend raises would represent a substantial variance from policy at this point in time and I would be happy to ask the House leader to consult with members of the House to ensure that there is full participation.

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, I doubt if anyone in this House, let alone the Canadian people, could understand what the Prime Minister just said in respect of the specific question that I asked, that is will there be a debate in this House on a clear resolution authorizing Canadian participation in force, or will there not be? Will the Prime Minister indicate how he interprets the resolution, that is the motion that is being placed before the House for debate tomorrow? Will he acknowledge that does not in fact give the government

the right to place Canadian troops at war in the Middle East?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, we brought the matter forward for full debate on September 24. It is going to be brought before the House for full debate again tomorrow. If circumstances require, we will bring it for debate again.

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** I take that, Mr. Speaker, and I assume that the House will take that as in fact a commitment that before troops are committed to the Persian Gulf that the government will bring forward yet another resolution.

Let me conclude with a supplementary on the resolution that is coming before the UN on Thursday.

• (1430)

It is clear to this House and to the world that a war in the gulf will be a catastrophe not just for Canadians or other forces who are involved but for civilians, the environment and the whole region.

Will the government use its position on the Security Council just for once in this term and speak and act independently at the Security Council for peace and not war in the Persian Gulf?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, that is a deeply offensive suggestion to the people who represent Canada on the Security Council whose entire commitment is to the cause of peace.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Mulroney:** From the very beginning, Canada's conduct has always been devoted to the cause of peace. It was our position. We could hardly be accused of anything when our position was the same on most of these motions as China, the Soviet Union, Colombia, Cote-d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Finland, Romania, Malaysia or Yemen.

This is the international community coming together and saying to those of all political persuasions from all areas of the world and conveying a message to Saddam Hussein that indeed, as my friend says, war is a catastrophe.

Rather than accuse the United Nations or the United States, the NDP should be conveying that message to Iraq.

[*Translation*]

## HOUSING

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State for Housing. The minister is about to table before Cabinet his recommendations regarding the co-operative housing mouvement. The Canadian people are concerned that the government will abolish the mixed income housing program which was very successful in the past. Why does the minister intend to abolish the Co-operative Housing Program? Will he tell the Canadian people now what his plans are?

[*English*]

**Hon. Alan Redway (Minister of State (Housing)):** Mr. Speaker, I have said a number of times in the House already and as recently as last evening that the government is reviewing the current Co-operative Housing Program that has been in place for the last five years.

We are consulting in good faith with the co-operative housing movement and the Co-operative Housing Federation of Canada. I will be making recommendations in due course before the end of the year on where we should be going in co-op housing from here on in. No question about it, I will be making those recommendations.

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre):** Mr. Speaker, the minister is well aware that there are over 1.2 million Canadians who are in need of housing.

I would like to specifically ask the minister if he will extend his support to: One, meeting the high demand for co-operative housing through the construction of at least 5,000 units annually. Two, the continuation of index-linked financing, and three, the maintenance of the income mix component for new and existing co-operative housing.

**Hon. Alan Redway (Minister of State (Housing)):** Mr. Speaker, in 1985 the government undertook some consultations with all people involved in housing in Canada.

At that time, as a result of those discussions, the government arrived at a policy whereby all federal housing dollars would be targeted toward low income Canadians.

The Co-operative Housing Program, as the hon. member knows, is an exception to those principles. It is an exception because the philosophy of co-operative housing is to have a mix of income in a co-operative housing project. That is something we are looking at very closely at at the present time.

The recommendations that I will be making to cabinet will address the whole issue of income mix. It will address the issue of ILM mortgages and the whole question of a continuing co-operative housing policy and program federally.

* * *

## THE ECONOMY

**Mr. Joe Fontana (London East):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. Housing starts are at their lowest level in six years, down 40 per cent. The construction industry has 82,000 unemployed and climbing, and could reach 150,000 in the next month or two.

Now that the minister has admitted that he has purposely triggered this recession and inflicted this pain, will he now do the right thing: lower interest rates, scrap the GST and start building this country instead of tearing it down?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, it is a gross distortion of the policy of this government to suggest that we have triggered a recession deliberately. The hon. member talks about the low level of housing starts, and that is true. What has happened here is we had a very strong level of housing starts, in excess of 200,000 units a year and up as high as 240,000 units a year for a period. That has resulted in a fairly substantial amount of the demand being met. Now the pendulum has swung the other way. We hope that it will swing back soon to a more normal level of housing. We have seen interest rates come down. Five-year mortgage rates have come down from the 14.25 to 14.5 per cent to the 12.75 to 13.0 per cent range, and other mortgages rates have come down as well.

This we believe is the best thing that we can do without doing things that will distort the housing market, as the housing industry would agree. They do not want us to put special programs in that will distort the market, but they do want us to get interest rates down. That is what we have been doing.

**Mr. Joe Fontana (London East):** Mr. Speaker, surely the Minister of Finance is not suggesting that interest rates are low enough. In fact, he should know that support for his government is even lower than the interest rates in this country.

My supplementary question is this. Effective April 1, 1991, 1991 home buyers, if there are any left, who buy a home which which was completed in 1990 but not yet sold will get no FST rebate but will also have to pay the GST. Why does this government insist on double-dipping into the pockets of new home buyers who are already pounded by this government's high interest rate policy? Will this government reverse that double-dipping policy?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I met with representatives of the housing industry just yesterday. This was a proposal that they put on the table that I said I would give consideration to. At this point I am not in a position to say what we would do.

* * *

## TRADE

**Mr. David Barrett (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade. Given the press reports that President Bush conditionally agreed to Canada sitting at the negotiating table to discuss free trade with Mexico, I ask the minister to please tell this House today exactly what the specific conditions are that Canada has agreed to in order to participate in these negotiations. Will the minister table all correspondence that his department has had with the United States relative to the Mexico-Canada-U.S. free trade agreement, plus research papers that support Canada's position?

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I am indeed glad to welcome the hon. gentleman back from his prolonged siesta.

**Mr. Speaker:** I know that the hon. minister is motivated by only the best of good wishes, but I would hope that he would remember the rules here and carry on with the answer to the question.

**Mr. Crosbie:** Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not going to ask the hon. gentleman to vamoose.

With respect to his question, he is a little out of date because it was two or three months ago, I believe—I cannot remember the exact date—that we agreed with the United States and Mexico to engage in a consultation

as to how we would best proceed with a trilateral negotiation of a possible U.S.–Mexico–Canada free trade agreement. The U.S. administration agreed to that then.

I will be having a meeting at Brussels toward the end of the week or on the week-end with the minister of trade of Mexico and Carla Hills, the U.S. trade negotiator on that subject. Our officials have had several meetings. We are working on a series of papers in that connection. By the early winter we expect to know whether or not we will engage in a such a trilateral negotiation.

• (1440)

**Mr. David Barrett (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca):** Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between having a siesta and being asleep at the switch.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** If the hon. member says there is a difference, I accept that there is a difference.

**Mr. Barrett:** Having sold out Canada in the Canada–U.S. Free Trade Agreement, the minister is now being asked what specific conditions the Americans are asking for. Of course he has not answered that question.

I now ask the minister what steps he will take to ensure Canadian working men and women that they will not be faced with cheap Mexican wages competing with existing Canadian jobs in Canada and lose thousands of jobs, as they already have under the Canada–U.S. Free Trade Agreement.

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is apparently afraid of every country in the world that has lower wages than Canada. If that is his policy, then we will cease trading and we will raise prohibitive tariffs against every developing country in the world. This apparently is the new humanitarian NDP policy: we cut off every country in the world that has lower wages.

As a matter of fact, since January 1989, 207,000 net jobs have been created here in Canada, of which 180,000 or 87 per cent have gone to women. That is the record of success that we have achieved despite difficult economic conditions.

* * *

## GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

**Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North):** Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister for International Trade.

In the Uruguay Round of the GATT, tougher rules regarding intellectual property are being sought, including for pharmaceuticals.

Is the Canadian government satisfied with the draft proposals permitting Canada to continue its current system of compulsory licensing in the pharmaceutical industry? Or, does the government envisage that it will need to change the present Canadian system?

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact there is an interesting comparison here between a sensible question being asked and the previous question that was asked.

This is an important issue that the hon. gentleman is asking about. There is a negotiation on TRIPs, so-called, trade related intellectual property, and about the U.S. and parts of Europe including Switzerland. The European Community has made suggestions in connection with the intellectual property matter that would prohibit compulsory licensing systems, for example, applying only to special fields of technology.

As far as the government is concerned, we are very satisfied with the present system that we have in effect. It was passed by the House several years ago, as I remember. There was considerable opposition from members opposite, but now they apparently support that system. I gather from the tenor from the hon. member's question that they realize their mistake and are supporting our system. We intend to continue to support it ourselves.

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk):** Mr. Speaker, my sensible question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

The minister will be aware that the use of generic drugs has saved consumers hundreds of millions of dollars. If compulsory licensing is dropped at GATT, it could wipe out thousands of Canadian jobs.

Will the minister tell this House once and for all that he will not sacrifice Canadian jobs just to satisfy his government's American corporate friends?

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, apparently the hon. gentleman did not hear the previous question or the previous answer.

I can certainly tell him that this government is not going to sacrifice Canadian jobs for anyone, including hon. members opposite.

* * *

## IMMIGRATION

**Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

Canadians who leave the country to marry a citizen of another country have to wait two years or more before their spouses can come to Canada.

Can the minister tell Canadians, and in particular Canadians of Indian origin, that this inhumane, long delay will not be tolerated any more and that new measures will be introduced to reunite spouses as soon as possible?

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, clearly this is a matter of some considerable concern from a humanitarian point of view.

However, as the hon. member knows, part of the reason for the delay is simply the high demand of people who want to come to Canada. As the hon. member also knows from my announcement on immigration levels, with the additional money that we are going to put into processing we will be able to speed this process up, I would hope quite considerably. We will be moving spouses to the top of our priority list, as we move into our new immigration plan.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard):** Mr. Speaker, the minister said that it is due to the high demand of people who want to come to Canada. But why do spouses have to wait over two years to be reunited? Why does the minister demand that spouses be separated immediately after getting married?

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that our immigration plan does call for better conditions for spouses. It is a problem, but it is also due to the high number of people who are applying to come to Canada. We have the power to change the system to some extent, but not to the extent the hon. member and myself would like to.

* * *

[*English*]

## THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment who has lost the battle in cabinet on including specifics on global warming in the shrinking green plan. Greed obviously packs more punch than green for the Conservatives and their millionaire friends in the fossil fuel sector.

Would the minister explain to Canadians why he has chosen pollution and profit ahead of the conservation and energy efficiency strategy, which would have cut carbon dioxide emissions and would have saved every man, woman and child in Canada $5,000 over the next 10 years?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, all I can say to my hon. colleague in answer to that question is that the only thing that is shrinking here is his knowledge base about what is going to be in the green plan.

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the same minister. It will be interesting to see if when he said "billions" with an *s* it is the $5 billion that his predecessor promised in five $1 billion announcements.

Would the minister confirm that without action on global warming, which is clearly the most serious global environmental threat that we face, Canadians will face emergency costs as revealed in Geneva of $12 billion in dikes and other emergency measures to hold back sea rise over the next 20 years?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to re-emphasize the position that this Government of Canada has taken in Geneva.

First of all, we re-emphasized our commitment to stabilize greenhouse gases by the year 2000 at 1990 levels. Second, we stated very clearly in Geneva—and my colleague was there to hear me—that we accepted that further steps were required and that we would be working with the international community to set out those steps. Finally, we argued very strongly in that

forum that the convention to be negotiated, starting in January in Washington and leading up to the meeting on global warming in Brazil in 1992, should be negotiated at the same time as the protocols are negotiated so that the heads of state in 1992 could sign a comprehensive package.

We are moving very aggressively on global warming, and that is the reason why at the Geneva meeting Canada was singled out among a small group of countries as being among those that had moved aggressively on the issue.

* * *

• (1450 )

## CANADA SCHOLARSHIPS PROGRAM

**Mrs. Louise Feltham (Wild Rose):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister for Science. It pertains to the Canada Scholarships Program in science and technology.

Presently the Canada Scholarships Program in science and technology is not available to students attending colleges and technological institutes.

Could the minister apprise the House whether the government, as part of its commitment to improving Canadian competitiveness, plans to recognize the excellent research being conducted by the young men and women in our colleges and institutes, by implementing an awards program for technicians and technologists?

**Hon. William C. Winegard (Minister for Science):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question and for her continued interest in this subject.

There is no question that every member of this House would agree that technicians and technologists are an important part of making Canada a competitive nation. I have received hundreds of recommendations on this same issue. Maybe they have all been inspired by my hon. colleague.

I remind the House that this government, not very long ago, agreed to support a private sector led study on the role of technicians and technologists in Canada. I think what we will do—and it is on the science agenda and it will stay very high on the science agenda—is that as soon as funding becomes available, we would be pleased to consider it.

[*Translation*]

## IMMIGRATION

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. We all know that Ottawa and Quebec are supposed to sign a new agreement on immigration. This morning, the Quebec Minister of Cultural Communities and Immigration pointed out that signing this agreement was essential if Quebec was to pursue its plans with respect to immigration and that the agreement was not incompatible with current attempts at constitutional clarification in Quebec. My question is this: Does the Prime Minister intend to sign this agreement as soon as possible and if not, why not?

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, last week, before the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration, we talked about the Meech Lake Accord and a constitutional agreement, and subsequently about an administrative agreement. Of course, we are still working on this question but at this point it is impossible to set a date.

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie):** Mr. Speaker, if I understand correctly, the minister has just demonstrated that federalism can be an asset to Quebec. History will remember the important role played by the Prime Minister of Canada since his famous speech in Sept-îles on Quebec's progress towards sovereignty, and I want to thank him for that.

**An hon. member:** That's more than you ever did!

**Mr. Duceppe:** However, would she perhaps tell us, in no uncertain terms, whether or not she will sign this agreement? Since there is no immediate connection with the discussions on our constitutional future, it is feasible in the present context.

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, the answer doesn't change just because the hon. member is a bit upset.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mrs. McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** The answer is still the same. The Prime

Minister and myself have said this is an important question, but other matters remain to be discussed. There may be an announcement at some future date.

[*English*]

## FISHERIES

**Hon. Roger C. Simmons (Burin—St. George's):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my friend, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. He will know that the inshore fishery in the Gulf of St. Lawrence is a complete disaster once again this year. Ten thousand fishermen on the south west coast, in Labrador, and along the great northern peninsula are facing a pretty rough winter as a result.

Would he confirm for us that further quota cuts in the gulf are being contemplated? Also, would he indicate to the House what plans he and the government have to help those fishermen and plant workers who are caught in this situation, absolutely through no fault of their own?

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says that it is not a fault of their own. Certainly members will not at this time blame the Spaniards or the Portuguese for the overfishing of the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

We know and we are aware that some fishermen have raided the resource by discarding and dumping at sea in ways that are totally unacceptable. We have people from the industry, from the provinces and from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans working out a plan to try to address these enormous problems in the gulf.

Yes, we are contemplating reduction of the total allowable catch in that area, but before we make that decision we have to see what measures we can take to try to alleviate the impact that this could have on fishermen on both sides of the gulf.

**Hon. Roger C. Simmons (Burin—St. George's):** Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed in the minister. He will want to reflect on the answer he just gave, because apart from it being inaccurate it is unfair.

He may be talking about some people but, if he listened to my question, he is not talking about the people in my first question. I carefully did not say people in other provinces or in other parts of Canada. I carefully said people on the south west coast of Newfoundland, in the great northern peninsula, and Labrador. I put to him in this House that none of them in these categories have been guilty of the kind of activities that he has described. He might first want to apologize to the House and to these people in particular.

I ask him, more to the point, to reflect on the question now that he understands it and tell us what he is going to do for those people who, I repeat to him, through no fault of their own find themselves in the situation.

I am not suggesting that it is particularly the minister's fault either, but he is in a position to do something about it. I appeal to him, on behalf of those people, to do exactly that instead of flailing away and blaming people who do not deserve—

**Mr. Speaker:** I am sure the hon. member has put his question. The hon. minister.

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, I fully understand that the answer or the solution does not lie in trying to blame anyone for the problems that fishermen on the south west coast of Newfoundland are experiencing and will be experiencing.

I think the hon. member knows the concern that this government has shown for fishermen affected by a reduction in fishing quotas. We will monitor the situation in the next few weeks and in the next few months. If it becomes required to implement measures to try to be helpful to those communities and those fishermen, we shall proceed the way we have done in the past.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## CHILDREN

**Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. On October 1st, this government virtuously declared it would designate a minister responsible for children. Today, we see reports telling us that 30 per cent of the 1,2 million children in Quebec schools are undernourished. I would like to ask the Minister responsible for children—that man who asked with such eloquence the rest of the world to fight children's poverty—to explain why his government did nothing to

put an end to that shameful situation in Canadian schools?

[*English*]

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, the key responsibility of the federal government is ensuring that an attack is made on child poverty in Canada and around the world. We have made significant progress during the tenure of this government to lift children out of poverty, to give their parents the resources that they need to ensure that all children in Canada are properly nourished.

It is a commitment that is ongoing. It is one where we have made significant progress, and it is one where we are determined to make progress in the future.

**Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East):** Mr. Speaker, thousands of Canadian children cannot afford breakfast while this government is out to lunch.

I have a supplementary questions. Some 20 years ago, the Prime Minister's friend and mentor, Margaret Thatcher, as education minister cancelled the milk program for school children in England.

I ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare if the events at Westminster last week will encourage his government to repair the holes it has cut in Canada's social safety net and, for a change, bring in direct support for those children who are hungry.

• (1500 )

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I have to give the hon. member credit for creativity, if not for her understanding of the Constitution. She may well understand education is a provincial responsibility as opposed to federal, but where the federal government does have a responsibility is in ensuring the welfare of Canadian citizens. We do that, first of all, with transfers to the provinces under the Canada Assistance Plan and, second, in ensuring that an attack is made nationally on the issue of poverty.

If the hon. member would consider the figures today with those when her party was last in office, she would find that poverty among all groups, and particularly among children, has declined significantly since the Liberals were thrown out of office.



## EMPLOYMENT

**Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration. I think everyone is relieved that Algoma Steel is back to work and hopefully 6,000 people will eventually get back to work. The callback threshold for steel workers to become eligible for UI has been designated as 1,870, more or less. I asked her chief policy adviser if 1,725 would be acceptable. He said: "Yes". I retorted: "1,625?" He said: "No.".

I am asking the minister which number would she endorse: 1,200, 1,625, 1,750, or 1,870, or none of the above?

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, the question clearly is a frivolous one because what we do is determine every case on its merit and that is the part of what is in the legislation and what is in the regulation. It depends on the context of the situation. He knows that.

* * *

## PRESENCE IN GALLERY

**Mr. Speaker:** I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of the hon. Joel Matheson, Attorney General of Nova Scotia.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## PRIVILEGE

### BLOC QUEBECOIS—REQUEST FOR RESEARCH FUNDS

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw your attention and that of hon. members to a question of privilege concerning services and resources which are available to members and which unfortunately are not fair at this time. You sent me a letter today—I take it upon myself to read it because it is so very short—in which you say: "Dear Colleague, be advised that the Board of Internal Economy has considered the note in which you propose that the board allocate funds to your group for research and for the leader's office. Having examined your request, the board members deemed it impossible to approve the allocation of funds for the time being. Sincerely yours—" and so on.

Mr. Speaker, this response is not satisfactory at all, and when I think it took two months for each line, things are worse still. As far as I know the Board of Internal Economy is not a dictator and, in cases of requests for public funds, it should have to justify its decisions. Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot be satisfied with this "no", no "for the time being".

For what reasons was the request deemed impossible? I suggest that nine members of the House are entitled to know who made the decision. When you say "for the time being", what do you mean by "for the time being"? Will it be possible next week or even the following month?

Mr. Speaker, I call on your sense of fairness to explain to me why some members of this House have access to research services when others, who must play the role of opposition, do not have access to these same services.

Mr. Speaker, which rule of the House prescribes that there are two kinds of members? Does the decision of your board create two categories, those who are entitled to research services and have the right to carry out their mandate in the opposition, and the other element which is even worse, because with the budgets the traditional parties have voted for themselves they continue to use funds allocated at the time when some of us were in other parties. Mr. Speaker, we know that these amounts are calculated on the basis of the number of members in the House.

Therefore, I find it unacceptable that the Progressive Conservative Party should continue getting over one million dollars, the Liberal Party $674,000, the NDP $461,000, while no research staff is available to our group, which represents nine ridings.

Mr. Speaker, even in the Members' Manual of Allowances and Services, they explain that it was agreed later on to make the research funds also available to the caucuses and ordinary members.

When I read this on page 2 of Chapter E–8 of the Members' Manual of Allowances and Services, I agree with you that the members of our group rank as individuals members, but I do not understand why, if these funds are available to individuals members, your reply was so short, so unjustified and so unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that your Board of Internal Economy operates as a sort of small select club, but it is indefensible not to provide the necessary means to those who have legitimately chosen to defend certain options which you might not share. But democracy being what it is, I feel that the Board of Internal Economy through its rules, is imposing what I call the tyranny of the majority. It will not allow the people who do not share their option to have access to the same services. I do not see why my friend the hon. member for Laurier—Sainte–Marie who sits here as an individual member should he not have access to as much research staff as the former member for Laurier—Sainte–Marie? What is the difference? Was he less properly elected then the former incumbent? What is this private club, whose members allow themselves millions of dollars but who refuse to make them available to the people who do not share their view, but who have greater legitimacy in public opinion?

My colleague of the Reform Party has no research staff either, and we all know that if an election was held today, she would represent many more citizens than all of the Western Tory Members put together. And I can foresee that if an election was held today, there would be very few Tory Members on the other side and that the Bloc quebecois would represent thousands and even millions of people.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member is making a point which goes very much to the administration of this place. I am listening carefully. A political speech is not going to help me make up my mind as to how I respond to the particular issue that the hon. member is raising.

I certainly have the hon. member's point. I would ask him to sum up.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Lapierre:** Mr. Speaker, I would not want to dwell on this issue, but I must say that in order to fully carry out my responsibility as the member for Shefford, I must have the same rights and privileges as any other member in this House. I insist that all hon. members should be treated the same because we represent here thousands upon thousands of people. We want to do so adequately. Mr. Speaker, research staff are there first and foremost to make it possible for members of the opposition to make a thorough review of the government's legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we get them in large number everyday. It is clear that if we want to assume fully our responsibility—in spite of everything, we manage as best we can, and the public appreciates it, but it is not enough. I do not see why the member sitting in front of me has access to a research staff while I do not.

Mr. Speaker, it is a question of justice, fairness and ability to do the job. There are not two categories of members in this House and you must make sure that they receive the same treatment. There are not two categories of citizens, and there are not two categories of members. That is why I beseech you to reverse your decision, and if you refuse, you should at least have the decency to explain why.

[*English*]

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises an interesting point. I would like to respond from my point of view and especially the view of my constituents in western Canada.

The hon. member says his party wants the same rights and privileges as other members. They have them, do they not? They have a research staff. They have people in their offices. We have three people in our office. They have three people in their office. They have their office budget like we all have. Each MP has that. They have that.

This Parliament has been very liberal—small *l*—toward the Bloc quebecois. That is what my constituents say.

• (1510 )

They have places in this House. They have been asking questions. They have been allowed to get in the House after a questionable oath taking ceremony. We have been very liberal.

It is not a party. It does not have 12 people. Those are the rules. They should stop whining. The House has been very liberal to them and I find it shocking when they get up and whine, bitch and complain.

If my constituents were here in the House, they would be a lot harder on them than the rest of us. We have been very liberal toward them. They should stop whining and get to work by using their existing resources.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am going to exercise my prerogative as Speaker and take the point that the hon. member for Shefford has made. I see other members rising, and this could go on all afternoon.

It may well be only an administrative matter, but the hon. member has argued his case with some passion and I am going to consider it carefully.

I am going to return to the House, and I hope my response will at least show that the complaint has been taken seriously, which I know the hon. member wishes me to do. I hope that my response will be consistent with fairness in the House.

This is not a place to continue a debate on oaths or other things.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### BROADCASTING ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of Bill C–40, an act respecting broadcasting and to amend certain acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunication, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam)** moved:

Motion No. 17

That Bill C–40 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 39 and 40 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"(vi) contribute to national unity, shared national consciousness and identity",

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal)** moved:

Motion No. 30

That Bill C–40 be amended in Clause 5 by adding immediately after line 6 at page 9 the following:

"(a) establishes priorities for the system based upon the national interest;"

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, this is a very crucial amendment to the bill, perhaps to one of the most important parts of it. Let me summarize what it does.

The 1968 Broadcasting Act, the act that we are changing, says that part of the mandate of the CBC is to promote national unity.

The government has removed that clause from the CBC's mandate. This is a very crucial change to a bill.

In describing the CBC's mandate, this present Bill C-40 describes it as follows: That the CBC should:

(i) be predominantly and distinctively Canadian,

(ii) reflect Canada and its regions to national and regional audiences, while serving the special needs of those regions,

(iii) actively contribute to the flow and exchange of cultural expression,

(iv) be in English and in French, reflecting the different needs and circumstances of each official language community—

(v) strive to be of equivalent quality in English and in French,

(vi) contribute to shared national consciousness and identity,

(vii) be made available throughout Canada—

(viii) reflect the multicultural and multiracial nature of Canada;

And so on.

Yet, the government has removed the one obligation from the CBC, that of promoting national unity. The removal of this clause combined with the division of the CBC board into English and French standing committees weakens the CBC as a national institution. It seems to me that now more than ever we need someone to speak for Canada. We need to start looking about strengthening national institutions.

My hon. friend from the Bloc quebecois wants to dismember Canada, to have a separate Quebec and other separate regions in Canada.

There are forces in the country that are out to destroy this very country. There are traitorous forces in the country that want to dismember it. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the government itself should be moving to strengthen national unity, not to weaken the country; to strengthen national institutions, not to weaken them. That is what is happening in this bill.

Marjorie Nichols, my friend, writing in the paper today, *The Ottawa Citizen*, suggested that maybe we should privatize the CBC. Well, there again, we would lose another national institution. The people in the country are asking who is speaking for Canada. They are dying for someone to speak for Canada. Look at the opinion polls. They want someone to speak for Canada.

Steven Godfrey, in a recent article in *The Globe and Mail*, put it this way: "The proposed changes," that is, the change in dropping this clause out of the Broadcasting Act, the promotion of national unity, "are a sad commentary on the fact that there remains no area in which the very words 'national unity' can be spoken without inviting attack from members of the federal government alone. The federal government itself."

In an earlier speech today, I pointed out how the government is leeching the CBC by cutting back its budget and by relying more on advertising revenues to make it more of a commercial corporation. The government is squeezing and leeching the CBC. What is it doing now? It is meeching the CBC.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Waddell:** I make reference to Meech Lake. What the government is doing is saying we want the CBC to have a Meech Lake view of Canada, but Canada is a little more than Joe Clark's community of communities. This is one reason why ordinary Canadians were opposed to Meech Lake. It is not because they were anti-Quebec, not at all. That is a misinterpretation in Quebec.

My friend laughs and many Quebecers believe that, but it was not to be anti-Quebec at all. Canadians believe, I think, that there is an over-all Canadianism that is beyond the regional loyalties and Canada must be more than 10 distinct societies. It is true that Quebec has a special place in Confederation, through language and culture, and should have power to do that.

Canadians, by and large, when they think about it, including English Canadians from all over the country, agree with that. But they do not want to see a number of decentralized distinct societies in the country so there is no national government at all. That is what this government is doing. That is what this Prime Minister tried to do with Meech Lake. That is why Canadians rejected that. There is a greater view of Canada.

When I was speaking in the Meech Lake debate, I said—and you have to remember that goes back a few years, Mr. Speaker—that Canadians do not want Team

Alberta with Gretzky—he then played for Edmonton—or Team Quebec with Mario Lemieux—he was then playing for a Canadian team. They wanted Team Canada. They wanted to see one team and they wanted people to speak for Canada.

The minister and others have expressed the view that keeping the clause dealing with the CBC promoting national unity will lead to propaganda, that the CBC will be forced to maintain an artificial, political notion of unity in defiance of the artistic integrity of the corporation and the independence. The minister noted in his speech that Liberal governments in the past have launched witch-hunts against separatists in the CBC. That is wrong. Clearly, it is wrong.

It should be noted that the CBC's journalistic independence is protected elsewhere in the bill.

I see the minister leaving the House. I hoped the minister would stay and listen to this very important clause. He just puts his hand down and he leaves. It is one of the reasons why this minister has never got this bill through the House of Commons and why it is being delayed. He just does not simply care.

This is a key provision of the bill. The government has attacked the CBC in the past. It stacked the board of the CBC. It made political appointments, such as Bill Neville and Elizabeth Burnam. It has cut back the budget of the CBC. It attacked people in the last election campaign. Dale Goldhawk, for example, the president of ACTRA, was silenced and forced to resign his union position. It has taken after other people in terms of the investigation of election coverage in respect of the free trade issue. Look at the attacks on Roy Bonisteel and David Suzuki?

The CBC is in trouble. The CBC has problems. Part of the reason is because of this government. It is about to attack the CBC radio. I appeal to people out in the country who are followers of CBC radio and CBC television, when it is at its best, to stand up for the CBC and to stand up for Canada. Do not let the government destroy it. My God, it has destroyed almost everything we have got. It has taken our rural railways and our rural post offices and gotten rid of them. It has cut back railways. It is about to sell Petro-Canada. It has slavishly followed the United States in foreign policy. We are losing Canada. This whole country is up for grabs and this is an indication of what is going on. This country may not survive.

• (1520)

We are in a struggle for survival in the next couple of years. This government should be forced to go. It is too bad that we have this out-dated system where a government can be so low in the polls and at the same time still have a majority in the House of Commons, because we have gutless back-benchers who are afraid to vote against their government. If they were not afraid, we would not have the GST. We would not have the cutbacks in these national symbols.

The government is removing the national unity clause of the CBC. It has said to the CBC board of directors: "Well, now you have to sit in English. You have to sit in French." The next step will be while there will be an English network and a French network. Then there will be an English network responsible to the government in Ottawa and a French network responsible to the government in Quebec. Then there will be two countries. We are moving to lose Canada. We need people to speak up for Canada and we need these particular clauses.

I know there are arguments saying that the CBC should not be a propaganda tool. I do not believe the CBC is a propaganda tool with government. I think there are problems with the CBC. I think some of the commentators, as Rick Salutin said in the *Saturday Night* article recently, feel that perhaps there is too much centralized power in Toronto where the CBC broadcasters, such as the Peter-and-Wendy-and-Barbara group, take on too much power to themselves.

But the real view of the CBC is an instrument of national unity, reflecting Canadians to Canadians, taking every part of the country and showing it to other parts of the country, not being a commercial network, such as the American networks, being distinctively Canadian with 95 per cent Canadian content in drama, with a Canadian view of the world, reflecting to our people.

Who speaks for Canada, Mr. Speaker? Not the government. Who is going to stand up while this country is going to the dogs? I hope ordinary Canadians will put pressure on the government, hopefully to get it to resign and to change government in Canada.

I believe this country is worth fighting for. I believe we are losing it and I think that is a great tragedy. We have to fight it everywhere we can and this is one of the places to fight it. I am pleased my colleagues in the other

opposition party are are also making this fight and I applaud them for that.

We want to see the role of the CBC to promote national unity. We want federal institutions to speak for Canada.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank the hon. member for his excellent presentation.

I am glad that this review of the Broadcasting Act provides us with another opportunity to talk about national unity. To me and to millions of Canadians and Quebecers, this question is extremely important, and I think it is a matter of utmost concern. I therefore want to take every opportunity to express my faith in a country I am proud of, a country that is mine, that is ours, and a country that is admired and respected throughout the world. Tell me: Where on this planet would we be better off than right here in Canada? Unfortunately, we are destroying this country with a bill that is a disaster, that is poorly drafted and unacceptable to Canadian men and women.

It should come as no surprise when I say that when I read the papers or watch television in Quebec, I can't help wondering who defends the interests of Canada in our province. There is plenty of talk about sovereignty and independence, but hardly a whisper about federalism. I am reminded of what was said so eloquently by the leader of my party. My leader said it this way: "No one has the courage to talk about Canada in Quebec," and I think this is very sad.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, my leader said no one has the courage to talk about Canada in Quebec, and I think he is right. And that is why I object to the abrogation of the national unity clause as proposed by Bill C–40 before the House today.

The bill, in fact, does away with the mission entrusted to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in 1968, and I quote:

> Contribute to the development of national unity and provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity.

If we relieve the Corporation of this obligation, who will take over that responsibility? Isn't the corporation the nerve centre of our communications, as was said by our Prime Minister? What do we expect to accomplish with this wording change proposed by the government, for it does not add anything—quite the contrary, it diminishes the importance of the CBC mandate? There can be no doubt that at a time when our country has to cope with profound divisions concerning our constitution and linguistic issues, at a time when intolerance and racism are all too often so obvious, the CBC can indeed be the very link which unites Canadians from coast to coast and which can promote our identity and set off the absolutely unique nature of our nation.

Since the infrastructure is already in place, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand why we should fail to ensure that it is properly maintained and in good condition. Why would anyone want to thwart such positive measures and not promote national unity? I cannot understand that.

Can this kind of mission be considered as propaganda, as the Conservatives claim, and I quote my leader, Mr. Jean Chrétien:

> The *raison d'être* of a country is to survive.
>
> Quebecers have to be told about Canada. Never since Confederation has the survival of our country been so seriously threatened.

Even after the Meech Lake failure we must continue to cultivate the will to live together, to understand one another, and to respect, support and appreciate all our differences. We must put the emphasis on the similarities which unite us, not on the differences which divide us. By taking away from the CBC the mandate to promote national unity—and not the Union nationale, as our Minister of Communications said a number of times in the House, for he thinks we are still in the mid 1960s—are we going to prevent the broadcasting of scenes which do nothing at all for national unity? If so, I will come back on my position.

As I see it, changing the words will not change anything. Freedom of the press would always be respected, and I sincerely hope so. I have in mind the sad isolated incidents in Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie which, repeatedly shown on the screen, led us to believe that all English Canadians were intolerant, something

which our history has contradicted on a number of occasions. That is unacceptable.

I suggest that the government is making a serious mistake by weakening an institution such as the CBC, which is the cornerstone of our broadcasting system. As far as the government is concerned, the CBC should be relieved of its responsibility for national unity at the time when the government should be using everything at its disposal to ensure that the people of Canada are well informed and share a common vision of the future, while appreciating our regional and linguistic differences.

I believe that building national unity in Canada requires developing its character, building its identity and its national conciousness. We need strong institutions like the CBC to ensure that all regions and all social partners weave together the fabric of national unity.

[*English*]

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this is not the way this bill is designed. What this government is doing is building a form of sovereignty association into our national broadcasting system, the CBC, instead of building bridges of communication and common links across this land. Cultural survival is one of the critical issues today.

• (1530)

I have before me an interesting piece of legislation which is presently being looked at by the European council. They have set up an important fund called the Euromidges support fund. It was set up at the end of 1988 to develop the European cinematographic and audiovisual industry. Its main aim is of a cultural nature. It said in its report that the importance of audiovisual works in transmitting European culture in all its forms is obvious. The European cultural values in particular to younger generations must be communicated.

Cultural survival is a critical issue today. Broadcasting is a central vehicle through which Canadians can communicate, a major instrument for Canadian expression in the arts and entertainment, an essential means for providing a Canadian perspective in news information and programming. CBC reaches almost every household, so it is in a unique position to enable this cultural appreciation and growth as identification for ourselves, our children and our grandchildren. This is what will help form Canada and inform Canada. It becomes a very distinctive culture on the global map.

I find this whole approach totally disturbing. On the television sets in our living-rooms is this little remote control that my grandson calls "the little clicker". We hold the key to the future of the cultural identity of Canada. If you look at this bill and if you look at the way the government has put a sense of sovereignty association into this bill, it is totally disturbing. It has taken the CBC and divided it into English and French. It has taken the national unity mandate away from it. It has taken the CRTC and balkanized it by putting in a "he who hears decides" on a regional level. It has put in the potential for a challenge of its federal jurisdiction through its definition of programming.

This bill is totally unacceptable and the national unity clause is the greatest farce of them all when you see what the government has done in removing that. It has also removed all the other things that make this a distinctive Canadian unity from coast to coast and have allowed us to take a sovereignty association vehicle, instead of being the central nervous system of this country, the transportation unit of the intellect. We have managed to destroy a wonderful concept that needs to be reinstated into this country.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Since the House is dealing with Bill C-40, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my views on the two amendments moved by my hon. colleagues of the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party and aimed at using the CBC in part as a propaganda agency.

I know that the Hon. Member for Mount Royal would simply love to see the CBC become an exponent of her own political convictions, that her leader would love to appear more often on the CBC and feels that the CBC should act as a agent of his party. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that if we respect the freedom of the press, the creative ability and the record of an institution which has adequately served its listening and viewing public, I do not think that we should allow the CBC to become a propaganda agency.

The NDP member has emphasized that the CBC should—

**Mr. Waddell:** Weaken Canada!

**Mr. Lapierre:** He said: "Weaken Canada". I say to the hon. member that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation would have no credibility if it were to become a propaganda tool. I am surprised these members show so little respect for the intelligence of the audience.

Mr. Speaker, you yourself were once a dynamic element of Radio–Canada, and I am sure you would never have wanted to become a propaganda tool. This particular clause in the Act could be interpreted very narrowly. If tomorrow morning, the hon. member for Mount Royal became minister of Communications, I predict she would immediately tell the president of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation about his obligation to promote national unity. And in any referendum we might have in Quebec, for instance, Radio–Canada would play a pro–active role that would have no connection with the neutral and objective information gathering to which Radio–Canada has always been dedicated.

The hon. member said earlier that we did not talk enough about federalism, that not enough people were talking about it. The problem isn't Radio–Canada. The problem is that the hon. member can find no credible spokespersons for her option in Quebec today. Only her leader, on his occasional visits to Quebec, mumbles a few words about old–fashioned federalism. But we shouldn't blame Radio–Canada.

What we must realize is that there are no more credible Francophone spokespersons for the option they want to suggest, no one who is prepared to serve their cause, and that is true across the province. When I see this abdication reason and common sense, these demands for a propaganda mandate for a Crown corporation, I can tell them it won't work. Quebecers didn't give Radio–Quebec a mandate to work for Quebec's sovereignty. In fact, the first people to object would have been the hon. member for Mount Royal and all her friends in the Equality Party. They would immediately draw parallels with the Nazis or whatever. We have heard those speeches before.

Why do they want to make Radio–Canada do something they would not approve in the case of Radio–Quebec? When the Parti quebecois was in power in Quebec City, for instance, did they tell Radio–Quebec: Now you are going to pursue the same objectives as the government? Never, Mr. Speaker! They had too much respect for freedom of the press.

When I heard the hon. member for Mount Royal say that the leader of her party said a country's purpose in life was to survive, I thought I never heard such a stupid statement. A country's purpose in life, Mr. Speaker, is to share what we have and to establish common institutions. Survival is not enough. When I hear them saying this sort of thing, I am not surprised they have dropped substantially in the polls. They just want to survive, but we want more that just survive, we want to live! To that extent I believe that the definition she wants to give to the CBC again underlies the weakness of their arguments.

Mr. Speaker, they say that the CBC should develop a common vision of the future, but who will do that? The hon. member for Mount Royal, or perhaps the hon. member for Vancouver? Will it be Clyde Wells, Mr. Speaker? Can you imagine Clyde Wells being the CBC president tomorrow morning? What kind of propaganda outlet would it become?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Lapierre:** I see the Liberal members applauding. I can appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, because they may already be looking for a new leader and Clyde Wells seems to be giving a much better performance than their present leader. Even so, Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to promote him.

When I hear the kind of statements Clyde Wells has just made, suggesting that the Bélanger–Campeau Commission is illegitimate, can you imagine what it would be like if he were president of the CBC! He would ban all news concerning the B–C Commisison. When he states that the future of the country lies in the Senate, it speaks volumes for intelligence and democracy! You know, Clyde Wells is the one who is called— In fact he is the Premier of Newfoundland, the man with great ambitions. He is learning French not only to be able to speak on the CBC English network, but now he also wants to speak in French on Radio–Canada!

**Mr. Waddell:** He is not a New Democrat.

• (1540)

**Mr. Lapierre:** He is not NDP, but NDPs are worse, Mr. Speaker.

The point I wish to make is that instead of asking the CBC to do the job for them, they should offer true alternatives to Quebecers. I respect their determination to promote federalism and Canadian unity. I tell them

that we are prepared to discuss this issue with them anywhere and anytime.

Over the past few weeks, Mr. Speaker, debates were held in 26 Quebec CEGEPs, and in most cases, the elected Liberal members did not have the guts to appear before the students. They had to send in their some insignificant party hacks. I can tell you that my friend from the NDP and my colleagues of the Bloc Quebecois took part in these debates. We did not ask the CBC to do our own job. The fact is that these people are desperate, that they cannot find anyone to transmit their message and they would gladly avail themselves of the federal government's resources.

Mr. Speaker, that happened before and I must confess that literally at the time the Canadian Unity Information Centre dumped millions upon millions of dollars on Quebec. A gentleman named Paul Tellier was in charge then but now the situation is different; such abuses were tolerated in the 1980s but today they would be totally unacceptable.

And I say to the Federalists: Go ahead, promote your convictions, but do not try this time to use Ottawa's spending power to buy the support of Quebecers. You would simply fail. Every effort to buy their support would result in a massive rejection. It is not without reason that the vision defended by the Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada only has a mere 6 per cent support in Quebec. This is not CBC's fault but that of the Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada himself, with 6 per cent. Even if he appeared every night on the CBC television network, he would not convince anybody. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say to them: Do not try using federal taxpayers' money to put one over. Use the power of your convictions. The time for propaganda is over!

[*English*]

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax):** Mr. Speaker, it is a relief to get up to speak. I can only say that the unmitigated balderdash to which we have just been treated by the hon. member for Shefford needs some response, even if it does dignify such nonsense by even mentioning it.

I am enthralled by the clear belief that the member who just spoke has absolutely no regard for journalistic integrity, obviously no regard for the professionalism of journalists who work for the CBC, and clearly no regard for journalists in general. I am glad to see the hon. member for Halifax West applauding. I trust that the hon. member for Halifax West holds the view I do. I would presume he does, that Canadian unity is a good thing. Perhaps he does not. No doubt he will have a chance to say so himself.

It is a tragedy in this country today that people are asking from one coast to the other, east and west, north and south, inside Quebec and outside Quebec: "Who speaks for Canada". When did it become a crime in the minds of members of this Chamber to speak out in favour of Canadian unity? When did it become some sort of disgrace, to quote the member who spoke previously, some propaganda, to be in favour of the survival and the flourishing of this country?

I cannot believe that anyone who would sit here in this House, who would stand in this House and speak or claim to speak for Canadians, could actually stand and argue against Canadian unity. It is a sad time that we have come to, if this is the case in this country today.

The mandate of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for Canadian unity is something that has been with us for a very long time. It is something that the past president of the CBC, Pierre Juneau, said did not in any way interfere with the workings of the corporation in serving its various and multicultural audience.

On May 16, *The Ottawa Citizen* reported that the CBC is an agent for Canadian unity. It must remain that way as a bulwark against various decentralizing forces. Everybody who sits in this Chamber knows what the decentralizing forces are. There are hundreds of them. There are the questions of language, culture, geography, and regionalism which every single one of us in our home provinces and here in Ottawa have dealt with and continue to deal with on a daily basis.

The things that pull us apart are part and parcel of our experience as Canadians. They make us who we are. To quote Andrew Coyne in *The Financial Post*, "they make us know that we are us, that we are imperfect and that we have a multitude of problems", but they also make us know that we have survived for 123 years and, please God, we will survive as long as this earth survives. Mind you, with this government, that may be a problem as well.

The member who spoke previously talked about a mandate for national unity destroying a respect for creativity. I am sorry that my colleague for Kingston and the Islands is not here to make his usual interjection of "what nonsense", because that is what it is. It is rank and errant nonsense. The creativity that has been fostered by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation across this country, whether one is talking about *Cod Co.* from the province of Newfoundland or cultural programs that relate to our native peoples in the north and in the west or whether—

**Mr. Tobin:** Codswell.

**Ms. Clancy:** It is codswallop, just so that the hon. member for Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte will know.

At any rate, the cultural programs which have come from all over this country reflect that "useness", if I may coin the word, that is Canadianism, that is neither English nor French nor any of the multitude of other cultural groups of people this country. It is Canadianism.

When I speak to that, I know that I speak to the hearts of millions of Canadians, from whatever background they have been fortunate enough to spring. I know that that strikes a cord. It must strike a cord in the vast majority of members of this House, because this country in all its works and pomps is perhaps the most precious gift which any group of 26 million people were ever lucky enough to receive.

We stand here in this Chamber, we look at a Crown corporation such as the CBC, and we know that that Crown corporation, that broadcasting network, has made a difference to Canadians all over this country. It creates for Canadians a sense of self and a sense of oneness with our neighbours. The forces that pull us apart, as I said before, are many, varied, and strong, so we must be particularly careful of those forces that pull us together, and the CBC is one of those forces. It is something that Canadians, certainly those of my generation and the generation that is coming behind me, have always taken as a given. I say that of Canadians, of whatever background and of whichever of the two official languages.

I recall, as a graduate student in England with other Canadian graduate students from Quebec, Ontario, the maritimes and the west, staying up all night to listen to Radio Canada International in order to get the news from home, to listen to hockey games, and to just keep our link with our home country. That is how we discussed it, English and French, of whatever background, our country. It remains our country. CBC is one of the strongest mechanisms that makes it stay our country.

• (1550)

This summer I was fortunate enough to travel to different parts of Canada to speak to friends and family who live all over this vast country. I visited Quebec, western Canada, and the north. I heard the same thing from all these people. What is happening to our country? What has become of the country that we all fought for? What has become of the spirit of tolerance, acceptance and acknowledging each other?

I will tell you one of the things that has become of it, Mr. Speaker. It has become the butt of jokes for people who have no respect for the history and the traditions that began with great explorers who came to this country in the winter with De Monts and Poutrencourt who came to Port Royal.

My friend over there thinks this is funny. He thinks that a spirit of caring for this country is funny. I am glad I amuse him. If I amuse him, that is fine. He should remember that French and English alike have a stake in this country and will hold that stake. It is this country. It is not two countries; it is one country. It is not two nations; it is one country.

I fear for my colleagues in the New Democratic Party as well. The critic for the New Democratic Party, the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam, said in a November 25 article in *The Toronto Star* that he does not share the fears of the member for Mount Royal about the deleted national unity clause. He believes that the CBC contributes to unity simply by existing.

I believe that it contributes to unity simply by existing. I believe, along with the member for Mount Royal, along with the member for Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte, and along with every Liberal member in this House, that putting in the mandate for national unity can only strengthen that endeavour. It can only strengthen our belief that this is one country of many peoples, all with an equal share and an equal stake; that we are not going to see the CBC die; that we are not going to see that mandate destroyed; and that we are not going to see this

country go down the tubes because of an irrational response of a government that does not care.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie):** Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the stand taken by the hon. member for Mount Royal who is in fact attacking the freedom of the press. I get the feeling that she has the same disease as her leader who accused members of the press of being against him. In his view, to be on his side, journalists have to be actually working for him. She said we should promote national unity because there is more talk about separatism than federalism in Quebec. But that is what is really happening in Quebec, Mr. Speaker. Indeed, there are more people talking of sovereignty than there are talking of federalism. Should the CBC not reflect that fact, make it known and ensure that the people get a clear picture of what is going on in Quebec? Should objectivity be denied for the sake of national unity?

Should the CBC be used for propaganda purposes? What would you say if Radio-Quebec were used to promote sovereignty? That is not the case. That is not the mandate it was given by the national assembly.

Mr. Speaker, for the hon. member for Mount Royal national unity means that you must say "Jean Chrétien is against Meech Lake!" if you are speaking English, and *Jean Chrétien est en faveur du lac Meech* if you are speaking French. That is how the member for Mount Royal sees national unity, Mr. Speaker.

Does national unity mean that the people of Quebec are to be made to believe that the NDP exists in Quebec because it exists in British Columbia? Come now! We know that would not be an objective statement and that is not the truth. So, once again, the CBC must reflect the reality and not be a propaganda tool at the hands of the government.

Must we, all in the name of national unity, display Chinese vases, would say a very contemptuous former prime minister as he did when he was having problems with Quebec? Is that what national unity means for the Liberal member? All in all, if the people of Quebec make use of the CBC and pay for it, do they not have the right to be informed objectively? Do francophone journalists not provide objective information? I am almost done, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that there is a disinformation problem in Quebec at the present time. It has to do with anglophone media distorting the Quebec reality and not informing the rest of the country of what is going on. All Quebecers do not live in the town of Mount Royal, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to rise and participate in debate on this bill. I want you to know that I was number 10 on the list. Eight of the colleagues who were ahead of me were contemplating their speech material in the back and I had the opportunity, I am sure of their deep contemplation, to rush in here and fill the gap.

I am pleased once again to rise and participate in debate on this bill respecting broadcasting. I had the pleasure of doing so some three or four weeks ago. This bill, in the context and against the backdrop of what is occurring today in our country, points out the new mindset—

**Mr. Duceppe:** Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** A member asked if there was a quorum.

*And the count having been taken:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** There being a quorum, I shall give the floor back to the member for Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte.

[*English*]

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am sick and tired of what the member just did. I think the Chair should actually talk to him when he just gets up and says "on a point of order" and then leaves.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** That is not a point of order. The hon. member for Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte has the floor.

[*English*]

**Mr. Tobin:** Mr. Speaker, I hope you will adjust the clock so that I do not want to lose the opportunity to

participate in this important debate. The Speaker, of course, has earned a reputation for fairness in this place.

It is indeed interesting that a member would want on the one hand to be concerned that the proper quorum be present in the House and, having ascertained that in fact the proper quorum is present in the House, would then vacate the House. That is not the kind of attitude that demonstrates a sincere desire to debate, a sincere desire to exchange views, because there is nothing more legitimate than having different strongly held views, no matter what the view, and wanting to share that view, wanting to generate understanding. I do not share the views of the members of the Bloc quebecois. I do not always share the views of every member of my own caucus. We discuss that on Wednesday mornings in the Liberal caucus. We certainly do not always share views with members of the Conservative Party. But, if I do not share views with colleagues of this place, I always share at least the notion that every voice has a right to be heard, and that every voice represents a legitimate point of view.

• (1600)

We are here in one place and the whole notion of a legislature is to ensure that different voices from different backgrounds, different regions, and sometimes in different languages, can exchange knowledge and information on life's experience and generate a degree of understanding.

Simply playing a role of anarchy, a role of division, a role of frustration and a role of anger is testimony to a mandate that seeks, not to build, but to break down.

In the face of those kinds of people, represented by the member who caused the point of order, who caused the fuss, and then left, and in the face of that kind of mentality what has the government done?

In almost every aspect of the national life of this country in the face of that kind of mentality, this government has retreated. In the face of the challenge to Canada today, the challenge to national unity, this government has retreated.

It has brought in a broadcast bill to appease certain people that removes the offensive and terribly insensitive reference to the mandate of the CBC to be an agent of national unity. That offended some people, so it takes it out because people such as the Bloc quebecois did not like it.

It brought in a Broadcast Act that set up two boards for the CBC because that offended some people—people such as members of the Bloc quebecois—so we take it out. In the face of the very thorough, very serious professional and dedicated members of Quebec's Bélanger–Campeau Commission—and I do not agree with many of its members—who were doing their job in a most serious manner on the future of Quebec, how does the government respond? Does the Prime Minister decide that he is going to appear before the Bélanger–Campeau Commission? No. Does the leader of the NDP decide to appear before the Bélanger–Campeau Commission? No. Does the government decide to set up a parallel national process involving every part of the country, including Quebec, to respond to Bélanger–Campeau? No, Mr. Speaker, it does not.

It sets up the Spicer Commission without any reference to the individual members of that commission. It has a mandate that is a watered–down, pale, pathetic mandate to act as a legitimate and serious response on behalf of the people of Canada through their agent, the national government, to the crisis that is unfolding in Canada today and to what is going on in Quebec today, legitimately. It is the right of the people of Quebec to have such an exercise, but it is the responsibility of the Government of Canada to respond to it in a meaningful way.

That has not happened with this pale, pathetic, watered–down, ridiculous answer called the Citizens' Forum. It is an insult to the intelligence of the people of Canada, a country mired in paralysis at a time when leadership is demanded.

These points have been made by the Leader of the Opposition in responding on the day the forum was announced when he said it had to be a serious agent to provide an opportunity for the people of Canada to speak about their country and to seek solutions and new directions. That was the position of the Leader of the Opposition and he shares my view, I am sure, that that the kind of comprehensive action we wanted has not been produced. We have nothing but great disappointment in what we have seen so far in the face of the constitutional evolution that is under way in the country.

**An hon. member:** Why didn't you tell Wells that?

**Mr. Tobin:** Mr. speaker, the member across the way is hooting and hollering: "Why did you not tell Wells that?"

What I am saying, and what I suspect, modestly, is reflected in the gut and in the heart and soul of a great many Canadians, is that people have a sense that this ship of state upon which they are all passengers today is adrift in a vast angry and stormy sea. As they sit as passengers, 26 million or 27 million Canadians, on that ship adrift on an angry sea being bounced to and fro, feeling their stomachs heave, they want a sense of leadership. They want once again a steady hand on the helm. They want a leader to chart a new course for this country. They want a captain capable of bringing the ship out of the stormy seas and back safe home again at port.

When they see this Prime Minister, this captain, to whom we have entrusted the job of navigating the ship of state for the next two years, the two years left of the mandate, obsessed with indecision and stuck in his wardroom below decks, incapable of taking new directions for Canada, incapable of being heard in the province of Quebec on behalf of all Canada at a critical time, the people of this country wish there was a way of making this captain walk the plank. They hope that when he walks that plank that he finds himself in shark-infested waters, because Canada needs a new beginning. It needs a new captain on the ship of state.

Canada needs a new sense of direction, and that sense of direction cannot be found in a government that continues to water-down national institutions, to haul the heart and soul out of the CBC, to strip bare of any national mandate the Broadcast Act, and to give us these pale and pathetic responses, such as the Spicer forum, to national crises.

The people of Canada know that this country is in crisis. They know that these are serious days. They know that the challenge to unity is great, perhaps greater than ever before in our history, but they believe the country is worth fighting for. They believe that the hearts, minds and souls of Quebecers are worth fighting for, that those who have turned to the Reform Party are worth fighting for and they want a leader to rally them to the cause. The sooner we get that kind of leader, the better off this country will be.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about an issue that is very important in the hearts of many Canadians. Unity. There are some of us who have chosen Canada and have come to this great country of ours by choice.

**Mr. Gustafson:** They destroyed it.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** My hon. colleague across the floor says we destroyed it. Well, I challenge him, because I came to this country 20 years ago to add to this country, and I certainly do not think that I came here to destroy it.

**Mr. Gustafson:** Ask Wells.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** Well, I do not have to ask Wells. I can ask my father when he made that choice to come to this great country of ours, and if you, sir, think that I do not have a place in here, then you are mistaken.

In the year 2000, 50 per cent of the Canadian population will be something that is neither French—which the Bloc quebecois thinks it has in the bag—nor English. They will be from other minorities. They will be people from Europe, south Asia, and east Asia.

When these people come here, are we going to ask them to follow the example of the Bloc quebecois? Are we going to ask them: "Why do you not raise your little bandito flag and make this part of Canada yours?" Well, I say to my hon. colleague from Quebec that that is not what those people coming over would prefer to do. They come here looking for a better future, as your forefathers did, Mr. Speaker, and as my father did. Yet, when we come to this great country of ours, we have something which is called dismemberment. We want to take this country and tear its guts out.

• (1610)

The Reform Party in the west says it is going to be a national party. Yet, its constitution does not allow it to run candidates in other parts of the country. The Bloc quebecois that is only interested in getting its 37 per cent in Quebec. There is one party that stands for Canada and there is one party that fights for Canada.

We see CBC and we listen to it. There is some dead time on CBC which is on the weekends in the mornings. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Communications will say: "Let us take this time and let some multicultural groups use it." In the greater area of metropolitan Toronto and in other areas, there is MTV which is distinctively made up of multicultural television. There is City TV, which is channel 7, which on Saturday and Sunday mornings devotes its programming entirely to multicultural television. There is Global which does the same. In Hamilton, CHCH-TV does the same.

Therefore, I am challenging the minister and I ask him why we do not give some air time to these different ethnic minorities. We should not call them minorities. We should call them different ethnic Canadian components, because I am proud to be Canadian first and of different roots and different heritages.

**Mr. Lapierre:** Good for you.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** My colleague from the Bloc quebecois says: "Good for you." Sir, it is good for me because I made this country my choice and I want to fight to keep it united, regardless of the hon. member who wants to split the country. He wants to take the country and split it apart.

**Mr. Lapierre:** I fought the last referendum and you betrayed me.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** You fought the last referendum and I betrayed you? Well, I did not betray you. In the commission set up by the Liberals in Quebec, who are in the hip pocket of the Prime Minister, we do not find one single member who speaks for the anglophones. In the Spicer commission, this hoodwink of a commission that the Prime Minister has set up, we do not find a single representative who speaks—

**Mr. Gustafson:** Keep your eye on it.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** My colleague says: "Keep your eye on it." It will be swept under the carpet, as was done with Meech Lake which failed completely.

I spoke before about notorious. This government is notorious about hoodwinking the Canadian people. Notorious, "n–o t–o–r–i u–s". Mr. Speaker, you can fill the blanks in.

I am very proud to stand in the House and speak about unity. For those members who think that unity is something to take to task, I say to them that there are those of us, the late comers, who have been the soft targets up to now who are going to stand up and say to their faces: "No more." There are those of us, 50 per cent by the year 2000, who will be neither English or French, who are going to say: "We want to keep this country united." There are those of us who will not opt for division. There are those of us who will fight to the death.

**Mr. Lapierre:** Too late.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** My hon. colleague from Quebec says: "It is too late." I have to remind him and the Bloc quebecois that there are only 37 per cent in the latest poll in Quebec who think like him. I wonder where the rest, the 63 per cent of the people—

**An hon. member:** Oh, no.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** Thirty–seven per cent is its popularity. Sixty–three per cent of the other people of Quebec—

**Mr. Gustafson:** They're all Tories.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** He says: "They're all Tories." He is dreaming, too. Is that notorious Tories? Is that "n–o t–o–r–i u–s" Tories? That is all he has got.

We want to keep the country united and, if the hon. member does not want to keep this country united, I will tell him what the Canadian population is going to do to him. They will turf him out.

I want to quote the Prime Minister. On July 31, 1990 he said: "I will not allow it to break into pieces or give it up to anyone." This Prime Minister has done nothing else but that. This Prime Minister has been a vehicle for division. He wanted to win the election so he went to Quebec to talk to those member who said they were federalists. We saw what happened to one of those members. They walked from over there on the government benches to be over here with the Bloc quebecois. They walked over here because the Prime Minister could not deliver to them what he promised.

The Prime Minister sold Canada out in order to form the government and he is going to try to do it again. Well, it is not going to work, Mr. Speaker.

My hon. colleague from Quebec asks if Canadians have a leader. I say to him that Canadians do have a leader. They have a leader within the Liberal Party.

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Lapierre:** Look at the polls.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** I would look at the polls and the hon. member had better look at the polls. By the year 2000, 50 per cent of the Canadian people—

**Mr. Lapierre:** That's not a poll.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** It is not a poll, he says. Well, maybe he should wake up and smell the coffee. He should wake up and smell the rationale because one-third of the Quebec people are allophones, one-third of those people.

**Mr. Lapierre:** They will be tested.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** Well, they came to this country by choice and that choice is to stay within Canada, not to separate.

**Mr. Lapierre:** They will be tested.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** He says that they will be tested. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure they will be tested.

In the two minutes I have left, I want to take the time to realize that as we proceed to the year 2000 there is one party that will speak for Canada's unity. There is one party that will try to work very hard to keep Canada united and that, Mr. Speaker, is not the Conservative Party. It is not the NDP. We know what its member from Quebec is saying. We know what he wants to do. He wants to sell this country out so he can get elected and so it can get one more seat in this House of Commons.

We know that the Bloc quebecois is saying: "Vote for us, we are going to separate."

There is one party that will fight very hard to keep this country united and that one party is none other than the Liberal Party.

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join in debate at report stage of Bill C-40, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act.

The legislation before us is similar to that bill which was presented in the House before I became a member in 1988. Because the election was called, of course, that bill died on the *Order Paper*.

As a former broadcast journalist, the major difficulty I have with this bill, and indeed the Official Opposition has with Bill C-40, is that it drops the CBC's 1968 mandate, and I quote, "to contribute to the development of national unity to provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity".

I have always found, and I am sure other Canadians agree with me, that the CBC has been a great instrument of national unity and, in fact, an expression of our very identity, the promoter of our cultural distinctiveness, our linguistic duality, and our regional diversity.

Where there are no CBC affiliates, there is a tendency to rely on news provided by American networks which have the budgets and resources to post correspondents around the world. The result is, of course, good news and good reporting, but it is through the eyes of another country, a country very different than ours, with a different philosophy and a different ideology.

There was the courage to establish a national broadcasting network composed of radio and television outlets across Canada, in part to resist the strong cultural influences of the south.

While working as a television broadcast journalist in the city of Barrie, Ontario, CKVR, a CBC affiliate, was fortunate enough to rely in part on news gathered from across the country and around the world. Then, while employed by CHCH-TV in Hamilton, Ontario, it became quite evident to me, because of budget restrictions and because it was an independent station—that is it did not have an affiliation with the CBC or CTV networks—we had to rely on our international news and purchase that news from NBC. The American slant to the news was ever-present, and that cannot be denied. The same can be said of other news organizations from across the country. Instead of relying on the American feed, they would be able to broadcast news from a Canadian perspective, with Canadians speaking on Canadian issues from around the world about those issues important to Canada.

• (1620)

Part of the reason behind the national unity clause was that Canada was so vast a land and in many ways geographically remote, that it was necessary to bring Canadian content to these regions. Many people wonder what the true identity of Canadians is. Whatever the definition is, as our communications critic for the opposition, the hon. member for Mount Royal noted: "there is no doubt that without a constant and unflinching determination to be ourselves and the direct and constant involvement of our government, never would we have survived or would we have preserved our identity."

This bill would move the CBC away from that mandate of promoting national unity. Just because the CBC is well established does not mean that it has to turn its attention away from its national unity role. After all, the forces of the United States are not any weaker today than they were yesterday. Indeed, they are even stron-

ger. Make no mistake. By opposing the changes to Bill C–40, we are not fighting against outside influences but fighting for our national unity. At this time in our nation's history, the role of national unity and our national broadcasting network is especially and crucially important. As other Canadian institutions are put on the auction block or are disseminated by this government and decimated by this government, such as the massive VIA Rail cuts that we saw last year, the CBC is truly the purveyor of national unity and is that thread that weaves and binds the regions of our country.

Unfortunately, it appears that the damage the Conservative government has wrought on this country is not enough and is far from over. Now it has sets its sights on the CBC. What is next? Privatization? I would certainly hope not.

Speaking on the record, the second reading of the Broadcast Act, 1932, R. B. Bennett stated of the national unity mandate that: "This country must be assured of complete Canadian control of broadcasting from Canadian sources. Without such control broadcasting can never become a great agency for the communication of matters of national concern and for the diffusion of national thought and ideals. It seems to me that in Canada, the system we can most profitably employ—"and the members opposite perk up their ears when they hear the word profitably—R. B. Bennett was talking about cultural profitability, "is one which responds most directly to the popular will and the national need."

He concluded: "In this stage of our national development we have problems peculiar to ourselves and we must reach a solution of them through the employment of all available means." The Minister of Communications said of the national unity clause that it is an "intolerable interference" because the CBC "was maintaining this political value artificially and it was a constraint on freedom of expression."

The minister himself has not contributed greatly to the CBC's freedom of expression when he himself has cut an estimated $240 million over six years. How can the CBC pursue the mandate it was founded to perform when it is under siege by this government? The maintenance of a Canadian broadcasting system such as the CBC is fundamental to the future of Canada.

Most people recognize how greatly affected we are by what we hear and what we see in connection with radio and television programming. Statistics brought forward in earlier debate by the hon. member for Mount Royal, who has been very articulate and worked very hard on this very thick bill, show that 80 per cent of our publishing industry rests in foreign hands. Eighty per cent of our publishing industry rests in foreign hands. Ninety–seven per cent of films shown in Canada come from outside the country. Eight–five per cent of records and tapes are based on imported master tapes in broadcasting. Seventy–one per cent of all programming viewed by English–speaking Canadians on television is American. The figure is lower in French–speaking Canada.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** Canada for sale.

**Mr. Keyes:** Canadians watch an average of 24 hours of television programming each week and 18 hours listening to the radio. Obviously, these statistics reveal not only how we rely on radio or television for entertainment, but show us how whatever is actually being broadcast will make its impression, affect our thinking. It is therefore important that the CBC remain an agent of Canadian unity and that it is so described in this legislation.

I would like to address a couple of other amendments put forward by my colleague, the member for Mount Royal. The amendment is grouped together with that of the amendment of the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam, dealing with the national unity cause itself. This amendment, Motion 17, reaffirms the mandate of the CBC to:

> "(vi) contribute to national unity, shared national consciousness and identity,".

This clause must be put back into the legislation. I believe that these amendments and others put forward by my colleague for Mount Royal will address some of the inadequacies of this bill, especially the one dealing with national unity.

I say again, in conclusion, that the government should not proceed with this legislation without the clause. As R.B. Bennett would have said, "especially at this critical stage of our national development".

Communications is, after all, the vehicle for understanding. The CBC, the envy of this ever-changing world of ours, is the beacon of our true national spirit.

**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 Comox—Alberni—Human Rights; the hon. member for Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing—Goods and Services Tax; the hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond—Scotia Synfuels Project.

The member for Oshawa has the floor.

**Mr. Mike Breaugh (Oshawa):** Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take just a moment to participate in the debate here this afternoon because I must admit I have been disturbed somewhat by not only what I have heard, but the way in which it has been put.

I think that most of us who have been in political life for a little while understand that the basics of it all is communication. If your constituents cannot talk to you, reach you or tell you what their problems are, you cannot very well solve them.

It seems to me that part of what I have heard discussed here this afternoon has to do with that ability to communicate. It may be that the CBC is only one of many ways in which the people of Canada can talk to one another. But it is apparent from the debate this afternoon that if we need anything, we need an ability to talk to one another.

I do not know that it serves a useful purpose to have a nation split up, people unable to communicate with one another, with political parties forming in different regions of the country and the rest of us not even able to share in that discussion.

It seems to me that some of what we have seen this afternoon is evidence of that, that there are political parties forming and reforming in this country which have a different idea. It would be fine if we all had some means, like this Parliament and like a national communications system, to hear them out, to hear what they have to say and to respond to them. It seems that some members do not want to hear what others have to say. They do not want to accept that somebody else might have an opinion just as valid as theirs.

I would argue that in this bill and in this Parliament this afternoon, there is evidence that we have a major problem in just translating our beefs to one another. I think we better resolve that because I think that that is the road to ruin. Whether one would be a member of the Bloc quebecois arguing that no one else in the world understands their point of view, or whether somebody is from the Reform Party in western Canada, and somehow you feel that the rest of the nation has not bothered to listen to you, we should all admit that at the very least we need a means to communicate. We need to resolve some of our difficulties and disagreements. If we have an argument that is real and substantive and divides, then surely it should be something where we can sense, but not just that we forgot to talk to one another. It is not just that we did not have any means to communicate. It is that the question before us is for real and that the arguments are for real. They are not because someone portrayed us in a light that we did not want.

• (1630)

It is difficult in this day and age where communication very often is not the long speech that is made in this Parliament, but communication is a 20-second clip on television. I do not think that any of us could deny for a moment, whether we like it or not, that we have all seen clips of life that have had much more impact on the people of this country than anything that has been said in this Chamber.

I think, very dramatically for example, we are now getting around to the point where we are analyzing the clip of people in the city of Brockville, Ontario, who walked on a Quebec flag. Now we are analyzing how widely that visual was disseminated around the world, and how much of an impact it had on people in Quebec, in other parts of Canada, and in other parts of the world. It is dramatic. It is ironic that it was the CBC which had the thoughtfulness to go back, almost a year after the fact, and analyse is that really what those people were trying to transmit? Well, most of them were not even from Brockville. Most of them did not have that idea in mind when they participated in something that was captured in a small video clip and broadcast around the world. That is the negative power of communications.

What about the positive power? Is there a chance? I was struck again during the entire Meech Lake debate of how little Canadians know about one another, about the different circumstances in which people in Canada find themselves. I heard this afternoon in this chamber a lot of members who, it seems to me, simply feel that if someone could slip a few words into a piece of legislation, the problem would be resolved. I do not believe

that is true. I wish it were that simple, but I do not think it is. I have heard members espouse that if we could only find a new slogan, or a new person, or a new leader, that all of a sudden all of the nation's problems would disappear. I do not believe that is true either. I wish it was, but I do not believe it is.

I look at the world, particularly a nation like Canada, and it is a pretty awkward place to try to govern. I am sure even the Prime Minister would admit to that this afternoon. It is difficult to bring together all of the different regions of the country. Some times people would say "this country does not make sense. It is too big. It is too diverse. It is hard to get around. It is cold. It is not a friendly climate in many parts of this country".

In part, even old Tories like Sir John A. Macdonald understood some basics about this nation, that if you wanted to be a nation people had better be able to reach one another. They need a train to go from one place to another, or you cannot even pretend to be a nation. People would have said: "You need things like a post office. You have to be able to send letters to one another". Even if you do not send a whole lot of letters, there has to be something which represents the federal government in each of our little communities. That is not a supermailbox. That is a tradition which they call a post office. They recognize that as being a focal point for the federal government in their community.

If there is someone who is undermining all of this sense of a nation, it probably is not anyone on this side of the aisle. I do not think that I would point my finger at less than a dozen members who purport to be something called a Bloc quebecois. I would look across the aisle where someone has taken away most of the institutions, slowly, surely and methodically, over a fairly lengthy period of time on which people have relied to make this a country that works.

Part of what we are discussing this afternoon is, once again, someone looking to the CBC to solve all their problems. I do not think it can. I do think it ever has. I do not think it ever will. But, I think it is part of what we need. If there is not an effective communications system in this country, how can you even have the argument? You cannot. You will wind up with people shouting slogans. That does no one a service, no one anywhere in this country. It is difficult. Many of the members here have had a chance to travel across Canada. The first thing that hits one when one tries to do that is that this is not easy; this is a huge nation, a diverse nation. We need to be able to talk to one another, we need to communicate effectively, we need to reinstate all of those institutions that brought us together, in the first instance.

I think it is sad, but it is a fact, that this government has moved steadily, slowly, on a day–by–day basis, to take away some of the things that made it possible to have a country called Canada. It seems to me, and it is evident from the discussion this afternoon, that the nation called Canada has a crisis on its hands, not just one but many of them.

If we are to move forward in a sensible, rational manner, we will need every communication device we can conceive of, including a revitalized Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, to do that. I believe it is possible for all of us, with very different ideas about what this country should be and about what the problems are here and extremely different ideas about how you would resolve them, to meet somewhere, whether it be by means of radio, television, print journalism, an effective communications system, or a postal system that we can all recognize in our own community. If these things can be put together and if members here and all Canadians can have some chance to utilize these things we will have, at least, an opportunity to work out our differences.

Part of what disturbs me about the debate I have heard here this afternoon is not that people argue and disagree but that they have no time to hear someone else's point of view. You cannot win an argument that way. One can shout people down; one can avoid the eventual resolution of a problem; but one cannot win an argument unless one is, first and foremost, prepared to hear what the other side has to say. One must test the waters and see if the grievances of others can be addressed. There has not been a lot of that in here, this afternoon.

It is true, as I have heard members say during the course of this debate, that this nation is changing. I am not sure that it is a planned, logical evolution but, undeniably, it is changing. It is changing in economic terms, in linguistic terms, and in demographic terms. I would hope that in this Chamber and in the broadcasting done by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, we

would at least have an opportunity to have a sensible, rational, logical argument and that we could, at least, have the tools that would allow us to communicate, effectively, with one another. I hope that that is what comes out of this bill and other attempts by the government, but I must say, I do not see a concerted effort to do that. Quite the contrary, I see things moving in the opposite direction.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilbert Parent (Welland—St. Catharines—Thorold):** Mr. Speaker, thank you for recognizing me this afternoon.

[*English*]

I want to make a few comments on what my colleague, the hon. member for Oshawa, said earlier. His concept of Canada probably parallels that of quite a few people in this country. Bill C–40 deals with amendments to the CBC act. My colleague, the hon. member for Hamilton West, put the problem into perspective.

What I would like to do in the time allotted to me is to point out, perhaps, some of the good things that emanated from the old Bill C–136, which are now incorporated in Bill C–40 and also, as gently as I can but hopefully with constructive criticism, point out where the bill might be a little bit deficient.

As my colleague, the hon. member for Hamilton West, said, the purpose of Bill C–40 is really to replace the 1968 Broadcasting Act and is essentially identical to Bill C–136 which died on the Order Paper when the 1988 federal election was called. The legislation had its genesis in the task force on broadcasting policy and it had an extensive review by the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture, which resulted in four reports, containing recommendations for new broadcasting legislation. Since Bill C–136 died, we hoped that the new minister would take the time to reshape a new bill and put his own imprimatur on it. In my opinion Bill C–40 is not such a bill. It is still the hurried bill of a defeated minister with very few changes. We had hoped that the new minister and the Department of Communications would have prepared a report on all of the suggestions made by so many responsible citizens and groups, by so many experts and, at the very least, explained why their concerns have not been met.

• (1640)

I mentioned earlier that there were positive provisions which were carried forth from Bill C–136 to Bill C–40. Among them, we the Liberals are very pleased to see the following provisions. Women, children, cultural minorities, aboriginal peoples and the disabled are specifically mentioned in the legislation. The need to portray more accurately the multicultural nature of our society is also included in there. The special nature of the French language broadcasting environment is recognized. The CRTC will thus be required to take these market differences into account when making licensing decisions.

The originators of program signals and their authorized agents, such as the cable operators, will be able to take action in the courts against commercial pirates stealing their scrambled signals. There is provision for making educational broadcasting an integral part of the law. I want to deal more specifically with that particular area a little later in my speech.

Local Canadian stations will be given priority status when carried by cable, and the provision that the president of the CBC be a member of the CBC board of directors seems to be a very common sense approach to this whole thing.

There were some amendments made by my party which were accepted in the legislative committee, such as the recognition of community broadcasting as one of the elements of the Canadian broadcasting system, along with the public and the private. We are going to have an amalgamation of the three. The mandatory requirement that the Canadian Broadcasting system be owned and controlled by Canadians is just common sense. Why should we have our communication systems controlled by someone outside this country? The programming of Canadian broadcasters will also include children and be a reflection of the multicultural and multiracial nature of Canada, ensuring that television and radio more accurately portray the multiracial as well as the multicultural nature of Canada.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to interject a few mild criticisms, if I might, hoping that with these interjections the minister will perhaps consider them. We believe, as I am sure my hon. colleague from Manitoba believes, because in his heart I believe he harbours Liberal ideas, that Bill C–40, while improved, is still seriously flawed

and should not be passed into law without further major changes. We believe in a national broadcasting system and a national vision of Canada; not a community of communities, not two Canadas, and most definitely not 10 Canadas. Bill C–40, if passed, will only further separate and Balkanize Canadians at a very critical point in our nation's history.

The following are some of my concerns. First of all there is the challenge to federal jurisdictions. We in my party are concerned that the federal government's jurisdiction over broadcasting could be challenged through new definitions. The new definition of broadcasting in clause 2 of the bill is defined broadly as to include the transmission and reception of programs other than by means of radiocommunications; that is to say, hard wire or closed circuit transmissions. These were considered previously to be under provincial jurisdiction.

Second, undertakings will be divided into programming and non–programming functions, a rejection of the conventional legal practice which has regarded such undertakings as indivisible. That too seems to be absolutely in keeping with common sense.

My colleague who is sitting beside me, the member for Hamilton West for whom I have a great deal of respect, addressed the problem of Canadian unity. The 1968 Broadcasting Act required that the CBC "contribute to the development of national unity". Of course it should. It is not there for the unity of another country. It is there so that we can speak to one another as Canadians. However, that reference has been dropped in Bill C–40. Why would they do this if this is the major *raison d'être* for this bill?

The Liberals, and myself personally, believe in the goal of Canada in developing its national personality. Building its sense of national identity and consciousness are factors needed to build Canadian national unity. This has been endorsed by my colleague from Quebec when he spoke on behalf of the Bloc quebecois. He and I do not share the same concept of Canada. We need a strong, national institution like the CBC, as my colleague said, to weave all the regions together in this mosaic that we keep talking about, the mosaic of Canada.

I skipped a lot of what I wanted to say because I want to deal with the educational service. First, the alternative program that we talk about in education should not be introduced at this time or through Bill C–40. This ruling was expressed by the Nova Scotia Department of Transportation and Communications and the Canadian Association of Broadcasters to which my colleague belongs.

However, if the government believes that there should be another service, we believe that it should be a Canadian learning channel which would address national needs while serving provincial and educational demands of its learner audiences. A Canadian service would provide a necessary and needed complement to the already existing American learning channel, which in 1987 was watched by 120,000 Canadians. That was an increase of 124 per cent over 1986.

There is a dire need to put forth our own Canadian programs for Canadians. Liberals recognize that education is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces. We feel that collaboration by the provinces should be encouraged to provide such a service. Issues and social challenges such as the general criticism of current educational standards, emphasis on the delivery capacity of education in Canada and others would be countless subjects available for the exploration of Canadian learning in this country. We should have our own learning channel.

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by thanking the Friends of Canadian Broadcasting, all 21,000 of the them across Canada who brought this issue forward in the years between 1985 and 1990. They worked extremely hard to bring this issue back before the House of Commons.

In my riding there is approximately 486 Friends of Canadian Broadcasting. Many of them have written to me on this issue, trying to bring to my attention to the many important aspects of Canadian broadcasting. I am in total agreement with the thrust of what they wrote to me about, and here I am before the House speaking in support of national unity as part of the CBC mandate.

If we look back to 1932, when the government of the day decided to create the public radio service that eventually became the Canadian Broadcasting Corpora-

tion, at that time the government made a very important step. It realized that Canadians should have control over broadcasting in Canada. R. B. Bennett said at second reading of the broadcasting bill, as reported at page 3035 of *Hansard* of May 18, 1932:

> First of all, this country must be assured of complete Canadian control of broadcasting from Canadian sources—

• (1650)

He recognized that Canada's autonomy and independence hung on the control of our communications systems.

When television was introduced, there was a need for further regulation to protect Canadian content and culture in CBC programming. Therefore in 1968 a new Broadcasting Act was introduced, at which time something very important took place. At that time the mandate of the CBC was to "contribute to the development of national unity and provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity". For the first time in Canadian broadcasting history, the national role of the CBC was reaffirmed.

The CBC realizes that Canada is unique in both its demographic and cultural diversity. As a result, a national medium is required to serve the needs of the Canadian population. Precisely because the CBC is considered our national medium, it does not make much sense to eliminate its role to promote and preserve a uniquely Canadian identity. As we know, traditionally the CBC has been a great vehicle for promoting Canadian culture.

There is no doubt that there is money to be made by decreasing Canadian made programs and by purchasing low cost commercial production, but the facts remain that Canadians without a doubt enjoy the CBC the way it is. I have the figures to prove it.

Nearly 500 English radio outlets and almost 200 French radio outlets broadcast CBC services in Canada. This year the CBC's annual report states that English and French radio programming reached about one out of five Canadian adults every week. That is approximately six million Canadians on a weekly basis.

As for television, English broadcasts are now made from 18 stations, 23 affiliates, and 637 broadcasters. CBC French television is broadcast from 217 media outlets. During the year 1988—89 television season, the CBC English audience share was 17 per cent, a figure that put it on par with the three major American commercial networks in their home markets.

The fact that the CBC has almost 20 per cent of the television market share is very impressive, particularly since most large cities in Canada receive all the American channels and some Canadian stations broadcast American programs.

The figures show also that Canadians are watching more and more Canadian television productions. According to the CBC annual report, efforts to Canadianize prime time schedules of both English and French television networks have had positive effects.

For instance, since 1984—85 the production of prime time CBC English viewing captured by Canadian programs rose from 60 per cent to 64 per cent. For the French network, for example, the proportion of viewing to Canadian programming has risen from 75 per cent to 85 per cent. Clearly the CBC continues to be a leading force in bringing a uniquely Canadian flavour to broadcasting in Canada. There is absolutely no reason why this should not be mandated within Bill C–40.

There can be no doubt that in this day and age we are flooded with information from all sides. It is for this reason that Canada needs a national information clearing house to sort through the information and present it from a Canadian perspective.

The CBC has always been a unifying force for Canada. It should be allowed to grow and continue to be Canada's voice. I do not think that keeping the national unity clause within Bill C–40 will turn the CBC into an instrument of the state, as has been stated by some members of the House.

Looking at the past four years, the CBC had some really difficult times. For instance, when the government was first elected in 1984, it promised support for CBC's resources and independence. However, in 1984 when the Minister of Finance introduced his mini budget, the first thing it did was cut $75 million from the CBC parliamentary allocation.

The following year, in February 1985, the first advertisement of the Friends of Canadian Broadcasting appeared in *The Globe and Mail*, calling upon the Prime Minister to study the future of broadcasting instead of making senseless cuts to the CBC's budget. In May 1985

the government responded by appointing the Caplan–Sauvageau task force on broadcasting policy.

The following year, after extensive public hearings and research, the task force issued a comprehensive unanimous report with recommendations for broadcasting policy and a badly needed new Broadcasting Act.

In 1987 a House of Commons committee studied the Caplan–Sauvageau report and issued unanimous recommendations to the government supporting the thrust of the task force report. As a result, in June 1988 Bill C–136 was introduced and in September 1988 it died on the *Order Paper*.

Now we have Bill C–40 before us. I would like to stop right here by saying that we do support certain aspects of the bill, but we would whole–heartedly like to see the government adopt the recommendation of the hon. member for Mount Royal.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having the two or three minutes remaining to express some of my views on Canadian unity.

[*English*]

I am pleased to speak about the unity clause because what we are talking about is the essence of Canada. The best statement I have heard or read to date comes from the *The Financial Post* a few months ago. It indicated, and I quoted: "If information is the currency of commerce of the modern economy, ideas are the binding force of a modern nation. We can no longer be defined by what we are but by what we believe. To be Canadian should mean to stand for something".

[*Translation*]

So we must learn and appreciate the fact that the CBC can be used as a vehicule to express the concept of Canada. We can defend Canada only if there exists a concept which all people can appreciate.

[*English*]

On that question, unless we give the CBC the opportunity, the mandate, or the requirement to gather together all concepts which in their totality define Canada and Canadians, identify the regions, and show the contribution that each and every one of these regions gives to the Canadian identity, both on a cultural and linguistic basis, then truly we can say that we have a vehicle for the expression of what is Canadian.

Unless we consider the amendment that my hon. colleague for Mount Royal has presented, we will forgo the opportunity to give the CBC not only this mandate but the opportunity as well to carry out the concept of a Canada that exists in the totality of all of its residents and all of its regions, be they from the west or the east, from the maritimes, from Quebec whether they speak French or English, or from a culture like my own which fits into neither pattern.

The important reason to support this amendment—and I think my colleague from Shefford can also appreciate it—is that we cannot understand and fully integrate the total diversity that is the essence of Canada, unless we are willing to recognize specific regions.

One would be tempted almost to say the distinctive nature of certain regions can be translated and exchanged with all other Canadians through a common vehicle. We are going to forgo that opportunity. For what purpose? To give us an opportunity to turn our backs on fellow Canadians? To ignore the contributions that French and English—

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please. It being 5 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Member's Business as listed on todays's *Order Paper*.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

### SOLICITOR GENERAL

#### TASK FORCE ON ABORIGINAL PEOPLES IN FEDERAL CORRECTIONS

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of immediately implementing the recommendations respecting policing of the Task Force on Aboriginal Peoples in Federal Corrections, as presented to the Solicitor General on March 30, 1989, and file with this House a timetable for implementing the remaining recommendations.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion was placed on the *Order Paper* many months ago when I was the critic for our party in the area of the Solicitor General and dealt with federal corrections.

Under the system in which the House operates, the names of members get drawn to present their motions. Mine happened to be drawn. I was very pleased about that and for the opportunity of presenting this motion to the House, because I view it as a particularly important motion at this time.

The issue of the condition and treatment of our aboriginal peoples is a matter that, of course, is now front and centre in Canada, one that has attracted the attention of all Canadians over the last number of months. The problems have been with us for many years, and the problem in particular of the treatment of our aboriginal Canadians in our corrections system is one that has been before Canada for years and years.

The Solicitor General's department and the Correctional Service finally responded to those problems with the appointment of a task force on aboriginal peoples in federal corrections. The task force was, for practical purposes, internal to the Correctional Service. Its members included Mr. Ingstrup, the present Correctional Service of Canada Commissioner, along with Messrs. Rayner, Nuttall, Sawatsky, Cunningham, Louis, and Dicerni, as well as a working committee, all the members of which came from within the Public Service of Canada.

The task force reports and recommendations outline the continuing horror story and the sheer racism of the treatment of native and aboriginal Canadians within our corrections system.

As we all know and as it has been pointed out time and time again, it is a scandal that a so-called civilized country such as Canada should treat its native people the way it does. There is no clearer picture of the discrimination against native people than the treatment within our Correctional Service.

It is a story of institutional, systematic racism, institutional conservatism, and an inability to change and respond to an obvious wrong, immorality, and evil. There is the simple statistic that 9 per cent of those within our Correctional Service who are incarcerated in Canadian prisons are native people. Yet, they only reflect 2.5 per cent of the general population.

To some extent, the Correctional Service of Canada can say: "Well, that is somebody else's fault. We only take the ones they send us." Yet, as this report shows, native people stay in jail longer than white, non-Indian, non-aboriginal inmates in our system. They spend less time on parole and more time actually behind bars. They have fewer services available to them. Frequently, their religion is given no regard whatsoever. Their system of thought and of internal government is disregarded and the result, of course, is that it contributes to recidivism among the native populations in Canada.

The time has finally come for the House and for the government to address the issue and to procrastinate no longer. The government, through the Correctional Service of Canada, produced a fine report, full of excellent recommendations. As a member of the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General, when I asked Mr. Ingstrup, Commissioner of the Correctional Service, what he intended to do about implementing the report, he said that there was a committee working on this. This was over a year ago, I think in the spring of 1989, shortly after the report was made public.

I am quite looking forward to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General telling us specifically what has been done to implement this report. If he is able to say that there has been substantial implementation, then I will congratulate him. But I would also hope that the parliamentary secretary will come to the House and offer a timetable for completion of implementation. I would hope that not only will there be a substantial record of achievement over the last year and a half, but for those items which have not yet been implemented, that a timetable will be offered today in this House.

This is not a partisan matter. It is a matter on which all sides of the House can join. We want the parliamentary secretary and the department to come forward with accomplishments in this area, because the people of Canada finally are saying to the government: "Do not wait longer. You must act on these recommendations."

I could take the House through the recommendations. They are important, but it seems to me the important point to make now is that the time has come for action.

There is a companion report which appeared after I had filed this motion in the House. That report is called *Creating Choices*, and it is the report of the task force on federally-sentenced women, filed in April, 1990. Among women who are incarcerated, there is again a disproportionate number of native people. This report poignantly outlines the pain that is suffered by native women in our prisons. Just recently, there was yet another suicide, that of a young native woman in our prisons.

I know that the Solicitor General has responded very positively to this particular report and he is to be congratulated for that. He recently announced that finally after over 50 years, the prison for women in Kingston is going to be closed. He said that the government has made a firm commitment to implement the recommendations of the task force on federally-sentenced women. I would like to hear from the parliamentary secretary a specific commitment to implement the recommendations respecting native women in our prisons, because that is important to hear and it is important to get the government on record on that.

We have not yet heard in the House the government commit itself to an implementation of the earlier task force report on aboriginal peoples in our federal corrections system. I would ask the government to take this opportunity to deal with this long-standing and painful issue. I would ask that the parliamentary secretary take the time to outline the specifics of what the government has done and what the government will do.

I am going to keep my remarks brief, because I know there are other members who would like to speak to this. I call on the government, not only to speak to the issue, but to allow this motion to pass unanimously before six o'clock.

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to this motion. Rather than make my hon. friend do penance, I will not dwell too long on what is perhaps a point of order or a technical problem that I had in the wording of the motion which seems to refer more to policing than—

**Mr. Brewin:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, just to clarify—

• (1710 )

**Mr. Lee:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has had ample opportunity—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The hon. member for Victoria on a point of order.

**Mr. Brewin:** Mr. Speaker, I hope you do not take this from my friend's time, but rather from the time I did not use.

I should have explained that in the wording of the resolution before the House the word "policing" slipped in inadvertently, but the motion does call on the House to ask the Government to consider the advisability of immediately implementing the recommendation respecting the task force on aboriginal people as presented and filed with this House. That is what it was intended to mean, and I believe that is what it really does say, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Lee:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the reference to policing was just partly Freudian as a result of the member's fine work on the Committee for Justice and the Solicitor General where the hon. member for Victoria served over the last year or so.

In any event, the task force report that is the subject of the motion raised many issues in corrections at a time which was well in advance of a number of very public Canadian events that brought to the attention of the public our clear delay in addressing a number of very obvious needs of native Canadians, not just in the field of corrections, but in a broad spectrum of activity that cuts right across the whole of their existence. We, in Parliament, must share some of that blame.

The task force was not a parliamentary task force, but was a task force of individuals with expertise in the field that was being studied, that was corrections.

The recommendations of the report address very clearly and succinctly a number of areas to which I am sure we agree the corrections system should be responding. I will mention just a few of the highlights of the report for the benefit of the record since the report is not a parliamentary report.

The report recommends the gathering of statistical information that would relate to the ethnicity that is the status of being an aboriginal in the country at the time the native comes in contact with the correctional system. It recommends the generation of some new particularly targeted measuring sticks to determine how well we are

serving the native community in the corrections field. It recommends instituting mechanisms which will address the particular rehabilitative needs of native Canadians.

As an aside, I would like to refer back, as I guess we should, to the justice system of which the corrections system forms a part. We must recall that there are several goals of the justice system taken as a package and the two most important for our discussion here are the deterrence role of the justice system and the rehabilitative goals of the corrections system.

No one wishes to detract from the deterrence function. We have a criminal code in the country that applies to all, including native Canadians, but I think we must admit that there are some environments across the country where our western Judaeo–Christian based criminal code may not be a perfect fit for the native communities. That issue is a conceptual one which is being addressed in other fora.

The second function is a rehabilitative one. I pray that we are not failed to be convinced, in addressing the rehabilitation function of our justice system for native Canadians, that we do not forget that for most native Canadians—not for all, but for most—they live their lives in a society and environment which is other than main street in any of our urban areas.

Therefore, in order to truly and honestly address rehabilitation in the corrections system, we have to do it from where they live their lives. There is a need in our corrections system to institute mechanisms that will dovetail and correspond to the social order in which they find themselves. It is a social order that has been there long before the white man came to this continent.

Another of the recommendations involves the integration of native Canadians into the corrections system's policing systems.

Lastly, it recommends that we have programs at least in a transition period to raise the sensitivity and awareness level of civil servants and volunteers in the area of corrections. Thus, when they work within the system in policing and corrections, whether it be the incarceration phase, a parole phase, a mandatory supervision phase, a residency phase—all of those aspects of corrections—the particular rehabilitative needs of native offenders are responded to in a way that is very sensitive and calculated to produce a result that will serve both the community that that individual lives in and Canadian society as a whole.

My colleagues on this side of the House are supportive of a prompt but comprehensive response of the government to this report. Because it is not a parliamentary report, it does not have a clock running on it. We would be remiss if we did not call the government to task and demand that the report not gather dust and that it respond in a concrete way to the well articulated needs of aboriginal peoples in our corrections system.

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to respond to the motion put by my colleague from Victoria regarding the report on the incarceration of native people of our country.

I listened with care to the comments of my colleague. I must say I was somewhat disappointed in them. First, he said that his comments were not meant to be partisan. If that was non–partisan, I would hate to see him in full flight when he gets partisan with his comments.

This motion is now over a year–and–a–half old. While it is not his fault that it has been on the *Order Paper* so long, he has been a critic for most of that period of time. He said he was waiting to hear from me as to what recommendations and activity had been going on in this area in the intervening months. A simple call to the department could have helped his curiosity during this period. He would have found that the department has been taking this report very seriously.

What concerns me even more is the fact that he has seen other indications that this minister and his predecessor had taken all of these recommendations seriously. Witness, for example, the example he gave of all of the recommendations regarding the incarceration of women. Part of that involves the incarceration of native women.

As he knows, and he will know, special attention will be given to native women in that particular report. That is what he said, and the very fact that he could recognize that should be clear evidence that we do take this report seriously.

• (1720)

The fact is that the report was filed just over 20 months ago. It is one thing to file a report. It is another thing to implement the recommendations, all of which are accepted in principle. The government accepts these recommendations. There then has to be a mechanism for implementing those recommendations. It would be wrong on the part of the government to try to implement them again from Ottawa. I think the hon. member for Victoria would agree to that. What we have to do is implement them in consultation with the people who are most affected by them.

The intervening months have been used, by and large, in consultation with the native community across Canada to make sure that when we do implement these recommendations, it is done in a way that is mindful of the sensitivity of the native community.

In a sense, I suppose I want to compliment the member for bringing this motion forward because it does allow us to put on the record what has been happening in the intervening months. I would like to put on the record the fact that following the completion of the consultations with the provinces, the territories and the national aboriginal organizations, the implementation of the recommendations of the task force was approved in February 1990.

In March 1990 the executive committee of Correctional Service Canada directed the execution of an accelerated implementation plan for the recommendations. I would emphasize the the plan is currently in effect with the objective of implementing the majority of the recommendations within the current fiscal year.

The hon. member opposite happens to be leaving right now just when he finished saying that he wanted on record what was happening. He is already leaving the House.

The 61 recommendations of the task force have been grouped thematically to foster a systematic approach to their application. The categories include recommendations relating to the following areas: institutional programs and operations; the release preparation of aboriginal offenders, post–release programs and support services; personnel matters, including aboriginal cultural awareness training and the recruitment of aboriginal staff; and the monitoring and evaluation of aboriginal programs and services. In addition, a study of the needs of Inuit offenders was commissioned by Correctional Service Canada to supplement the work of the task force. The study, which was completed in April 1989, produced an additional 29 recommendations which are being put into effect as part of the accelerated implementation plan.

The plan has the following objectives: to increase the number of institutional programs which are relevant to the needs and interests of aboriginal offenders; to increase the full parole release rate for aboriginal offenders to equal at least the rate for non–aboriginal inmates, which is what the member who just left wanted to hear about, to make sure that the aboriginal population would be treated the same way as the non–aboriginal population was treated; to increase the percentage of aboriginal offenders who are successfully serving a portion of their sentences on conditional release; to increase the extent of program delivery for aboriginal persons, and/or agencies; and to implement the development of accurate data collection concerning aboriginal offenders and their program involvement.

The strategies for the implementation of the recommendations of the task force vary in the five regions of Correctional Service Canada. This variation is necessary because each region has a different proportion and distribution of aboriginal offenders. As of September 30, 1990, the distribution was as follows: the Atlantic region had only 31 aboriginal offenders; a small population of aboriginal offenders existed in the Quebec region, which had only 34; the Ontario region had 146; the Prairie region had by far the largest population of aboriginal offenders with 844; and the Pacific region had 246 aboriginal offenders. In total, the number of aboriginal offenders under the responsibility of Correctional Service Canada as of September 30, 1990 was 1,301.

Aboriginal inmates comprise about 11 per cent, not 9 per cent as the member suggested before, but rather it is much worse. It is 11 per cent of the total of approximately 13,000 offenders incarcerated in the federal system. Aboriginal peoples who constitute only 2.5 per cent of the population of Canada are therefore significantly over–represented in the population of federally–incarcerated offenders.

In addition, the 194 aboriginal offenders who are serving federal sentences are housed in provincial institutions under the terms of federal-provincial exchange of service agreements. A number of initiatives—and this is what the member wants to hear—toward the provision of equitable decision making and equivalent opportunities for the successful reintegration of aboriginal offenders have been implemented or they have advanced enough to report on. For example, the Atlantic region has established native liaison services in its institutions. Despite the small number of aboriginal inmates in this region the native liaison workers are necessary for the development of culturally sensitive programs and services.

In the Quebec region, the tensions of the past summer between aboriginal people and governments have not slowed down the implementation of initiatives planned in support of the aboriginal and Inuit offenders in that region. For that reason a special program for Inuit offenders is under way at La Macaza Institution. When fully implemented, the program will include academic instruction by a professional person who has experience in teaching Inuit individuals as well as a program of cultural instruction.

There is also significant progress in the Ontario region, and I notice Mr. Speaker, that you want me to hurry along, and in the Prairie region.

The Prairie region has the largest population of incarcerated native persons, with approximately 65 per cent of all federal aboriginal offenders. For that reason, many special initiatives are under way within that region. Let me give some very noteworthy examples, and I will conclude with this, Mr. Speaker: an increase in the number of native liaison workers under contract to a ratio of one worker for every 50 inmates; the solicitation of proposals for the piloting of a new substance abuse treatment program in three institutions; the implementation of three pilot projects for the intensive case preparation of difficult and high-risk cases; the commencement of staffing actions for the placement of community development officers in northern Manitoba and Saskatchewan; the production of printed materials in the Inuit language for placement in four institutions; the modification of regional instructions in order to accommodate the unique dietary needs of Inuit offenders; the establishment of a regional council of aboriginal elders in order to obtain elder input into native issues in the region, this in addition to the native advisory committee of the Prairie region; the implementation of a pilot project on cross-cultural staff training that promotes increased understanding of aboriginal approaches to learning, this in addition to the native awareness training which is already established within the region.

I could go on. There is the Pacific region and so forth. I would hope that the member is satisfied that the government has, is and will continue to take this issue seriously, not simply because it is a government responsibility, but because it is right to do and the aboriginal peoples of our country deserve it.

**Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Victoria for bringing forth this motion so long delayed because of the problems of House business. I think it is nevertheless timely that we discuss this issue, given what has been happening across the country in the last several months.

While I appreciate the statement that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General has brought to the House, in every instance he talks about this has commenced or that has commenced. It has been a year since this motion has been tabled in the House and there should be much more progress, I would say, than has been the case in this situation.

Every time we hear the government answer criticisms as to the delay in implementing programs, we hear that the process of consultation has had to be carried out.

• (1730 )

The process of consultation is not that satisfactory either. I am sure that would find some agreement among natives across Canada. This is just another example of the points of contact that native Canadians have had with non-native institutions in this country dating back to time immemorial.

The first institutional contact, of course, was the institution of the reserves and the Indian agent system. When natives were forced on to reserves, they were forced to suffer some of the worst, lowest quality lands that Canada could locate for them.

They were put on to reserves without adequate funding or the adequate availability of housing, health care, infrastructure and education systems. As a result, those kinds of problems resulted in additional problems which native people were forced to experiences: diseases of poverty, things like tuberculosis and dysentery that killed thousands of our native citizens across this country.

They were oppressed while on the reserves. They had to get permits from the Indian agents in order to leave the reserve. If they violated that permit system, often they were enfranchised and kicked out of their communities. That is the first point of institutional contact that native people made with the non-native society.

The second point of institutional contact, of course, was the residential school system. We have all heard the stories recently about what happened to native children in the residential school system. That system was designed as a systematic approach by the Canadian government and the Department of Indian Affairs to tear native children away from their parents and communities, which were seen as cultural influences, influencing them toward the old native culture, and forcing them into the residential school institutions which were run by the missionary religions.

Those institutional schools totally uprooted children from their communities, something that many of us who have not gone through that school system would find extremely difficult to understand, contemplate or sympathize with because without having gone through that kind of experience, it is very difficult to understand.

It is only now that native citizens such as Phil Fontaine who have gone through the experience of the residential school system have begun to tell us about that institutional point of contact with the dominant, non-native society.

In those institutions, native children were terrorized, brutalized, sodomized with the object of destroying their culture, contact with their parents, families and communities, and accepting the culture of the dominant society. That institution was an institution of cultural genocide that achieved its objectives by humiliating and brutalizing those native children.

I do not think any Canadian, having seen that system in operation, could possibly believe that that kind of system could be perpetrated by one Canadian upon another. It is interesting because I am getting to the other institutional points of contact.

**Mr. Friesen:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I just wonder if it would not be in order to call irrelevance of the remarks of this member to the motion.

**Mr. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, if I may speak for a second to the issue of relevance, I think as many native people will tell you today, many of the community and social and individual dysfunctions that have resulted from this particular Canadian institution brought about into Indian communities "for their own good"—to use the term of the Department of Indian Affairs—have resulted in dysfunctions in native communities that result in many natives ending up in another institution, the institution we are talking about now.

I think it is strictly relevant to the discussion that we are having now. If given a few seconds, I will be able to make that relevance clear.

What has happened as a result of the residential school system is that native people have lost their languages, culture, family and community institutions in many cases. That has led to serious individual problems that result in native people coming into contact with the justice system.

For example, when native children came home to their reserves from residential schools, children who had been away for years and years from their parents did not, in many cases, recognize their parents. The understanding of the content of the relationship between parents and their children had been lost. The incest taboo that exists between parents and child had been lost. There are many cases now of domestic sexual abuse and violence that are prevalent on native reserves that many people draw exactly back to this system of the residential school system.

The United Church of Canada has apologized to the native people of Canada for what they have done to the native people through the residential school system. It is regrettable to this day that the Roman Catholic Church has not done that. The Government of Canada, which was the author of the system in the first place, has not seen fit to apologize to native people for what it did to native children, native communities, native parents and to native culture through the residential school system.

Those individuals are still paying the price for that institution today. In fact, all Canadians are paying the price for that system today.

The result has been that when natives themselves revolted against the school system and refused to allow them to continue, back in the 1960s, what happened was that native people took control of their own education. They insisted on taking control of their education system, thereby taking it away from the missionaries who had so abused native children and native communities.

What happened is that natives then came into contact with another institutional system of the dominant society. That was the child welfare system. Indian families had been so disintegrated that it gave the white middle–class social service system an opportunity to apprehend those children. Often they were adopted into foster homes or exported to the United States or Europe where they lost their culture altogether. The final point of contact that many native children and many native young people have with this system is the prison system. For this assistant to the Solicitor General to stand up here and say that things are proceeding normally and that things are progressing as quickly as they possible can is a cop–out.

My colleague from Mackenzie recently told me that of the six women in Kingston prison in the last year, three have committed suicide.

**Mr. Brewin:** Six native women.

**Mr. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** That is six native women in the Kingston prison. Fifty per cent of them have committed suicide. As a result of the contact that native people have had with our institutions, natives have the highest suicide rate of any ethnic group anywhere in the world. It is 11 times higher than any other ethnic group anywhere in the world. It is directly due to the kind of institutions that Canadians have forced upon native people, including the institution of prisons.

We have to act quickly on this issue. We have to act effectively on this issue. A territorial judge has pointed out that now, more native young men are likely to come into contact with the justice system or to go to jail in the Yukon than are likely to complete school. There are serious problems out there. I do not think that the Solicitor General or his parliamentary secretary have taken this issue seriously enough. I congratulate the member for Victoria on bringing this measure and motion forward to make sure that this Parliament is constantly looking over the shoulder of the Solicitor General, to make sure that this institution does not treat natives like other institutions that we have forced on them in the past.

**Mr. Brewin:** Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested to me that for the record, I should raise a point of order about a comment made by the parliamentary secretary during his remarks.

He is an experienced member and he knows it is not appropriate to draw attention to the fact that a member happens to be absent from his seat at any particular moment. I happened to briefly duck behind the curtains. I could hear every single word the member was speaking. I am probably one of a few people in the country who could even tell him now what it was he said while he was speaking. I would hope that he would render an apology to the House, because he knows he was out of order when he said what he said.

• (1740)

**Mr. Friesen:** Mr. Speaker, I made those remarks. I accept the fact that we are not to call members on that, but he had made such a point of wanting to hear exactly what we were proposing and the progress we were making that I was a little surprised he was leaving the Chamber.

**Mr. Brewin:** I would ask the parliamentary secretary to do a little better than that, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I appreciate the co–operation of hon. members on both sides of the House. Again I recognize the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Dorothy Dobbie (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today in support of the motion of the member. I am a little surprised at some of the comments I hear when my understanding is that the House is very much in accordance with this motion.

In that spirit we want to proceed to speak in favour of the motion because the government certainly takes these questions very seriously. A major factor in our efforts to improve the delivery of correctional services to aboriginal offenders was the task force on federally sentenced women. This was a joint initiative between the public and volunteer sectors.

The task force was made up of two committees, a steering committee and a working group, which were co-chaired by representatives of the Correctional Service Canada and the Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies. As my colleague probably knows, the membership of the task force included federally sentenced women, community, aboriginal women's groups, and a variety of governmental agency representatives as well. The task force released its report in April 1990. As I have said, that has had a major impact on the thinking of this government.

There are approximately 260 federally sentenced women incarcerated in various places in Canada. The total number of women offenders is generally a stable number, as my colleague is aware, representing about 2 per cent of the total federal offender population. Of this group, about 15 per cent are aboriginal women. Specifically, according to the latest statistics available to me, native women in prison number about 46.

Approximately 200 of women at any given time are under the control of the federal government are under the Community Release Supervision Program. About 50 per cent of all federally sentenced women are accommodated at the only federal prison for women, which is a multi-level institution located in Kingston. Most of the remaining women are serving their sentences in provincial institutions due to a federal-provincial exchange of service agreements.

Additionally, since March 1990, 11 women who are serving federal sentences and who have earned the privilege of a minimum security rating have been housed in a new minimum security institution which is also located in Kingston.

Due in part to their small numbers, there are several long-standing and unresolved issues which have placed women at a disadvantage in the federal facility for women at Kingston. Many of the women, for example, are very far from their families, their cultures, and their communities. Like their male counterparts, many aboriginal women offenders come from the prairie provinces. They already face cultural isolation. In addition, when they are removed geographically from their communities they face additional isolation. As well most of the inmates are whites, so there is a cultural separation that creates many problems.

Because it was originally designed as a maximum security institution, the prison for women must accommodate a whole variety of security classification levels. This results in the overclassification of many women. That reduces their opportunities to access other community facilities and programs that are geared and suited to their individual security needs. While the minimum security facility for women helps to address some of these problems, especially, for example, the problem of geographical dislocation, like the prison for women it too is in Kingston. It can only accommodate 11 minimum security women, which means there is a great and crying need.

There is also a lack of programs and services to respond to the unique needs of women. The task force found that physical and sexual abuse is part of the history of many federally sentenced women and that the incidence of such abuse is particularly high among aboriginal women.

In fact, 90 per cent of aboriginal women offenders told the task force members that they had been physically abused during their lifetimes. Usually this abuse had taken place over long periods of time. This compared to 61 per cent of non-aboriginal women. In addition, the number of aboriginal women who talked of being sexually abused was as high as 61 per cent as compared to 50 per cent of non-aboriginal population. Many of these women expressed a desire for individual counselling to deal with these experiences.

There are very few services available in provincial institutions for survivors of physical and/or sexual abuse, a fact which disadvantages many of the federally sentenced women who reside in these facilities through the exchange of service agreements with the provinces, as I mentioned before. Furthermore, aboriginal women really look to having some culturally appropriate programs—they need these—which will help them to recover from their experience with either kind of abuse.

There are other program inequities which result from the placement of federally sentenced women in provincial institutions. These facilities, for example, are not

geared to the needs of longer term offenders, people who will be in the population for a longer period of time. They do not offer programs that will contribute to the eventual reintegration of these women into the community. There is very little effective pre-release planning or programming to help these women.

Furthermore, it is somewhat demoralizing for women who are facing long-term incarceration to be housed in provincial institutions with other offenders who are there for only a short period of time. Because of the time differences friendships are broken up just when they are beginning. This creates much greater pressures for the women who are there as federal offenders. The facilities are continually releasing women who are there with shorter sentences, reducing the opportunities for friendship.

In its report the task force presented a number of recommendations including the following. It suggested that we close the prison for women and the establishment of four federally operated regional facilities for women serving federal sentences. Additionally it suggested the creation of an aboriginal healing lodge, which would serve as an incarceration option for aboriginal women who are under sentence.

The aboriginal healing lodge would be designed in consultation with aboriginal people. It will operate from a unique cultural perspective, which would put a high value on spiritual leadership, as well on things that are culturally appropriate in terms of role modelling. The services will be provided by professionals who have had some experience with the native traditions and cultures. In addition, the healing lodge will respond to the concerns expressed by many aboriginal women offenders that they are not dealing with people who understand their culture and have experiences relevant to their particular needs and that they are not comfortable talking with non-aboriginal people about sexual or other kinds of abuse.

The lodge will provide the following to aboriginal offenders: a safe place for women of aboriginal descent; a caring attitude toward self, family and community; a belief in individualized client specific planning so that people are treated like people rather than like numbers; an understanding of the healing role of children who, in aboriginal cultures, are considered to be closer to the spirit world; and pride in surviving difficult backgrounds and personal experiences.

The lodge will also respond to the concerns of aboriginal women around issues of racism. Aboriginal programs should reflect the cultures and spiritual experiences of federally sentenced women who feel that they have suffered from marginalization and from erosion of their culture in mainstream Canadian society.

• (1750)

On September 26, the Solicitor General announced the government's response to the recommendations of the task force on federally sentenced women. Canadians can be very proud that the response included full support for the major recommendations of the task force.

The government has made a commitment to ensure that new regional correctional facilities for women will be constructed within four years. In the meantime, Correctional Service Canada is committed to implementing the short-term recommendations which were also submitted by the task force and which aimed at improving conditions in the prison for women.

The recommendations calling for the elimination of transfers from provincial correctional institutions for women will be implemented. The recommendation calling for the daily presence of an aboriginal elder at the prison for women to minister to the spiritual needs has been partially implemented. The service is also in the process of implementing such measures as funded visits with family and enhanced telephone contacts at no additional cost to the inmate.

This will be of particular value and of great assistance to aboriginal women because, as I pointed out, most of them suffer from serious geographical dislocation from their families, their communities, and their cultures.

Finally, the recommendation which calls for the provision of a national aboriginal liaison worker has been successfully implemented already. This worker facilitates information sharing and assists aboriginal women in maintaining contact with their families, cultures, and communities cross Canada.

Once again, we would like to support the motion of the hon. member opposite and say that we whole-heartedly support all and any measures that can make the

aboriginal women more comfortable in federal institutions.

**Mr. Doug Fee (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, I too am very pleased for this opportunity to comment on the motion and to offer my support to it in principle. I share the desire of the hon. member for Victoria, as do most if not all members on both sides of this House, to implement any changes that are going to make Correction Service Canada more effective and able to improve rehabilitative services to all inmates of both sexes and all races.

The issue raised in this motion is serious. Although it is obvious that I am going to be more supportive of actions that have been taken since the task force recommendations than was the hon. member for Victoria, we are both going to agree that there is still need for more.

I also edited my comments very carefully so that they fit into the allotted time. I notice that the time has been reduced somewhat, so I would like to offer my conclusion and then give my argument because I do not want to leave out the conclusion.

My conclusion is that I feel there has been a significant evolution in aboriginal offences services over the last two decades, but there are still facts that are outstanding and troubling. They include the fact that fewer aboriginal offenders have been granted full parole by the National Parole Board. Second, when aboriginal offenders were granted some form of conditional release, it occurred later in their sentence than in the case of non-native offenders. Third, aboriginal offenders were more likely to have their parole revoked than non-native offenders.

These are serious concerns, but I believe that the federal government, through the intervention of Correctional Service Canada, has, is, and will continue to take every possible step in implementing the recommendations of the task force on aboriginal peoples in federal institutions.

I said that I support the motion in principle. I would suggest that so does the federal government and Correctional Service Canada. The federal government and the CSC have already taken measures to implement the majority of the recommendations within this current fiscal year. I say "the majority of the recommendations" because some of them, those which relate to affirmative action, to personnel recruitment and development, and to the statistical adaptation of psychometric diagnostic tests for use with aboriginal people, as well as some which require other agency participation, will require a phased in implementation that will extend beyond the current fiscal year.

The hon. member for Victoria has spent time, as have I, on the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General. Among other things, we have read and reviewed the mission statement Correctional Service Canada. For those who have not heard or read it, I would like to add it to the record of this debate.

Correctional Service Canada, as part of the criminal justice system, contributes to the protection of society by actively encouraging and assisting offenders to become law-abiding citizens, while exercising reasonable, safe, secure and humane control. Through this mission statement, Correctional Service Canada recognizes its responsibility toward all offenders, including aboriginals. Further, it recognizes what it calls core value number 2, that "the offender has the potential to live as a law-abiding citizen".

The mission statement also articulates a specific strategy objective in relation to core value number 2, which is "to ensure that the needs of female and aboriginal offenders are properly addressed".

Many other objectives which are reflected in the CSC strategic plan for the period of 1990-91 to 1992-93 are also of special importance in order to meet the needs of aboriginal offenders. They are all relevant to the question before us, so again I am quoting:

> 1.2 to ensure that policies and procedures affecting offenders are communicated in such a way that they can be understood by offenders and are readily accessible to them;
>
> 2.3 to provide programs to assist offenders in meeting their individual needs, in order to enhance their potential for reintegration as law-abiding citizens;
>
> 2.4 to ensure that offenders are productively occupied and have access to a variety of work and educational opportunities to meet their needs for growth and personal development;
>
> 2.6 to ensure that program needs are considered when making placement and transfer decisions;
>
> 2.7 to ensure that the risk presented by the offender is taken into account when making decisions, particularly in matters relating to the reduction of security and conditional release;

> 3.8 to provide staff training and development opportunities that are based on the achievement of our Mission, develop the full potential of staff members, and emphasize interpersonal skills, leadership, and respect for the unique differences and needs of all offenders.

Corporate objective number II of the plan is:

> To develop and implement policies and programs to address the specific needs and reduce the potential recidivism of federally sentenced women, native offenders, violent offenders, sex offenders, mentally disordered offenders and inmates serving long sentence.

The innovative projects and enhanced services for aboriginal offenders are aimed directly at these strategic and corporate objectives.

These objectives do not answer all of the recommendations contained in the report of April 1989, but it is important for this House and everyone concerned about the recommendations and their impact on Correctional Service Canada to know that they exist. They are stated objectives of Correctional Service Canada written for this year which illustrate that the recommendations of the committee are being acted upon and that the programs are being influenced.

As I mentioned earlier, the federal government and Correctional Service of Canada have already taken measures through a national accelerated implementation plan to implement the majority of these recommendations within the current fiscal year. The plan has the following five objectives:

> to increase institutional programs that are relevant for Aboriginal offenders, and to assist in their preparation for success on conditional release;
>
> to increase the release rate on full parole for Aboriginal offenders;
>
> to increase the percentage of Aboriginal offenders who are successfully serving a portion of their sentence on conditional release;
>
> to increase program delivery by Aboriginal persons and/or agencies; and
>
> to develop accurate data collection concerning Aboriginal offenders and their program involvement.

Prior to being elected to this House my first-hand experience with federal Correctional Service Canada was limited to the medium security institution in Bowden, and of course media reports about others. Since my election and appointment to the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General, I have had the opportunity to look at corrections in a different and hopefully more complete manner. I still know more about Bowden than the others.

I would like to offer two recent press reports as examples of positive attempts to improve correction programs. First, on October 9, a news story appeared in the Red Deer *Advocate*, under the heading "Spirits soar at prison powwow". It outlined a Thanksgiving week pow wow that was held in the Bowden institution. It reported not only that the spirits of native inmates had been raised but, quoting from the article, "It gave them a chance to reflect, take in and start to heal". On the institution grounds in Bowden the native inmates have established a tepee and sacred grounds where they have erected a sweat lodge, where they hold sweat lodge ceremonies twice a month. From the Red Deer *Advocate*, of last Friday, an announcement was reported of a federal grant to the institution for a native awareness day to curb racism and give staff a better understanding of natives and of their culture.

In corrections it is important to address the individual needs of offenders and of specific, identified offender groups in order to optimize their successful reintegration. Because of the disadvantaged position of aboriginal offenders, this concern becomes even more acute in order to respond effectively to their needs and to encourage their return to the community as law-abiding citizens.

• (1800)

The implementation of elder services and native liaison worker services launched aboriginal specific correctional programming and marked a pivotal point in the situation of native offenders. These have now become the—

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1), this order is dropped from the *Order Paper.*

[*English*]

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*.

*Adjournment Debate*

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, as you know, I am expressing some concern about a response that was given to a question I asked almost at the time that the member for Victoria submitted his motion.

I asked at that time the Minister of Justice, having received the 1989 report of the Human Rights Commissioner of Canada, if she would act on a recommendation proposed by the Human Rights Commissioner for a Royal commission of the stature of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism commission into the issue of the relationship between natives and non-natives in Canada. At that time the minister responded: "It is not up to me to institute a Royal commission. It should be a decision of the Prime Minister and his government".

As Mr. Speaker will recall, in his 1988 report, the Human Rights Commissioner pointed to the situation of native people in Canada. He indicated that the grand promise of equal opportunity that forms the central purpose of Canadian human rights stands in stark contrast with the conditions in which many native people of Canada lived. He pointed out that the treatment of native Canadians is a national shame. He called upon the people of Canada to set up a Royal commission which would inquire into the relationship between Canada and its native citizens, a Royal commission that would have the stature of the Bilingualism and Biculturalism commission that set the language and cultural debate between the two nations of Canada's dominant society.

At the time of his annual report of 1989 the Human Rights Commissioner came back to the House of Commons recognizing that little if anything had happened to correct the situation or improve the situation of native people in Canada. He talked about the conditions under which native people in this country lived. He said to the people of Canada: "Anyone who thinks the game has been won need only to glance at the statistics or have a closer look at the shattering truth that lies behind them. Some of the social indicators may have improved, but the condition of aboriginal life is still a long way from matching the expectations of Canadian society as a whole".

He also said: "Make no mistake about it, these are human rights problems. If there is any single issue on which Canada cannot hold its head high in the international community, any single area in which we can be accused of falling down on our obligations, it is in this area of aboriginal relations". Again he called upon the people of Canada, the Parliament of Canada, and the Government of Canada. He said: "It is for this reason we have suggested that a thorough going inquiry into these problems modelled on the Royal commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism of 25 years ago might play a useful role in achieving consensus without being used as an excuse for delaying important developments".

Again the chairman of the Canadian Human Rights Commission called on Parliament and called on government to take action to establish a Royal commission into the relations between Canada's native people and its dominant society.

• (1805)

Just a few days ago, on September 21, in an act almost of desperation and frustration coming out of the Oka crisis this summer, again Human Rights Commissioner Max Yalden made public a report to Parliament in which he again called on the Canadian government, saying: "Progress has been too slow and little if anything has been done." He called upon the Canadian government to establish a Royal commission into the relations among Canada's aboriginal people, the government, and the people of Canada. Again nothing was done.

I am concerned that as a result of what is happening with the recommendations of the Royal commission, native people are becoming more and more frustrated and perceive more and more that Canada does not attach any priority to their problems. In fact, they see the Prime Minister playing games with the issue of a Royal commission. At one time, he holds it out as a carrot to the Manitoba chiefs in order to try to get the chiefs to silence Elijah Harper when he is standing up in the legislature and saying no to the Meech Lake Accord. Another time he is holding it as a stick to the natives. When Meech Lake died he said: "You are responsible

and, as a result, you are not going to get a Royal commission."

When he talked to the First Nations Congress in British Columbia about the possibility of either having a process to set up land claims negotiations in that province or having a Royal commission, the native people in British Columbia said that they wanted both but that they did not want the selection of one to jeopardize the other.

More recently we have heard Lowell Murray say: "No, this Royal commission will not be struck until the Spicer committee reports on July 1."

It is time to end this process of manipulation. It is time for the government to call a Royal commission. It is evident that the problems out there need the examination of a Royal commission. The aboriginal people want it. The people of Canada want it. When is the government going to follow the people of Canada and do the bidding of the people of Canada?

**Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, the issues raised by the Canadian Human Rights Commission are serious ones of concern to the federal government.

As the hon. member noted, the report recommends a Royal commission, one modelled on the Bilingual and Biculturalism Royal commission of 25 years ago.

The Prime Minister told this House of Commons on September 25, 1990 that the government had been discussing an agenda with native leaders to address issues of concern to Canada's native people. The Prime Minister outlined this government's plans to preserve the special place of first nations in this country, based on the aboriginal and treaty rights recognized in the Constitution.

The agenda will have four main pillars: the land claims, the economic and social conditions on reserves, the relationship between aboriginal peoples and governments, and the concerns of aboriginal peoples in contemporary life. Fundamental to the agenda are changes to the Indian Act, with the objective of enlarging the aboriginal capacity for self-government within the framework of the Canadian Constitution.

However, at the present time many of the departments of this government are already at work on the issues that have been identified by the Human Rights Commission. The Ministry of the Solicitor General, the Ministry of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and the Department of Justice are among those departments that are addressing separately and jointly the question of aboriginal rights, native justice, self-government, and other pressing issues of concern to the people of Canada, aboriginal and non-aboriginal alike.

Since 1977 the Department of Justice has funded the Native Court Worker Program in conjunction with the provinces and territories. The purpose of this program is to assist natives who become involved in the criminal justice system and to enhance the awareness of those involved in the criminal justice system concerning the values, customs, and socio-economic conditions of native people.

In most cases the program is delivered by a native agency which varies from province to province. In British Columbia, for example, the carrier agency is the Native Court Worker and Counselling Association, while in Ontario the Friendship Centres deliver the program.

In June 1990 the Minister of Justice, meeting with her provincial and territorial colleagues, agreed to sponsor a national conference on aboriginal justice jointly. Fifty per cent of those participants will be aboriginal people. The conference will be co-sponsored by the Yukon whose Minister of Justice originally proposed the gathering.

• (1810)

The Marshall inquiry made a number of recommendations concerning the criminal justice system and aboriginal people in Nova Scotia, and since the report was released representatives of our government have been available to work with provincial and Micmac representatives to act upon these recommendations.

I think the hon. member would, and should, agree that the federal government has demonstrated by these and other initiatives that it is deeply committed to addressing the problems faced by aboriginal people in this country today, and we have every intention of continuing to do so.

*Adjournment Debate*

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing):** Mr. Speaker, I have raised a number of questions regarding the GST and the way it affects lower-income Canadians.

Over the past several months, we have heard the Minister of Finance and the Minister of National Health and Welfare state repeatedly that families with incomes of $30,000 or less will, in fact, be better off under the goods and services tax than they are now. This statement is open to challenge on a number of grounds. In fact, the GST will not help middle and lower-income families in any way, shape or form. That is why, of course, 80 per cent or so of Canadians want the tax scrapped and want a fair taxation system in the country.

While arguing the benefits of the GST for lower-income Canadians, the government often refers to the GST tax credit as the measure that takes the burden of the GST off this group. This, of course, is simply not the case. The tax credit is only partially indexed to inflation, first of all, meaning that its real value will decline each year and that the income threshold for receiving the credit will also decline. As the years go by, fewer and fewer families will be eligible for the credit and those who are eligible will receive less money.

If the government was serious about using the GST tax credit to assist the less well off, it would have indexed it fully to inflation. By not doing so, the government is making it clear to lower-income Canadians that they will bear a greater tax burden in the years ahead. Lower-income Canadians will be paying more tax and receiving less in the form of the GST tax credit in the future.

Another problem with the tax credits under the GST is that by earning less, a person does not necessarily receive a higher credit. In other words, those who are less well off will not necessarily be compensated any more. For instance, a single person earning $6,000 is eligible for a tax credit of $190. A single person earning between $14,000 and $24,000 is eligible for a tax credit of $280. Whatever the case, it is clear that this will not compensate those Canadians for the increased costs due to the GST.

Presumably, the rationale for giving those with lower incomes a lower GST credit is that they will, in fact, spend less of their money on GST taxable items. But they will spend a higher proportion of their income on taxable goods and services. The lower a person's income, the larger the proportion they will spend on essential goods and services.

Lower-income earners do not have the luxury of putting some money aside in tax-free savings account such as RRSPs. Canadians living below the poverty line are not going to be savers. In fact, with this government's regressive policies, such as cutbacks to family allowances, cuts to transfer payments to the provinces for health and post-secondary education, cap on CAP for British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario, and the privatization and reduction in benefits for the Unemployment Insurance Plan, few ordinary Canadians will be saving at all.

Yet another call for concern about the efficacy of the GST tax credit is that a number of provinces have indicated that they may consider the credit as income and thus reclaim the credit from welfare recipients. In other words, many welfare recipients, the poorest of the poor, will have absolutely no protection from this regressive GST at all.

The Minister of Finance, and others, have indicated in the House and elsewhere that they would strongly encourage the provinces not to take this step of robbing the poor of their GST tax credit. But, the government has not made a firm and absolute commitment to ensuring that this will not occur. It must make such a commitment immediately to stop its ideological cousins and provincial Conservative governments from grabbing this meagre GST tax credit from the poorest of Canadians.

This, Mr. Speaker, is particularly a problem in Alberta and my province of Saskatchewan, which has not yet indicated that it has no intention of taking the GST credit from social assistance recipients, and indeed appears to be considering the matter very strongly.

In addition to this, there are many other claims about the miracle of the GST. The Minister of Finance has told us that many products will actually cost less under the GST. He has given examples such as washing machines, driers, and new automobiles. These items are generally not in the budget of lower income families. Lower-income families, if they can afford a car at all, will buy used cars which are newly taxed under the goods and services

tax. It is hard to visualize just how lower-income families will benefit under the goods and services tax.

• (1815)

In addition, the minister's statements assuring us that some items will cost less under the goods and services tax because of the removal of the manufacturers' sales tax are based on the assumption that manufacturers will pass this saving on to the consumer. Yet we have heard on numerous occasions from manufacturers saying that they have no intention of passing on the savings. Instead, we will see many items simply jump 7 per cent in price beginning January 1, 1991, if indeed the tax is implemented.

What about the timing of the implementation of the GST. Canada is presently in a recession and governments across the country are running deficit budgets and, at the same time, trying to reduce the deficits. The way in which they are trying to do this will inevitably lead us down the road to cuts in social assistance, health services, post-secondary education programs and so on. These are the sorts of cuts we have seen from this Conservative government and provincial Conservative governments.

During a recession, a time when low-income Canadians need social safety nets the most, it appears that they will be reduced, both at the federal and provincial level.

The government has acknowledged but under-estimated greatly the inflationary effect of the GST. While this will make it more difficult for all Canadians to make ends meet, once again lower-income Canadians will be the hardest hit. Lower-income Canadians, if employed at all, are most likely to be employed in non-unionized, part-time and temporary jobs. They have no bargaining power with their employer, or with the government, to index their wages or, if they are on social assistance, no bargaining power to indexed or social assistance cheques to inflation. The latest example of this is the partially-indexed GST credit, a small compensation to the poor for the great hardship the GST will bring them. They will fall further and further behind in times of inflation.

In closing, Canadians have asked for tax reform but they have not asked for the GST. The GST is clearly not what they have in mind. When they want a tax reform, they want a fair taxation system where those who can afford to pay more do so. The more affluent, who are now the subject of tax loopholes, should be paying their fair share. The 118,700 profitable corporations which paid no tax last year should also be paying their fair share. The GST is regressive and hurts lower-income Canadians the most. It is not fair that a welfare mother earning $6,000 a year pays the same 7 per cent tax that a corporate executive earning $200,000 a year pays.

In closing, it is time the government listened to the concerns of Canadian families by helping them, instead of punishing them for being less well off. Surely not being able to see their own children eat properly—we all know that one in four children in Saskatchewan goes hungry—is punishment enough. It is time that the government decided to implement a fair tax system and scrap the goods and services tax.

**Mrs. Pauline Browes (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State of Canada and Minister of State (Multiculturalism and Citizenship)):** Mr. Speaker, prior to the assertions of the hon. member for Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing, this government has had a great interest in fair taxation.

We have worked to eliminate the special treatment that is used to permit those of greater means to pay less tax. Consequently, higher-income Canadians and profitable corporations now pay taxes which are more commensurate with their earnings.

First, we converted personal exemptions and many deductions to tax credits to improve fairness, and reduced or eliminated many special tax breaks. We also eliminated or reduced many special corporate tax breaks, and broadened the tax base so that profitable corporations pay tax.

In the 1989 budget, the government announced a new large corporations tax for Canadian corporate capital in excess of $10 million. Effectively January 1, 1991, the large corporations tax will be raised and that rate will be a 15 per cent increase. This tax will help ensure that big business pays its fair share of tax.

The proposed goods and services tax is designed to further improve the fairness of taxation in Canada. Under the GST, the distribution of the tax burden will be more progressive.

Wealthy Canadians will pay their fair share. They will not be able to avoid the GST. They tend to consume more and, therefore, will pay more on average on the

sales tax. With the GST credit, families with incomes of up to $30,000 a year will have more after-tax income than they do now. This includes three-quarters of families headed by seniors or single parent families. In total, some 8.7 million families and individuals will receive credit cheques.

• (1820 )

As well, basic groceries and residential rents will be exempt under the GST, further reducing the tax burden of lower income Canadians.

Before the government introduced refundable sales tax credits in 1986, low income Canadians paid much more federal sales tax as a percentage of their income than the higher income brackets. Since 1986, the federal sales tax credit has been increased three times. With the introduction of the GST, the refundable sales tax credit will be enhanced once more, the monetary value of the credit will be increased and the income eligibility threshold to receive the credit will be raised. As a result, lower income earners will pay much less as a percentage of their income than those in higher income brackets.

The hon. member is also of the opinion that business will fail to pass on to the consumer the savings of the existing sales tax replaced by the GST.

**Mr. Dingwall:** That's right. That's right. Nose is growing.

**Mrs. Browes:** Well, albeit there will be a number of forces operating to ensure that savings in the removal of the existing tax are passed on to consumers.

The hon. member might just want to look at pages 7 and 8 which contain a number of businesses in the Consumer and Corporate Affairs operations dated 1990 of the committee report.

Since 1984, the government has taken an active role in making the Canadian tax system more progressive. The GST is just another step toward fair taxation.

## SCOTIA SYNFUELS PROJECT

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I rise with regard to a question that I posed on November 20 this year to the Minister of Industry, Science and Technology.

On that particular occasion I asked the minister if he would reconsider the decision that he had made to kill the Synfuels project, which affects the people of eastern Nova Scotia.

This particular project had widespread support across the province. In fact, April 18, 1990, was the first time in a long time the Nova Scotia House of Assembly passed an all-party resolution. Even the socialists and the Conservatives supported the Liberal Party in Nova Scotia in supporting the Synfuels project, which in its very essence is where coal and crude oil come together to form a particular product, thereafter being exported to various countries and to various businesses in order to produce energy.

Unfortunately, the Government of Canada has killed this particular project. If there is any further testimony, as codified in the *Chronicle Herald* of November 16, 1990, it said: "Ottawa kills Synfuels Project".

There are three major advantages of this particular project. I would have hoped that the minister in his wisdom. and particularly the officials of the department, would have seen fit to sit down with the principals of the Synfuels project to debate and discuss with them a plan of action in order to see this particular project realized.

I should note for the edification of members in this House that we in Atlantic Canada, partly because of our geography, and also because of our limited sources of energy at the present time, are dependent to a large extent on the importation of foreign oil, so much so that it has caused provincial governments down through the years, going back to the mid 1950s, and perhaps even before that, to come up with an energy policy which is supportive of the resources which we have in the boundaries within our provinces and to utilize that not only to create jobs, but also to have a stable supply, if you will, of energy for the taxpayers of that province.

With coal being used on the Synfuels project and the technology that is readily available, one could get approximately five barrels of oil per tonne of coal. That is an amazing sum, Mr. Speaker, in view of the large quantities of imported oil that we have in the province of Nova Scotia.

There is a clear advantage for Canadians from coast to coast, but particularly for those of us in Atlantic Canada, namely, that there would be less of a dependence on foreign oil. I do not have to point out to the parliamentary secretary who will be responding to my assertions here today the need for stable supplies of energy across this

great country of ours. We just have to look to the Persian Gulf where the stability of oil supplies which feed many parts of the world are certainly in question. Of course, the consequential effect that that has with regard to rising energy prices is a concern for all Canadians.

• (1825)

The environmental advantages of this particular project are well documented and well supported by environmentalists and those of us who are concerned with good public policy for Canadians in that area of our country.

Cape Breton has coal which is low in ash, but it is very high in sulphur. It is a very soft coal and it would be utilized very easily with regard to new coal technologies and the processes that go into place in terms of changing that particular coal into a liquid substance, which is thereafter used in energy and used for domestic purposes. There is a real environmental advantage.

There is a regional development advantage. As I said on November 20, as my colleagues have said on previous occasions, and of course as I have said this repeatedly in the House, the construction phase of this project would result in approximately 500 construction jobs. It would provide direct and indirect jobs of approximately 2,000. So you can see, Mr. Speaker, in terms of an economic bonanza, if you will, in that area of eastern Nova Scotia, it would be very helpful.

I want to point out to the parliamentary secretary that in that area of the province unemployment is exceedingly high. In fact, the figures from the Department of Employment and Immigration base it at approximately 17.3 per cent. For those of us who have the privilege, and I say it is a privilege to live in that area of this country, we know it to be much worse than 17 per cent. In fact, municipal leaders in many parts of my constituency, namely Glace Bay, would indicate that it is much higher than 17 per cent and at 30 and 40 per cent.

Hibernia will cost $5.2 billion of taxpayers money. The Lloydminster project will cost taxpayers $1.2 billion. The OSLO project will cost Canadian taxpayers $4.1 billion. All those compared to the Synfuels Project, with benefits in terms of environment, regional development, jobs indirect and direct, as well as the construction, and of course the benefits in terms of less dependence on foreign oil, which will cost a mere $400 million.

In closing, I am the first to admit that this is indeed a lot of money. Therefore, it underlines the need for the the Government of Canada to sit down with principals of the Synfuels Project and work out a plan which is equitable for the principals and for the Government of Canada, but more importantly beneficial to Canadians who happen to live in the Atlantic region and reside in the eastern part of Nova Scotia.

I invite the very able parliamentary secretary to stand in his place and give us the kind of reassurance that taxpayers in that area of the country so rightly deserve.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Plourde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Science and Technology):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to respond to the question raised by the hon. member for Cape Breton—Richmond East concerning the Scotia Synfuels project.

The project, in a variety of configurations, has been examined and analysed by federal representatives for nearly ten years. During the initial years of its development, the project enjoyed financial and technical support provided by a consortium, directed by private sector interests with the necessary expertise to carry out the project. Over time, the members of this consortium abandoned the project for technical or financial reasons.

During that time, the federal government invested approximately $2 million, together with the private sector, in testing procedures and project-related technology studies. We wanted to work with the project sponsors to find out whether we could develop viable markets and thus use the human and natural resources of Cape Breton.

Tests indicated that the technology could be used but additional detailed engineering studies were necessary to ensure that the proposed facility would produce the forecast quantity and quality of synthetic fuel. Federal and provincial representatives met with the project leaders on many occasions over the years in order to make the project a success. As you can see, Mr. Speaker, we co-operated very closely and we invested taxpayers' money. Briefly, we did our share to make the project materialize.

During discussions with the sponsor last year, it was frequently pointed out that a project of this size could not proceed without a qualified and dynamic principal partner from the private sector. This essential ingredient could not be found, Mr. Speaker, which means that all the risks would have to be taken by Canadian taxpayers. In addition to the requested investment tax credits totalling $200 million, the project would require hundreds of millions of dollars in additional financial assistance, in the form of interest reductions and credit insurance.

As I pointed out, the project sponsors have had every opportunity to develop the project and meet the appropriate people to make the project a success. At the present time, after years of activity, the project has not yet been finalized. Funds that were supposed to come from the private sector are not there and have not even been identified. Briefly, it is no use having further meetings on the subject, Mr. Speaker, unless there is a significant change with respect to private sector interests.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tommorow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 6.32 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, November 28, 1990

The House met at 2 p.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*Translation*]

### SOCIAL SCIENCES

**Mr. Ronald. J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, Canada is facing a number of serious social problems such as marital violence, environmental complications, constitutional issues, native claims, new reproduction technologies, illiteracy, poverty, sexual, physical, psychological and emotional abuse, just to name a few. All such matters relate to humanities.

Humanities have been neglected. Since 1980 the budget of the council has increased by a mere 23 per cent while appropriations for the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council have gone up by 77 per cent. Humanities researchers account for 55 per cent of university scientists but the government allocates to them only 12 per cent of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. Three quarters of students applying for doctorate scholarships are turned down despite the shortage of academics in this field. The Canadian federation is advocating a considerable budget increase, as recommended in the report of the Advisory Council on Science and Technology.

The environmental green plan must acknowledge the determining role of humanities in this field, and a tax credit must be established with a view to encouraging businesses to invest in research in humanities, as is the case in other research endeavours.

[*English*]

### CANADA–U.S. FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

**Mr. Stan Wilbee (Delta):** Mr. Speaker, on January 1, 1991 the United States plans to charge an excise tax of $1.07 U.S. a gallon against the products of small Canadian wine and cider makers, while only charging 17 cents a gallon against the beverages of American producers.

Chapter 5 of the free trade agreement clearly states that once goods have been imported into either country, they will not be the object of discrimination.

It is a bitter irony to discover that U.S. lawmakers passed an act of Congress to abrogate the obligations of the Canada–U.S. Free Trade Agreement, resulting in Canadian small producers, such as Wyder's Cider of Delta, suffering discriminatory excise taxes for an indefinite period.

I commend the work the Minister of International Trade has done already on this issue, but I would urge him to take an even stronger stance against this discriminatory excise tax.

* * *

### VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS

**Mr. Peter L. McCreath (South Shore):** Mr. Speaker, no group of Canadians makes a more selfless or more valuable contribution to the safety of our society and our community than our volunteer firefighters.

In a modest way, this contribution and the financial costs associated with it are recognized through a $500 exemption or allowance under the Income Tax Act.

This exemption has not changed for 20 years. The same cannot be said for the value of the dollar. The time is overdue for a change, and in accordance with the request put forward by the Maritime Fire Chiefs Association, I urge the government and the Minister of Finance to increase the volunteer firefighters' exemption to at least $1,000 in the next budget.

*S. O. 31*

## PRESIDENT OF THE IRISH REPUBLIC

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax):** Mr. Speaker, as a Canadian woman of Irish descent, it is with great pride that I salute the election of Mary Robinson, the first woman President of the Irish Republic.

Winning the post with 52 per cent of the vote, the 46 year old lawyer, in her own words, rocked the system instead of the cradle.

At 25, Mary Robinson was Ireland's youngest law professor. At 26, she was the youngest member of her country's Senate.

The mother of three has been a long-time advocate of liberalized divorce laws, access to contraception and the decriminalization of homosexuality.

The fact that the women of Ireland overwhelmingly supported her candidacy is another example of the increasing influence of the gender gap world-wide.

Ireland's presidential mansion is in Dublin's beautiful Phoenix Park. I know that all members of this House join me in agreeing with Mary Robinson's campaign slogan—A woman's place is in the park.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think members would permit me to observe that my grandmother was Mary Robinson. She also was Irish.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## PROPONENTS OF FEDERALISM

**Mr. Jean-Pierre Blackburn (Jonquière):** Mr. Speaker, would you believe it? After Jean Chrétien campaigned across the country and managed to kill the Meech Lake Accord, and now that Canada is in a constitutional dead end and the country is no longer able to renew and regenerate its federalism—all because of Jean Chrétien and the Liberal Party—the Progressive Conservative Party and the Liberal Party, to provide a counterweight to Quebec's efforts to redefine its future, may be getting together on the Bélanger-Campeau Commission via their respective representatives. That the Progressive Conservative Party's representative is a federalist and defends that position is his right, and I respect that right, but Mr. Speaker, I also would like to see some respect for our history and the events that took place last June. Trudeau—and Chrétien—style federalism and Brian Mulroney's federalism are at opposite ends of the scale—never the twain shall meet!

[*English*]

* * *

## RURAL CANADA

**Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River):** Mr. Speaker, rural Canada is in crisis. Most rural communities are losing their businesses, and their populations are stagnant or in decline.

This is not a crisis made in rural Canada. Past P.C. and Liberal governments have mismanaged our forestry, farming and fisheries.

This government's policies are a direct attack on rural communities. High interest rates, cuts to VIA Rail, the abandonment of railway branch lines, the goods and services tax, cuts to regional development and unemployment insurance changes are just a few examples.

Symbolic of it all, the government is standing by and applauding while Canada Post guts rural communities by closing rural post offices, even in places the size of Yorkton. Government members opposite sit idle while the only federal service that rural communities have is being savaged.

Rural Canadians deserve better. This Saturday, December 1, New Democrats will initiate a rural Canada defence campaign. We plan to stand shoulder to shoulder with rural people from Newfoundland to B.C., fighting with them against the government's attack, and for policies which will support viable rural communities.

* * *

## LOBSTER FISHERY

**Ms. Catherine Callbeck (Malpeque):** Mr. Speaker, many fishermen in the riding of Malpeque and across Prince Edward Island are angry and confused over the contradictory policies and broken promises of this government.

Last spring the federal government advised Prince Edward Island lobster fishermen that no size increase

would be introduced on the Island until the results of an experimental increase in Cape Breton were fully known.

Yet the Department of Fisheries and Oceans increased the lobster minimum size prior to making the results of the Cape Breton experiment public.

Once again, this government is not living up to its commitments to the people of Prince Edward Island.

Once again, this government has failed to properly consult the fishermen of my province prior to making a decision that may have a major affect on their livelihood.

• (1410)

When the minister meets with fishermen on December 7 in Prince Edward Island, I strongly encourage him to visit the wharfs and harbours on the Island. I call on him to commit his government to take into account the concerns and views of our Island fishermen. They have been ignored for long enough.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## DAIRY INDUSTRY

**Mr. Gaby Larrivée (Joliette):** Mr. Speaker, a recent study by the economics and agricultural policy research group at Laval University concluded that Quebec's dairy producers might lose 21 per cent of their incomes as a result of GATT. The study refers to the present situation and does not consider the fact that if the talks fail, yogurt and ice cream would no longer be subject to article XI and that other products might be questioned, if we fail to clarify and reinforce this article.

Furthermore, the study did not allow for the fact that incomes of producers will improve as a result of higher prices on international markets. It also makes the assumption that our exports of dairy products will not increase, which is entirely unlikely. The 5 per cent increased access to U.S. and European markets will open up new markets so that we can expect to see a balanced situation in 10 years. It is mainly for these reasons that Canadian dairy producers have supported the government's position at the GATT talks, which, we hope will be successful.



[*English*]

## TAX AUDITORS

**Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester):** Mr. Speaker, this morning federal government auditors staged a demonstration at the Canadian Tax Foundation Conference in Montreal. These are the people who are responsible for conducting the tax audits of some of the largest corporate institutions in Canada.

The auditors bring in $2 billion annually in corporate tax, interest and penalties. As professionals they are seldom driven to such visible displays of labour unrest. What they seek is a fair contract with Treasury Board. There is a difference of only 1.5 per cent between what they have requested and what the conciliation board has proposed.

During a similar dispute last year, the government lost $180 million in revenue from tax audits. We cannot afford a loss of this amount of revenue if strike action is forced upon the government auditors. The government should realize that good economic sense and blind stubbornness do not mix.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the presence of a delegation of over 200 people representing the Coalition against Taxes on Books. More than 250,000 Quebecers have signed the coalition's petition against the GST. I may recall that the government of Quebec has decided to exempt books from the GST. Taxing books means imposing ignorance. Instead of trying to scare workers in Baie-Comeau, the Prime Minister should give them a chance to continue their education, but that may be what he fears above all.

* * *

## REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times before this House, eastern Ontario badly needs economic development. Since September, the following lay-offs have taken place in the town of Hawkesbury, in my riding: Amoco Fabrics, 24; Fib Pak, 22; Fiberworld, 80; Canadian

Plastic, 23; Astro, 29; IKO, 15; Montebello Metal, 11; Duplate, 20; and LPC Paper, 10, which adds up to 234 lay-offs in a town with a population of 10,000.

Mr. Speaker, on top of that, there have been a number of severe cutbacks in shared-cost programs. I therefore want to ask the government opposite to immediately provide assistance to help the economy of Glengarry—Prescott—Russell and Eastern Ontario.

* * *

## HOUSING

**Mr. Jacques Vien (Laurentides):** Mr. Speaker, this week I had the privilege of visiting a construction site in Saint-Jérôme, on behalf of the Hon. Allan Redway, Minister of State (Housing). This is a 63-unit project for single people and the elderly, which is being built under the Non-Profit Housing Program. These units will help meet the needs identified by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the Société d'habitation du Québec as part of their joint planning for 1990.

This is a concrete result of the housing policies introduced by our government, realistic and dynamic policies that provide housing where it is needed, for the people who need it.

* * *

## DAIRY INDUSTRY

**Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond):** Mr. Speaker, less than a week from the final match in the Uruguay Round, which is surely the most ambitious initiative ever taken since the GATT was established in 1948, the Quebec Milk Producers Federation met with us this morning and apprised us of their concerns about the Canadian position regarding the global access level of the domestic production allowed for foreign dairy products. To reassure these producers, Mr. Speaker, I wish to reiterate the statement the Minister of State for Agriculture made to the effect that the Canadian position is clear and did not change since we made our offer on October 15.

Therefore, the minimal access to importations we would agree to under par. 2*c* of section XI of the GATT would be no more than 5 percent.

[*English*]

## PERSIAN GULF

**Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary delegation that has been in Baghdad this past week consisting of hon. members for Burnaby—Kingsway, Winnipeg South Centre and Fundy—Royal have received word today that at least five Canadians will be allowed to leave Iraq. Members from the New Democratic Party wish to pay tribute at this time to those Canadians who have suffered and worried about their relatives for several months now.

While there is reason to celebrate their return, this House must also express its support for the families of Canadians who still cannot leave Iraq and Kuwait. The pain felt by the absence of loved ones will be particularly difficult with the real possibility that they will not be home for the holiday season. The lives of these Canadians and those of our military personnel in the Persian Gulf are among the many compelling reasons why the Canadian government must commit itself to seeking a peaceful resolution to the crisis sparked by Iraq's illegal invasion and annexation of Kuwait.

* * *

## CORPORATE TAXATION

**Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, it is time once again for the corporate welfare bum of the week award. This week our nominees are: the first nominee, Varity Corporation, which used $200 million of Canadian taxpayers' money for the bail-out of Massey Ferguson and then promptly set up shop in Buffalo, New York; the second nominee, Consolidated Carma Corporation with $11.5 million in profits in 1989 and no taxes paid; finally, MICC Investments with $72.6 million in profits in 1989 plus a tax credit bonus of $29 million from taxpayers and no taxes paid.

The envelope, please. And the winner is Varity Corporation. Special thanks for this award go out to Victor Rice, the chairman of Varity who took the money and ran. After receiving $200 million in tax credits to help save Massey Ferguson, Mr. Rice shuffled off to Buffalo leaving behind 5,000 laid-off workers in his wake.

[*Translation*]

### TAXATION SYSTEM

**Mr. Jacques Tétreault (Laval–Centre):** Mr. Speaker, a movement called Alliance for Fiscal Justice was founded in Quebec a few years ago. Among its aims are tax justice and fairness for every individual and family in Quebec, bringing together individuals, couples, families and others who have a common desire for better quality of life and ensuring that everyone can exercise the right to chose the marital status he or she wants to live under, without tax or economic discrimination.

In a recent newsletter, the Alliance asked the following question: "Does the taxation system favour married couples?" The tax record of the past few years indicated that the winning answer is divorce, with the common law relationship where both spouses are working close second. The same study showed that the gap widens every year at the federal level between the various marital statuses.

In closing, the Alliance requests that all taxpayers and all families who have the same income and burden be treated fairly, taking into account their true burden, no matter what their marital status is.

Mr. Speaker, I support these goals and commit to helping to achieve them.

---

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Like us, Mr. Speaker, for a good many months the government of Quebec has been urging the federal government to exempt books from the GST. Like ours, their plea fell on deaf ears. Yesterday, realizing that levying a tax on books had been a serious mistake, the government of Quebec revised their position and decided that neither books nor reading materials would be subject to the tax.

Is the Prime Minister now prepared to tell the House that he will follow the example of Quebec, heed the advice of thousands of eastern and western Canadians,



and announce that books will indeed be exempted from the GST?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

• (1420)

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** With respect to taxation, Mr. Speaker, the government has opted for a wider tax base and a lower tax percentage. The government appreciates the fact that, particularly in recent years, the cultural industry sector generally and its publishing arm specifically have experienced hardships. The Prime Minister has stated that he can understand the problems facing publishers, and the government is prepared to analyze the conditions and respond appropriately as the situation evolves.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Appropriate measures are needed now, and the minister knows that full well, as does the Prime Minister, I am sure!

[*English*]

In Vancouver, the Prime Minister said he was reconsidering taxing books like the Bible and the Koran, for example. The television clip tells the story; the Prime Minister may not agree with the TV. I cannot blame him. We cannot blame him because every day we are more concerned about the growing problems of illiteracy, its impact on our economy, on our international competitiveness, as well as the isolation of those who do not yet know how to read.

The Ministers of Finance and Communications have told—

**Mr. Speaker:** I would ask the hon. member to put her question.

**Mrs. Finestone:** The ministers have told me that they are looking for alternate ways to finance the book industry, which this minister has just acknowledged, and which also acknowledges that they are gutting the book publishing industry.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member is beginning to make a speech. I would ask her to put the question.

**Mrs. Finestone:** Will the minister withdraw the tax on reading materials now?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Talking about reading materials, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the hon. member for Mount Royal read the

exact words of the Prime Minister, for she would realize that her interpretation is completely at odds with the Prime Minister's statements.

Second, the hon. member says the government must take action. That is precisely what the government did, is doing, and will do. Indeed the government is quite conscious of Canada's two book markets, the English market and the French market. We know as well that the French market is under pressure because there are fewer people to sustain the industry as a whole. This is why 40 per cent of the $8–million government funded publishing assistance program are earmarked for Canada's French publishing industry, Mr. Speaker.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Whether anglophones or francophones, Canadians who read books need that, not a tax.

[*English*]

—no tax on reading. Read my lips.

Mr. Speaker, for six years now this government has been systematically tearing down Canada's national institutions and Canada's cultural industries, and now the minister is choking Canada's cultural engine, the Canadian Broadcasting—

**Mr. Speaker:** It was to be a lead–off question, but it is becoming a speech. I would ask the hon. member, in her preamble, to lay the basis for the question and then put the question.

**Mrs. Finestone:** Mr. Speaker, CBC radio and television remains the last of the national institutions across this land.

Is this government, through its Minister of Finance, its Prime Minister and the Minister of Communications, going to acknowledge the exemplary role and the importance of communications across this land, and promise no further cuts to our national broadcasters.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to note the suggestion made by the hon. member for Mount Royal.

## THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister and concerns the environment.

Yesterday, thanks to a leak on the green plan, we heard, first, that the government will reduce the number of new national parks; second, it will dilute the impact of the solemn commitment it made in Geneva only three weeks ago with respect to $CO_2$ emissions; and third, it will cut 80 per cent of funds budgeted for protecting the environment. My question is this: Can the Prime Minister deny this bad news? Let's be frank and ask the real question: Can the Prime Minister give us the assurance that since September, his cabinet did not chop the green plan?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, speaking of editing, my hon. friend would need some revision.

As far as the green plan is concerned, we are not about to comment on leaks, even leaks at the CBC, if that was the case. We will comment once the plan has been tabled and made public. I know my hon. friend would not want us to do otherwise.

[*English*]

**Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard):** Mr. Speaker, this is inconceivable.

Ask this government about Point Aconi and Kemano, and it dies. Ask it about Rafferty and the Oldman Dam, and it fumbles the ball. Ask it about James Bay, and it cannot hold a position for more than one day. Ask the Prime Minister about the green plan, and he does not know what the heck is in it.

The only positive thing that this government has ever done for the environment is to make a compost heap of its environment ministers.

Yesterday, despite all the leaks to the contrary, the minister could not even give us a date as to when the green plan will be released.

My question is: Will the Prime Minister take the environment minister out of his misery? Will he end the farce? Will he table the green plan now? If it gets any thinner, there will not be anything left to release.

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I almost hate to respond, because my hon. friend gets so much pleasure from his own lyrical questions that he has prepared.

He enjoys them so much, I almost hate to break the rhythm and interrupt my friend with a few facts.

My hon. friend says that I do not know what is in the green plan. I can tell him this. Everything that he has mentioned is not in the green plan.

* * *

## PERSIAN GULF

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, in an hour or so, this House will begin debate on the government motion dealing with the Persian Gulf crisis.

I would like to take this opportunity to ask the Prime Minister if he will clarify for the House the government's interpretation of the language in the resolution.

The Prime Minister will be aware that the resolution implies support for the Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions. Does the Prime Minister take this resolution as support for the resolution that will be coming before the United Nations—

**Mr. Speaker:** The Speaker is in some difficulty here.

We have had a rule for many years that says that in Question Period it is not appropriate to ask a question which anticipates the Orders of the Day. It is a rule which is there and which I must draw to the attention of the House.

Having said that, I am in the hands of the House. If the House wants to pursue this, it can. Perhaps the hon. member could rephrase the question. I know it is the lead question for the New Democratic Party and I do not want to cut him off, but I am bound by the rules as are we all.

• (1430)

**Mr. Brewin:** I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, and it did seem to me a convenient and useful time for the government to make clear its position on this question. If the government wants to take the opportunity, I am giving the government the opportunity to do so.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will hear the question, but I may have to rule on it.

**Mr. Brewin:** The question is: Will the government indicate to this House whether or not, assuming the motion today passes, it will tomorrow—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Chair is in very great difficulty. I want hon. members and the public that is watching to understand what the difficulty is. First of all, the question the hon. member puts is a very pertinent question. It is going to be debated later this afternoon. The difficulty is that we have rules that say that we ought not to raise that question at Question Period.

The second question that the hon. member puts forward is equally intriguing, but it is hypothetical. I know the hon. member would want to support the Chair.

**Mr. Brewin:** I have said what I have to say. The Prime Minister can choose to do what he wishes. Let me now go to the substantive question, to another question, and I will ask the question of the Prime Minister.

[*Translation*]

The Government of Canada says it sent Canadian troops to the gulf to take part in the economic blockade of Iraq. For the blockade to be a success, it should be given time to work. Mr. Speaker, the motion on which the United Nations will be asked to vote does not seem to consider this fact. Why is the Canadian government in such a hurry? Why not give the blockade enough time to be successful?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the Canadian government firmly supports all actions by the United Nations, and I hope all members of this House will do likewise.

As for sanctions, we have one of the most effective programs in history as far as the observance of sanctions is concerned by countries outside Iraq. The important question is whether these sanctions are having an impact on Iraq and whether they affect Saddam Hussein's decisions. That is not a foregone conclusion.

**An hon. member:** Give it more time!

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** They say: Give it more time. You always have to judge the circumstances, and as far as we can see at this time, it is unlikely that these sanctions will have an impact on the people making the decisions in Iraq during the months to come.

If the New Democratic Party wants the United Nations to wait for months, that is their problem. We believe it is extremely important for the world, the United Nations and Canada to keep putting pressure on Saddam Hussein in order to make it easier to reach a peaceful solution to this problem, so that Iraq will withdraw peacefully from Kuwait.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

[*English*]

## TRADE

**Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North):** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister for International Trade, I shall direct my question to the Prime Minister.

Yesterday the minister said that this coming week he would meet with the Mexican and United States trade representatives to discuss the proposed Mexico–Canada–U.S. trade agreement.

Any trilateral agreement must either reopen the existing bilateral agreement or else be limited to a narrow range of interests common to all three countries.

Will the Prime Minister indicate which alternative the government seeks? Which aspects of North American trade does the government want to see included in a trilateral deal?

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, the minister has made it very clear many times in the House that Canada is seeking to have discussions with the United States and Mexico to see what form the negotiations would take and what form the agreement would take.

I can assure the hon. member that the free trade agreement that was negotiated between the United States and Canada will remain in place. Of course, if we can improve the free trade agreement to Canada's advantage, we would always take a look at that. But it is not anticipated that the free trade agreement negotiated between Canada and the United States would be re-opened.

**Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North):** Mr. Speaker, you can have the bilateral deal or you can have a narrow trilateral deal, but you certainly cannot have it both ways.

In the U.S.–Canada Free Trade Agreement this government conceded substantial sovereignty over our energy resources. By contrast, the United States has agreed with Mexico that its energy sector is not negotiable.

Does the government intend to negotiate a trilateral agreement in which Canada and Mexico would be equal with regard to energy? Why should Canada cede more sovereignty than Mexico in a trilateral deal?

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think that the information that the hon. member has is incorrect. I do not know whether negotiations have started between Mexico and the United States and whether energy is included in that or not.

If the hon. member is reading the same newspaper clippings that I am, he is certainly interpreting them entirely different. I think his question is purely hypothetical and cannot be answered.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau—La Lièvre):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. With respect to the GST, the Quebec Furniture Manufacturers' Association has to cope with an unfair method to rebate the sales tax on inventories. Will the minister give consideration to the recommendations of the association which accounts for 80 per cent of Quebec's independent dealers with a view to resolving this matter which may end up by forcing many of them out of business?

[*English*]

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, we have put into rules the basis on which we would provide a rebate in respect of federal sales tax that is to be paid on inventories which are in place on December 31.

Those rules have been discussed at length with industry. They are an average. There are some people who will have a greater rebate than the amount of the federal sales tax in their inventories. Others will get a lesser rebate, but the point is that it is a rebate. It is not a refund. It is important for my hon. friend to understand that people in the same businesses are all in the same position.

If my hon. friend is concerned about this, there are many business people who are uncertain about what the impact of the GST will be on them, simply because the law has not passed through the Senate.

If my friend has concerns about this, he will go down to the Senate and say: "The Liberal Party of Canada does not have an alternative to the GST. We have set up a committee that makes it quite clear that we do not have an alternative to the GST". I might just point out—

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the hon. minister could deal with it on the supplemental.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau—La Lièvre):** Mr. Speaker, the minister did not answer the question, very simple though it was. The association made a number of recommendations and its members are very interested and very concerned. Am I to infer from the minister's response that many of them will experience major problems during the recession because he cannot solve the GST problem, which happens to be very simple and which he could easily address? Will the minister respond at least in part to these recommendations.

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I have already answered the hon. member in my first answer, as I did the question raised by his colleague one or two weeks ago. The hon. member must understand that the GST is very important if this industry is to remain competitive with American imports, for they have an advantage over Canadian manufacturers. This is why the GST is so important, for it will put Canadian manufacturers in a better position to fight their competitors.

I should like to point out that former Liberal Party finance critic Raymond Garneau said, and I quote, "—the GST is the most equitable and least harmful—".

• (1440)

[*English*]

## TAXATION

**Mr. Ross Harvey (Edmonton East):** Mr. Speaker, the 1988 taxation statistics released yesterday show that the number of Canadians making more than a quarter million dollars a year who paid no income tax rose by 40 per cent over the previous year; 140 quarter-millionaires avoided all income tax. The number of Canadians who made more than $50,000 a year and who paid no income tax rose by a staggering 87 per cent, almost doubling. That is 5,430 tax holidayers.

My question is for the Minister of Finance. At a time when he was forcing ordinary Canadians to pay more and more and more, how could the Minister of Finance possibly put in place a taxation regime that allows wealthy Canadians to pay less and less and less?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I it is quite clear that phase one of the income tax reforms has resulted in a fair tax system.

Those Canadians who are earning $15,000 or less are going to see their share of income tax revenues drop from 2.1 per cent to 0.8 per cent. Those in the $15,000 to $30,000 range will see them drop from 26.5 per cent to 23.1 per cent. Those who are over $50,000 will see the amount increase from 34.1 per cent to 40.4 per cent. The tax system has become more progressive and more fair.

In terms of the upper income people whom my hon. friend has talked about, we have addressed that problem. It represented 2.17 per cent of tax filers in 1984. It is now down to .35 per cent. Those are people who have all endured a specific loss.

The clear point here is that when we say something about tax reform it happens. It happened in the phase one of tax reform. It will happen with the GST.

Those families who are earning less than $30,000 will be better off with the GST than is the case now under the existing sales tax.

**Mr. Ross Harvey (Edmonton East):** Mr. Speaker, I greatly fear the finance minister intends to keep his word, because those more than 3 million Canadians who earned $15,000 a year or less actually saw their average tax bill go up by an average $71, while those earning over

a quarter million dollars saw their average tax bill decline by $20,597.

Will the minister not agree, then, that his government's tax reform is nothing more than tax cuts for the rich and tax hikes for the poor and ordinary Canadians?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, the very clear fact is that those people who earn over $50,000, representing 7 per cent of the tax filers in this country, pay up to 40.4 per cent of the tax compared to 34.1 per cent. That clearly shows that the tax system is more progressive. It is fair.

We said in phase one of tax reform that there will be 850,000 low income Canadians who would not pay tax after tax reform where they paid tax before. In fact there are 905,000. We said there would be 250,000 seniors who were paying tax in 1987, who would not pay tax after tax reform. That figure is 290,000.

We have made tax reform work and we are going to make it work again.

* * *

## HEALTH

**Mr. Lawrence MacAulay (Cardigan):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Two years ago, the government made a commitment to help senior independence by setting aside money for research into Alzheimer's disease and osteoporosis. Recently, the minister confirmed that he is cutting 20 per cent from the program. Alzheimer's may not be a concern for the minister, but it is a concern for millions of Canadians.

Will the minister do the right thing and restore the proper funding?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I can confirm to the hon. member that the government has committed substantial amounts of money for research into diseases of the elderly and for medical research in general.

We continue to set a high priority upon that and we will do so throughout the life of this government.

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, cutting funds for research into prevention now will mean more funds will be required for cure of diseases in the future.

Many health researchers and workers responded to the government's initiative announced two years ago and planned their careers in accordance to the previously announced government priorities. Now, without any warning, after plans were made by the research community, the minister has cut funding by 20 per cent.

Will the minister admit his responsibilities to the seniors of the country and their families, and to the workers and research investigators, and restore funding to the levels previously committed to help reduce the occurrence of Alzheimer's disease among the seniors of tomorrow?

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, the government continues to put a high priority upon diseases related to seniors.

If the hon. member were to look at the record of spending by the government on medical research during the life of this government, he would see that substantial commitments have been made and that substantial increases have taken place in research funding for health care in Canada.

Hon. members opposite cannot have it both ways. They recognize the fact that there is a national debt in Ottawa of over $13,000 for every man, woman and child in Canada. The hon. members complain about that, but every effort that is made to attempt to bring that debt under some control they oppose. They have to be honest with Canadians. It is time to choose whether or not they are prepared to support restraint, or whether they believe that we should continue to spend in all areas without constraint.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## CFB CHATHAM

**Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Miramichi):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence.

The minister has just announced today, I am told, that the Low-Level Air Defence School at CFB Chatham will be moved to Alberta. This is another way of announcing the closure of CFB Chatham.

Can the minister tell the House how he is going to replace 1,000 jobs and the $20 million annual input that CFB Chatham represents to the economy of the riding of Miramichi?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I realize the hon. member understands the importance of the base because he was a member of the government in 1983 which first started the procedure to close CFB Chatham.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. McKnight:** I would inform the hon. member that the replacement activity that the Department of National Defence has identified is that of—

**Ms. Copps** Oh.

**Mr. McKnight:** I am sorry, the member's colleague is interrupting and I will wait.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Miramichi has the floor.

**Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Miramichi):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to put my supplementary to the Prime Minister.

During the 1984 election campaign, the Prime Minister promised to the people of Chatham that he would never hurt his home town and that there would be aircraft flying in Chatham as long as there was air.

Will the Prime Minister now rescind this minister's decision and fulfil the promise he made to the people of Chatham?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

• (1450)

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the comments attributed to me by my hon. friend are absolutely false.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Mulroney:** The statement that I did make was that, if a Conservative government were elected in 1984, we would put in train a process which would reverse the policy of the Liberal government, of which my hon. friend was a member, which meant the end of CFB Chatham. We said that we would not let the Liberals close Chatham. We would keep it open and we have been doing that ever since.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Phillip Edmonston (Chambly):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry, Science and Technology claims that the GST is good for Canada as a whole and for Quebec as well. But the Quebec government seems to have repudiated the minister, since they removed the GST on books in Quebec.

My question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Science and Technology. Will the good Quebecer he claims to be personally put pressure on his colleagues to protect the interests of the people of Quebec and have the GST on books removed in Quebec, as the province of Quebec has already done? Does he prefer to impose ignorance by maintaining the tax on books in Quebec? What do the minister and his colleagues intend to do?

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, this question was answered in part, but I should like to add that the government, recognizing the existence of a francophone market separate from the anglophone market, already announced a seed money program for the cultural industries of Canada, in addition to a program 40 per cent oriented at francophone books. For the first two years, the program will be oriented toward the publishing industry and at least 30 per cent of the yearly budget, or $9 million, dollars, will be devoted to francophone books in Canada.

[*English*]

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Science and Technology who seems to have lost his tongue. His department has pointed out that the most important element in Canada's future economic growth is knowledge and technology.

In that circumstance, does he not agree that the introduction of the GST on books is plain asinine?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, the government does recognize the importance of books as an element of our cultural policy. That is why it supports the Canadian publishing industry with many programs.

* * *

[*English*]

## INCOME TAX

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance in regard to his so-called tax reform policy. In light of the fact that in the past he has made many statements in which he claims to be making our tax system more equitable, the truth of the matter is that 640 Canadians earning over $100,000 last year paid no taxes at all.

How can the minister make this claim on the one hand, while on the other hand allow his rich friends to avoid paying any taxes at the expense of hard-working, lower and middle-income Canadians?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, when we came to office there were 1,830 high-income Canadians who were not paying tax because of the loopholes that in place as a result of the policies of the Liberal government, that he was a part of, that he supported at that time.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre):** That is now down to 640. In terms of the number of tax filers, it was 2.17 per cent of tax filers in 1984. It is down to 0.35 now.

There are good reasons why these people are not paying tax. They have suffered losses. They may be farmers. They may be—

**Ms. Copps:** Oh.

**Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre):** My hon. friend from Hamilton is moaning over there. I do not think she understands how the tax system works.

There are individuals who own farms. There are individuals who own unincorporated businesses who lose money. It is for that reason that we have a provision that one can apply one's losses against other income and for that reason not pay tax.

We have removed a number of the other loopholes and incentives that were in place that were being misused by upper income Canadians. That is why there has been a substantial reduction from 2.14 to 0.35 per cent.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt):** Mr. Speaker, that is crocodile tears from Bay Street. This is typical of what we have come to expect from the government.

The facts are clear. The government is afraid to bring real tax reform, because it does not wish to offend the financial supporters of the party.

Will the minister explain why he continues to allow those in the highest tax brackets to pay no taxes, while he is crippling the middle and low income Canadians? Close the loopholes, and close them today, Michael.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** It's better than a crock from Scarborough, that is all I can say.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre):** The hon. member is talking about low-income Canadians. The share of income tax dropped for people who are earning less than $15,000 from 2.1 per cent down to 0.8 per cent; for those between $15,000 and $30,000, from 26.5 per cent to 23.1 per cent; and from 37.3 per cent to 35.7 per cent for those people who are earning between $30,000 and $50,000.

The major thrust in making the tax system fair in 1987 was to reduce the share of income taxes paid by those low income people, as I have indicated here, and raise significantly, from 34.1 per cent to 40.4 per cent, the share of income of those people who are earning over $50,000.

I understand the people opposite do not like to hear the truth.

[*Translation*]

## HIGHWAY SAFETY

**Mrs. Gabrielle Bertrand (Brome—Missisquoi):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Early in 1989, four young children from my riding died instantly as a result of two front-end collisions. In both cases, the children were riding in the back, secured with lap belts.

For a number of years, the *Régie de l'assurance automobile du Québec*, as well as many individuals, including a former colleague Mrs. Thérèse Killens, have been urging Transport Canada, which is responsible for establishing motor vehicle safety standards, to make it mandatory for all cars and vans sold in Canada to have three-point seat belts installed on the back seat. Could the Minister indicate whether he will follow up on this request?

**Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the interest my colleague is showing in this matter. The appropriate regulations will be published in *The Canada Gazette* before the end of January.

* * *

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right honourable Prime Minister. The Quebec government, his greatest supporter in his effort to impose the GST, has yielded to the arguments of the book industry and abolished its tax on books. My question to the Prime Minister is this: Will he assume his responsibility and immediately order his Minister of Finance to announce officially that books will be also excluded from the federal GST?

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, the government prefers to bring *ad hoc* solutions to the specific problems of the francophone book industry. I have already explained that 40 per cent of my department's assistance program is alloted to the francophone industry. Also, under the new program implemented by the Federal Development Bank, 30 per cent of the amounts allocated by the bank will go to assist the francophone book industry. Finally, the government is seriously considering the possibility of implementing two years earlier its postal subsidy replacement program, 50 per cent of which will assist the francophone publishing industry in Canada which we know is facing a very difficult situation.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Shefford, for a very short supplementary.

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Prime Minister. Everyone in the book industry agrees that the minister's announcement is a lot of baloney. Is the Prime Minister ready to meet today with the cultural patriarch of Quebec, Mr. Gélinas, now more than 80 years old, who came to Ottawa to make representations for the book industry? Will the Prime Minister set aside five minutes to meet with the personality of the year in Quebec's book industry?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. In fact, the Minister of Communications asked me if I could take a few minutes before going to chair the National Council for Science and Technology and speak with Mr. Gélinas. I told to the minister I would pleased to meet him at three o'clock sharp. Is he here?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**Mr. Mulroney:** Well, in that case, we can do so right now.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Mulroney:** I will be pleased to meet him in a few moments.

* * *

• (1500)

[*English*]

## VETERANS AFFAIRS

**Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, last Friday when Treasury Board's supplementary estimates were tabled, they showed that the veterans affairs budget was reduced by $3.26 million.

The Minister of Veterans Affairs stated that some budget-cutting measures will inevitably reduce veterans affairs' ability to respond to unforeseen problems and to deal as quickly as usual with new applications.

I ask the acting minister why is the government making it tougher for these people to receive their benefits?

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond on behalf of the Minister of Veterans Affairs, because I think there is good news for Canadian veterans.

First of all, in terms of areas which will not be affected, the Minister of Veterans Affairs has indicated budgets for veterans benefits, for pensions, for war veterans allowances, for veterans and dependants program and so on will not be affected.

In addition to that, the hon. member will be aware that in the supplementary estimates there was an increase of some $60 million for veterans dependants. No doubt he will applaud that increase. We believe that the veterans affairs department can make these cuts from overhead. It will not result in a cut in terms of services or benefits for veterans.

* * *

## PRIVILEGE

### COMMENTS DURING DEBATE ON BILL C-40

**Mr. Speaker:** I have a question of privilege from the hon. member for Scarborough—Agincourt.

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege in regard to comments made yesterday in debate by the member for Souris—Moose Mountain.

While responding to a point I made about those of us who came to Canada by choice, the member said: "They destroyed it".

Along with all immigrants to this country, I am deeply offended by comments such as this. Nearly all of us who live in Canada are descended from people who trace their roots back to other countries and to say that the more recent arrivals have destroyed it is a gross manipulation of the truth. I found it doubly appalling that the member who made these remarks is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister.

I therefore call upon the member to immediately offer his apology for such insensitive remarks to the House and to all Canadians.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Len Gustafson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that if you check the "blues" the debate was on the CBC. The debate became one of national unity and my reference to "they destroyed it" was a reference—if you will read on in *Hansard*—to the Liberal Party, to Clyde Wells, and those who did not support unity, including his leader. There was absolutely no reference whatever to immigrants.

My grandfather was also an immigrant to this country and the reference was to the Liberal Party. However, if there was anything inferred that was taken out of context I apologize for it. That is his problem. The question is clear if you read the "blues".

I again and again said: "Ask Mr. Clyde Wells about unity". It seemed somewhat hypocritical to me that they defended unity after defeating Meech Lake and—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Some hon. members:** Sit down.

**Mr. Tobin:** Come on, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to stand for this.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have another question of privilege. I will certainly come to the hon. member in a moment.

### COMMENTS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Miramichi):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege resulting from the non-answer to my question by the Prime Minister. If the record is checked I think you will find that the Prime Minister said: "Every word he said is a lie". And again he said that I was "a bloody liar"—

**An hon. member:** He said "hypocrite".

**Mr. Dionne:**—"A bloody hypocrite", I am sorry. Mr. Speaker, I will leave that in your hands until the Prime Minister is back in the House so that he can answer that charge. But I want to say more about it at that time, Sir.

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond. The Prime Minister had to leave for a meeting of the National Advisory Board on Science and Technology, which he chairs.

I want to say to the hon. member that what the Prime Minister did say in his comments was that in 1983, when the Liberal government was planning to close CFB Chatham he promised that, if elected in 1984, we would keep CFB Chatham in operation. In fact, that is what happened. Any suggestion by the hon. member other-

wise is simply not in keeping with the truth, as the Prime Minister saw it.

We will examine the "blues", in terms of other comments made and respond to the hon. member.

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on the question of privilege raised by my colleague. I sit directly across from the Prime Minister in the House. The Prime Minister, quite clearly, was heard by many members sitting on this side of the House. I ask the Speaker to take the word of members. The hon. member from Hamilton brought it to your attention during Question Period, Mr. Speaker, quite loudly.

I heard every word the Prime Minister said. He said the member was a hypocrite. He then went on to say, and I am sure the clerk will record it, "Every damn word is a lie". Those are the Prime Minister's words, Mr. Speaker.

That kind of language by the Prime Minister and the example set by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister in attacking a premier outside of this House, does not lead to constructive debate in this House, it sets a poor tone. The example is coming from the Prime Minister; it is coming from his parliamentary secretary; it is not constructive; it is destroying the institution; they ought to apologize, without editorial comment.

COMMENTS DURING DEBATE ON BILL C-40

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence):** Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege. I was in the House yesterday during the debate that caused the question of privilege by my hon. colleague, the hon. member for Scarborough—Agincourt.

I was here during the debate. I remember what the hon. member for Souris—Moose Mountain indicated about other persons who were not here, Mr. Clyde Wells and my leader, Jean Chrétien. He clearly interrupted my colleague in the middle of the debate that dealt with the contribution made by those who were not born here in this country. It was very clear to me and, I think, to other members that he was referring to that particular element that was being introduced into the debate.



**Mr. Speaker:** I understand the very strong feelings of the hon. member but we have heard the hon. member on a question, as he put it, of personal privilege. I have listened to it and the House has listened to it. I have also heard from the parliamentary secretary and the parliamentary secretary has said that whatever he did or did not do, if offence was taken, he apologizes for it and that closes it off. After that—

**Ms. Copps:** What about "bloody hypocrite"?

**Mr. Speaker:** If the hon. member feels the matter is not closed, I would like time to look at exactly what the parliamentary secretary said. If I feel that it was not an appropriate withdrawal, then I will come back to the House. But we are not going to reargue it now.

On the other question, I have listened very carefully to what has been said. I will look very carefully at *Hansard* and I would hope that the matter would resolve itself at the earliest opportunity but if it does not, then I will of course take steps to do something about it.

**Mr. Jack Shields (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I think it should be made clear that, as you mentioned in your remarks, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister had made a withdrawal. I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you can take this under advisement.

• (1510)

He also did say that he did not refer in any way to ethnic origin or immigrants, but he referred to the actions of the liberal government in killing unity in this country in the CBC. I think that should really be pointed out very clearly.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Athabasca has—

**Mr. Arseneault:** It's in *Hansard*.

**Mr. Speaker:** —on a point of order really risen to reargue the position the parliamentary secretary made. I heard the parliamentary secretary. I will look very carefully at his remarks. If necessary, I will come back to the House.

On the other matter, as I have said, I hope it resolves itself. If it does not, then of course I shall have to do whatever it is that is appropriate.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, having heard the Prime Minister state quite categorically that my colleague, the

member for Miramichi was a bloody hypocrite, I hope I understand from the Speaker that the resolution will be the Prime Minister coming into the House to withdraw those remarks. Is that what he takes to be a resolution?

**Mr. Speaker:** Sometimes Speakers make suggestions which, of course, are heard by everyone. Under certain circumstances they often are acted upon. I do not think I need to go any further.

* * *

## PRIVILEGE

### STANDING COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORT

**Mr. Speaker:** I am now ready to rule on the question of privilege raised on Thursday, October 18 by the hon. member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan regarding events which transpired in connection with a planned meeting of the Standing Committee on Transport of the same day. The hon. member explained that a meeting of the transport committee had been duly convened with seven days notice pursuant to Standing Order 106(3) for the morning of October 18. He went on to state that the meeting did not take place because quorum could not be met. To put it in ordinary terms, there were not enough members there to proceed with the meeting.

The hon. member further argued that the absence of government members was perhaps a collective decision which in essence created a boycott of the committee and as such was an infringement upon the rights of other members of the committee. The hon. chief government Whip stated on the other hand that various government members of the committee had important previous commitments and it was felt that the subject matter was too important to leave in the hands of alternate or substitute members.

[*Translation*]

I have carefully considered the comments made by the member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan and the Chief government Whip, and also the excellent arguments for and against which were made on that day by other members. It is difficult for the Speaker to decide on the specific issues raised by the member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan.

[*English*]

According to the conventions and traditions of this place, the Chair ought not to intervene in the proceedings of a committee unless the matter has been placed before the House by means of a report from the committee. While there obviously could be no report in these circumstances since the meeting never took place, the attendance or non-attendance of hon. members at committee meetings is clearly in the Chair's view not a matter upon which the Chair can or should take a position. However, it is a matter obviously of concern to the House and it becomes a matter of concern for the Speaker because when there are problems within the committee system, eventually and inevitably they are raised in this Chamber and before the Speaker.

As I have said on other occasions, it has to be a very severe situation indeed for the Speaker to consider intervening.

Further details of this situation have, however, been brought to the attention of the Chair by the hon. member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan in a subsequent intervention on Tuesday, October 30, 1990. At that point, the hon. member asked the Chair to rule on whether the fact that the chief government Whip had not convened a meeting of the Standing Committee on Transport for the purposes of electing a chairman constitutes an act which impedes members of the House in the performance of their duties on committees, in connection, specifically, with the review of Order in Council appointments is provided for in Standing Orders 110 and 111.

[*Translation*]

In his comments, the chief government Whip said that that House need only vote on the Striking Committee report pertaining to the membership of standing committees in order to deal with the situation of the transport committee.

[*English*]

The Chair has looked very closely at this matter. Clearly there is no chairman of the Standing Committee on Transport to convene a meeting for any purpose. Under these circumstances and pursuant to past practice, the next meeting of the committee can be convened by the Clerk of the House if the report of the Striking Committee providing for new committee memberships is adopted, or by the chief government Whip in consultation with the Whips of the other parties.

The Chair can see that there is cause for concern here, that it is difficult to find a breach of the privileges of hon. members in the fact that a standing committee is paralyzed and cannot meet. The solution would appear to lie in negotiations among the parties, which the Chair would encourage at this time.

I have to say to hon. members and to the public that the working of committees is very important to the working of the House of Commons. I do ask hon. colleagues to make every effort possible to come to whatever agreements and understandings among themselves which are necessary to make these committees work.

I do not want to state this too often, and I hope that I will not have to, but there is a general feeling across the country that somehow or other not only politicians, but maybe institutions, are letting down the country. This is why it is essential that everybody make an extra effort to try to make this system work.

I am not happy with this situation, obviously. But, I am also bound by rules here and if I am to intervene in committees, it has to be in a very severe and outrageous situation indeed. While this is not only inconvenient but perhaps very aggravating, I do not feel that I can depart from the laws which bind me as they bind all other members of the House of Commons.

I thank hon. members for their intervention.

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, as a member of that transport committee, I want to thank the Speaker for his decision today.

On a point of clarification, I wonder if the Speaker could clarify something for me. Am I to understand that the Chair is restricted to make decisions on issues only involving breaches of privilege out of the confines of this place?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Hamilton West rises on a point of clarification. I have made it clear in the past that I do not take the position, nor do I think a Speaker should take the position, that a Speaker is forever bound never to intervene in a committee matter. But, it will have to be a matter of very gross disorder indeed, a very grave situation.

This is a matter which can still be settled by consultation. The jurisprudence on this kind of a question goes back not just decades, but for a long, long time indeed, and not just to jurisprudence in this House but in other Houses where we have the parliamentary system. I am very reluctant to move into the committees if it can be possibly avoided.

What I want the hon. member and other hon. members to understand very clearly, I am not saying that there might not be an occasion in which the Speaker would have to move. One can say well, it has not been done before. Speakers have made decisions in the past that had not been done before, and they form part of the precedents of our law of procedure.

What I am asking hon. members in this case to do is please take into account everybody's responsibility to this institution and to our country, and try to resolve it. I think it can be resolved by discussion, and that is the way I would hope it would be resolved.

What I am saying to the hon. member, in summary, is I might have to intervene at some point.

• (1520)

It would have to be under a most grave situation, and I am reluctant to move into the committee field and do what really the members of the committee ought to do for themselves.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### PETITIONS

#### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I would be honoured to table in both official languages the government's response to 95 petitions.

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

* * *

[*Translation*]

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### STRIKING—PRESENTATION OF FIFTY-SIXTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the Fifty-Sixth Report of the Striking Committee. I ask that the Clerk at the Table be

dispensed from reading the report, which consists of a list of members of the Special Committee.

[*English*]

BILL C-74—REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

**Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the report of the legislative committee on Bill C-74, an act to amend the Fisheries Act and to amend the Criminal Code in consequence thereof, with amendments.

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

[*Translation*]

STRIKING—CONCURRENCE IN FIFTY-SIXTH REPORT OF COMMITTEE

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West)** moved that the Fifty-Sixth Report of the Striking Committee, presented earlier today, be concurred in.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

[*English*]

## JAPAN

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF INSTITUTION OF PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I have a motion concerning the 100th anniversary of the institution of parliamentary democracy in Japan.

I move:

That the Speaker of the House of Commons convey to the Speaker of the Japanese House of Representatives and the Speaker of the Japanese House of Counsellors, the good wishes of the House of Commons of Canada on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the institution of parliamentary democracy in Japan.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

## PETITIONS

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Mr. Speaker, I have a petition, signed by several dozen Canadians, calling on the government to remove the goods and services tax as it applies to the printed word on such things as magazines, books, newspapers and other printed matter.

The petitioners point out that the dissemination of the printed word is the cornerstone of our democracy, culture, education and a literate and productive society. This literate and productive society would be negatively affected by the application of the GST.

I would hope, now that the Prime Minister has indicated some concern about the imposition of this tax, the government would withdraw it as it applies to all matters, especially to books, newspapers, magazines and other printed word.

**Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition signed by 49 Canadians.

These Canadians note that since Confederation, a zero rate of tax has been applied on magazines, books and newspapers. Now with the goods and services tax, there will be a tax on this. In fact, the petitioners consider it a tax on reading.

These petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to reaffirm the historic principles embodied in the tax free status of the printed word by retaining the zero rate in the GST legislation and regulations.

THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present two petitions. The first one deals with the clean-up of the Seine River. A large number of my constituents call upon the three levels of government to sort out the various responsibilities for the clean-up of rivers, and more specifically in this instance the Seine River, a once beautiful and non-polluted river. Of course, this is applicable to other Canadian rivers as well.

The petitioners really want governments to sort out what it is that they have to do, stop talking and start acting.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** My second petition deals with the concern of a number of my constituents, and other Canadians as well, with the goods and services tax on reading materials. They note that there has never been a tax on reading and learning materials. They are concerned that while the government talks about competitiveness, participation and

democracy, it will be imposing a tax on those very tools that permit us to do just that.

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, I too am honoured to present a petition pursuant to Standing Order 36 on behalf of 50 Canadians who are concerned about the imposition of the GST tax on books and other printed word. It has been the cornerstone of our country, of our democratic society, that the printed word be disseminated as widely as possible and without tax.

I humbly submit this petition asking Parliament to reaffirm the principles of democracy and allow no tax on the printed word.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I too am pleased to rise to present a petition in this House concerning the goods and services tax. The many Canadians who have signed this petition are from the city of Toronto. They are opposed to the tax, and in particular insofar as that tax is applied to the printed word.

Like many other members of this House, I plead with the government to change its obstinate approach to this bill, agree to changes that will make the bill more sensible and reasonable for Canadians, although I find the whole idea of the goods and services tax unreasonable, as I am sure these petitioners do, and call upon the government, as they do, to reconsider the goods and services tax and for the Senate of course to reject this bill.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, as we have been doing for months and months, I come before you with hundreds of petitions once again from the general population from east to west and from the north, who are extremely concerned about the tax on reading. They consider this tax to be a tax imposing ignorance on our population with a terrible mortgage on our future. We should do everything possible to encourage reading, and not to tax reading. The petitioners call upon this government to reconsider the goods and services tax on books, magazines and literature and to stop being so stubborn, change its mind and move to remove the tax.

**Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 it is my pleasure to introduce similar petitions to those that have been introduced already. These come mainly from Toronto. They are opposed to the GST as it is related to the printed word. It is highly hypocritical of this government not to accede to this particular request and see that the GST is not applicable to the printed word.

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present a couple of different petitions this afternoon. The first one is from people who take objection to the GST being applied to magazines, books and newspapers, going totally against Canadian precedent. I think it is important that people realize that there are a lot of people in this country who do not have easy access to libraries where they can inform themselves and that the purchase of printed material is important to them. I ask on their behalf that the government consider dropping the application of the GST to the printed word.

## VETERANS AFFAIRS

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** As well, Mr. Speaker, I have petitions from people in my riding who take exception to the government's budget proposals for veterans. I think that in this perilous time in which we live in this world, where we are sending our Armed Forces to serve in the Middle East, that we assure the Canadian public that we treat our veterans with the greatest respect for the service that they have given.

The petitioners on this petition humbly pray and call upon Parliament to reject those budget measures that deprive veterans of proper services and increase their financial hardship.

• (1530)

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence):** Mr. Speaker, I too would like to rise, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present a petition on behalf of many constituents from the city of Toronto.

They have noted a very timely action by the Government of Quebec on the decision not to impose a sales tax on printed matter and other learning material. They call upon the government to consider that action as a precedent, to act on it, and to follow up on it.

A GST or any kind of tax on the printed word and learning material that profligates the essence of democracy is truly unproductive, as is, for example—and they have noted it—the language of the Minister of National

Revenue when referring to those who act against the GST.

**Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso):** Mr. Speaker, I too would like to rise, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present petitions on behalf of Canadians who object to the GST in general but take particular exception to the tax on reading embodied in that particular tax.

They note that since Confederation the government has always avoided charging a tax on books, magazines and newspapers, up until the proposed GST. They feel that the uninhibited dissemination of the printed word is the cornerstone of our democracy.

They petition Parliament to reaffirm these historical principles and to withdraw the tax on reading embodied in the GST.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to table a petition signed by a number of Canadian men and women. Your petitioners object to applying the Goods and Services Tax to books, newspapers and magazines, and they feel that this tax is extremely regressive. Your petitioners, and there are quite a few of them, maintain that free distribution of printed matter is one of the cornerstones of our democracy, our culture and our education. They also claim that an educated and productive society can only be undermined by a provision that would put a tax on books, textbooks and anything that can be used as such.

Today we want to congratulate the province of Quebec which has decided not to tax books, and we hope the federal government will do likewise.

[*English*]

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, the number of citizens objecting to the tax to be imposed on magazines, books and newspapers is increasing at an exponential rate day by day.

In addition to what my colleagues have already done, I have the honour to submit a substantial list signed by citizens from metro Toronto.

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, I too have the honour to submit petitions from Kitchener and from several sections of Toronto in opposition to the tax on books.

The petitioners oppose the increase in illiteracy and in the costs of persons who want to read, want to become educated, and want to become more productive members of society.

They are asking Parliament to restore the historical exemption of reading from taxes.

**Mr. Gilbert Parent (Welland—St. Catharines—Thorold):** Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in presenting a petition against the GST.

I was approached a few days ago by representatives of the Canadian Student Federation. In view of the fact that these students are directly involved with the printed word, as this is how they get their education, they are adamantly opposed to the GST.

Once again, we put before the government to reconsider this ill-conceived and, I hope, ill-fated tax.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

* * *

[*English*]

## MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers P-28, in the name of the hon. member for Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, is acceptable to the government, and the document is tabled immediately.

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a feasibility study on establishing a new race relations network, prepared by Mr. Ralph Agard of Toronto for the Minister of State (Multiculturalism and Citizenship).

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers be allowed to stand.

**Mr. Milliken:** Mr. Speaker, Notice of Motion No. P-31 that I have been after the parliamentary secretary to answer for some time, asks about the cost of the deployment of Canadian forces personnel to Oka.

This morning I received from the Minister of National Defence a press release that indicated a total cost of $83 million, so obviously the minister has this information. He must have had it in order to cook up this press release. In the circumstances—

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Milliken:** If the government House leader would look at the Notice of Motion on the Order Paper, it asks for details. Surely these details are now available if the Minister of National Defence has a total.

I wonder if the government House leader would agree immediately to this motion. He could table the documents tomorrow or Friday.

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, as usual I bend over backward for this member. I do everything I possibly can to accomplish all the various requests he makes of this government. If he noticed earlier today, I tabled responses to 95 petitions. I am not sure, but I suspect 89 of them were his.

I can tell him, we are looking at his particular Motion No. P-31. My information is that he should have an answer not soon but very soon.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Shall the remaining Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers be allowed to stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### INVASION OF KUWAIT

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs)** moved:

That this House, noting that the Government of Iraq has not complied with the United Nations Security Council resolutions concerning the invasion of Kuwait and the detention of third country nationals, supports the United Nations in its efforts to ensure compliance with Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions.



He said: Mr. Speaker, today we are on the eve of another important Security Council vote. I think it is right for Parliament to consider the implications of the crisis that prompts this vote. It is the intention of the government through this crisis to consult as much as possible with the people of Canada and with Parliament, just as we have been consulting extensively with our allies. I intend, in the course of my remarks, to report briefly upon some of the conversations that I have had over the last 16 days with countries involved directly as Canada is in the gulf.

We tried, in this extraordinary crisis, to offer candour to the House and to expect from the House and to ask from the House understanding of the larger international implications of the grave issues that face us. We are trying to approach this issue step by step. It is in that context that I want to take this opportunity to set out the thinking of the government on the decision that is before us in the Security Council tomorrow and my view of the context in which that decision will be taken. I expect there will be other debates in this House as the situation evolves.

This vote, Sir, comes near the end of Canada's two-year term on the Security Council. It is our fifth such term, a record for non-permanent members of that council.

That is an appropriate record because, I dare say, no other country has been as loyal a supporter of the ideals of this world organization in whose founding Canada participated actively and creatively.

When we look for a noble and far-sighted vision for managing world affairs in what will be a difficult decade and century to come, we can hardly do better than to draw on the vision of the United Nations charter.

The great sadness of our times has been that the charter was a dead letter for 40 years, because of the paralysis of the cold war.

The cold war is over. I was in Moscow the week before last, and I found an extraordinarily different country from the austere monolith I had visited five short years ago. Sadly, their problems in the Soviet Union are enormous but they have a country and they have a leadership and they have a people with great reserves of strength. Nations like Canada will and must help them where we can.

• (1540)

The tremors of the Gorbachev reforms have allowed profound change through eastern and central Europe that not only helped end the cold war, but set the stage for the CSCE summit in Paris last week. In some respects, that summit marked the formal end of the Second World War.

I would like to communicate, in passing, one of the remarkable moments of that CSCE conference. Vaclev Havel, prisoner, playwright, president, sitting at his desk in that debate, said to others around the room and around the world that this summit was the pre-eminent moment in his life because it brought to pass so much of what he had struggled for through all of those years. That was the context in which we met to bring in effect a formal end to the Second World War.

The Paris summit should have been an unqualified celebration of the new possibilities before us, of our shared determination to build a new European common home, to be secure from Vladivostok to Vienna to Vancouver, as Eduard Shevardnadze has said. It should have been a celebration of the growing willingness to use the United Nations in the way it had been intended, to bring peace and to bring greater security to this world.

But the celebration in Paris was muted, because we all understand that a terrible breach of faith and a breach of law and a breach of order has happened: an act of war by Iraq which imposes on the world community the burden of a great challenge. If new and more hopeful vistas for world peace are at last to open, we as the United Nations have to be equal to the challenge which Iraq's invasion of Kuwait represents clearly to all of us.

This challenge goes to the heart of Canadian interests and Canadian diplomacy, not just now but for 50 years: the building of a workable world organization able to prevent or able, if necessary, to reverse the most blatant and dangerous of international offences, which is the acquisition by force of another country's territory and, in this specific case, an effort to extinguish a UN member in its entirety.

The challenge has gone even beyond these transgressions of international law, as Iraqi authorities have threatened the use of terrorism and of chemical weapons which they have used in the past, with terrible consequences, even against their own people.

That is the evil that countries historically arm themselves against. That is the evil that causes proliferation, which is responsible for an arms race which in large part diverts the resources that should be going to the poor of the world and denies people in developing countries the right to live decent lives.

That this evil has occurred in the most heavily armed and the most volatile region in the world only amplifies its gravity.

I have just come from the Middle East. The potential for death and for destruction in the Middle East is very real. Members of this House of Commons should have no illusion about the danger, nor about our obligation to try to moderate that danger. Most of Israel's neighbours remain in a state of war against her. The Palestinian people, despite the *intifada*, despite their acceptance of resolution 242, live in a pressure cooker of frustration with thousands of new migrants forced home from the gulf. There are the larger questions of democracy and decision-making in the Middle East. There are quarrels between families and regimes who each want to leave the Arab world. There are shocking gaps in income between opulent wealth and the most terrible poverty. There are chemical weapons, biological weapons, almost certainly some capacity for nuclear weapons, and there is the steady flood of conventional arms.

In the midst of all that, in a region where the institutions of modern government have shallow roots, there is generally the common link of the noble religion of Islam which, if it became radicalized, could have devastating consequences around the world. President Gorbachev—the Prime Minister and I know from our conversations with him—is aware of those consequences. King Hussein is aware of them. Presidents Ozal and Mubarak are and, of course, Prime Minister Shamir understands the threat of Islamic extremism.

That the Iraqi aggression affects security of access to the most vital of commodities further compels our attention. But make no mistake about the importance of the principle we intend to defend, the principle of international order where international law is respected, and the United Nations is used and the United Nations works.

Canadians, historically, have been at the cutting edge of the practical measures which have won respect for the United Nations. We helped draft the charter. Professor John Humphrey of McGill was a principal author of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Lester Pearson guided the ideal of peacekeeping, against Canadian critics who said it was an inappropriate use of the United Nations, and 83,000 Canadians wore and wear today the blue beret, with pride and with effect, to build peace and to maintain peace.

Now we are at a new step in the evolution of the United Nations, a time in which at last the members of the Security Council are working together on resolutions which involve enough compromise on all sides to allow this diverse world to act together to keep its house in order. And yet, at the same time as being prepared to compromise to come together, the Security Council of the United Nations has taken actions which are clear in their intent and respected in their application. It is hard to think of a time when the United Nations worked better and we, Canada, want to keep it working because that is the only way to advance peace and prevent war.

Since the beginning of the crisis the United Nations has shown that blatant disrespect for international law can be met with a response that is firm in its resolve and unbending in its respect for international order.

For Canada, some of the basic precepts in which our foreign policy is deeply rooted are being challenged by the gulf crisis and they just may be vindicated by its resolution and its aftermath. The rule of law and the establishment of a stable international environment have been key objectives of ours since the end of the Second World War.

[*Translation*]

Since the beginning of the crisis, the government of Canada has kept the same objectives in constant view: to make clear the unacceptability of Iraqi behaviour and Canada's determination to play its part in the collective response; to reinforce the rule of law in international affairs and support a renewed United Nations in its first post-cold war response to a gross violation of its charter by a member state; and, of course, to protect Canadian lives and Canadian interests put in jeopardy by the invasion and annexation of Kuwait. Following from those objectives, we have been trying for three months, in co-operation with the other countries joined in a united stand against Iraq, to ensure that the UN-imposed sanctions are made as effective as possible; that the international consensus is sustained; that the humanitarian and economic problems created by the crisis and the sanctions are adressed quickly and sympathetically, both as an intrinsically important goal and one supportive in sustaining the international consensus; that the international community explore peaceful means to end the dispute, while enforcing the UN resolutions.

• (1550)

[*English*]

Well, Sir, where are we today? Iraq is still occupying Kuwait, in spite of universal condemnation and the near universal application of sanctions.

We, of course, hope that sanctions will help to persuade Saddam Hussein to withdraw. We continue to believe that they help make clear our resolve, but we also now recognize that sanctions in and of themselves are not sufficient to force a withdrawal, if the Iraqi government places a higher priority on holding onto its territorial gains than on the resumption of normal life for its citizenry. We simply have to face that fact.

The government in Baghdad, as the House knows, has been using innocent civilians of third countries, including Canada, in its efforts to wrest concessions from the international community and to try to win propaganda points with its own supporters. It has proceeded at the same time with a ruthless program to annihilate all traces of Kuwait's separate existence. In short, Iraq has repeatedly ignored the demands of the international community in successive Security Council resolutions passed since August 2. It has failed to comply with the obligations incumbent upon it on the basis of international law, on the basis of the principles of civilized behaviour, and on the basis of its own membership in the United Nations.

I have, as I said, Mr. Speaker, in the last several days been in the Middle East. That trip followed intensive talks that both the Prime Minister and I had with the leaders of the Soviet Union, the European Community, and the United States. In the Middle East, I spent many hours in discussions with Iraq's neighbours, including the President of Turkey, the King of Jordan, the Prime Minister of Israel, and with the ministers of foreign affairs of those countries. I also met at length with

President Mubarak of Egypt, and with his foreign minister, Dr. Abdul Mequid.

Several weeks ago, I met with other foreign ministers from the gulf area, from Saudi Arabia and Qatar. I set out for all these interlocutors the view of this government regarding the unacceptability of Iraq's invasion.

It is important for the House to know that every head of state, every head of government, and every minister with whom we have met shared that view, that the occupation of Kuwait is unacceptable.

The view in Canada, in the region, and throughout the world is the same. Iraq is isolated. Iraq has behaved abominably. It has invaded a small neighbour, and it has done its utmost to ensure that its restoration would be impossible. It has taken thousands of hostages, including Canadians.

This destruction of a small country is, in the words of President Mubarak, "unbelievable". That was the word President Mubarak conveyed to me when he told me of specific and categoric assurances that had been given to him personally by Iraq's president only days before Iraq unleashed its military arsenal against Kuwait.

From the beginning of this crisis, we have all hoped that peaceful means would produce the necessary Iraqi compliance with Security Council resolutions. Indeed, Canada has been working strenuously since the beginning of August to seek just such a peaceful solution. We have done so in the United Nations, we have done so in the region, and we have done so in close consultation with all the members of the Security Council.

Officials of my department have been travelling around the world regularly, particularly to Security Council members—including the people who rarely vote with Canada—to try to encourage a unanimity and a consensus that will allow the United Nations to be effective in these circumstances.

I am sure that I speak for all Canadians in hoping that a peaceful solution may still be possible. Time, however, is running out.

Tomorrow at the United Nations in New York, Canada will, as a member of the Security Council, participate in the formal consideration of a new resolution that has been under discussion for some days now. This new resolution will almost certainly authorize the use of whatever means are necessary to remove Iraq from Kuwait and to restore to Kuwait its own destiny.

For Canada and for others, what is at stake is the integrity of our international order and the credibility of international law and of our multilateral institutions.

We must recognize, however, as I have seen over the last few days, that the neighbours of Iraq have another interest in ensuring that Iraq's deed is undone. Mr. Speaker, we in Canada, far from the scene of the battle, far from the immediate site of those terrible tensions, must realize that there will be no safety and there will be no stability if Saddam Hussein gets away with his annexation of Kuwait.

All countries would prefer a peaceful solution, not a deal which rewards the aggressor, but full and swift compliance with the resolutions of the Security Council. Regrettably, many believe that a peaceful solution is not attainable, whatever their preference.

The leader of Iraq does not seem to grasp the dimensions of the problem he has created. Consequently, he does not seem to understand the strength of the resolve to see justice done. He thinks the world is bluffing. The purpose of the United Nations resolution, which Canada and other members of the Security Council will consider tomorrow, is to ensure that Iraq understands that this is not a bluff.

Tomorrow's resolution will demand full compliance with previous council resolutions. If Iraq does not fully implement those resolutions, the text will authorize member states co-operating with the government of Kuwait to use all necessary means to see they are implemented and to restore international peace and security in the area. Does this mean that force will be used? That is up to Iraq.

That resolution will probably be approved tomorrow, November 29. In normal cases, that would mean the capacity to act, with whatever means, would exist tomorrow, November 29. Now there is a serious and constructive proposal that the resolution build in a pause between the day in November when the authority is vested, and some specific later date on which it might be used. That proposal reflects the call for a pause which

Canada and other countries proposed after discussions during the United Nations General Assembly. A deadline which implied an ultimatum could be counterproductive and artificial, and that is not what is proposed. As the Prime Minister said yesterday, what is contemplated is, instead, a pause of goodwill to allow Saddam Hussein one more opportunity to reflect on his options. Naturally, that time must be used by all nations to seek a basis for the peaceful acceptance of Security Council resolutions. But, in particular, it gives Iraq an opportunity to seek a peaceful end to the war it began when it invaded Kuwait.

In passing, Mr. Speaker, I should say, that that proposal for a pause indicates one of the very real fruits and benefits of the new atmosphere within the Security Council, when countries that had not previously worked together were prepared to work together in these circumstances to ensure that there was a basis on which the world could act together.

We certainly hope that Iraq will take this opportunity. If Iraq does so, will the international community in any case insist on the elimination of its leadership or its entire military capacity? No, there is a willingness in the region to live with Iraq, warily to be sure, but on a basis of international law and internationally guaranteed frontiers.

• (1600 )

Does Iraq have legitimate concerns which should be discussed? Perhaps there are some. That is up to the Government of Kuwait to negotiate or for Iraq to pursue in the many international fora which adjudicate exactly such disputes. The possibility of such a negotiating power is contained in Security Council Resolution 660, the very first passed by the Council in responding to this invasion. We urge Saddam Hussein to pursue this option.

Would military action in the gulf be an exercise of only western will? Absolutely not. The coalition includes such partners as Pakistan, Morocco, Czechoslovakia, Argentina, as well of course as Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia, the Gulf states and dozens of others.

An Arab force could see to the future defence of Kuwait with international peacekeeping components as necessary or as desirable. Canada would certainly consider seriously a request to participate in the cause of peace.

Will there be further attempts to resolve existing tensions in the gulf and Middle East regions? Yes. During my discussions in the Middle East the Arab–Israeli dispute was also raised, specifically the Palestinian question. I believe that one of the consequences of the current gulf crisis could be a new sense or urgency about solving other problems facing that troubled region. We have of late witnessed a pattern of successes within the Security Council in addressing regional issues, not just in the Middle East, but also in Cambodia and elsewhere. If that pattern continues, if we do not lose it here, if we can maintain the strength of the United Nations which we have so carefully built over the last years and particularly the last months, if that pattern continues, then a just, lasting and comprehensive solution to the Arab–Israeli dispute, which Canada views as necessary and urgent, may at last be possible. This is a matter than can only be addressed, however, separately from the current crisis.

Iraq's offence is *sui generis* and its undoing, according to the highest principles of international law and the highest interests of international security, is essential. But resolution of all territorial disputes in the region on a just and equitable basis is urgently required, if peace and security are to apply in a durable way in a region which may be the most volatile in our world.

We will also have to turn our collective attention to the need for arms control measures which deal with weapons of mass destruction that threaten the whole region. Sustaining the new unity of the international community is the only hope, the best hope, that these problems can be resolved with speed.

There may be the elements of a peaceful resolution of this crisis. I was more encouraged than I thought I might be by the conversations I had in the Middle East. I was encouraged by the determination of people ranging from Israeli leaders, to King Hussein, to the Palestinians to look for ways in which this experience may lead to constructive responses to other issues. So we hope that there will be means found to resolve this crisis.

Otherwise, force will have been authorized by the world community, and on behalf of the international institutions Canada has spent five decades to design and to defend.

To abandon those institutions now, to abandon the unanimity and the consensus that has been found in the United Nations now, would be to abandon all hope for the rule of law in world affairs. The world agrees with that. The question is: "Will Iraq agree with that?"

The resolution we will be voting on tomorrow in New York is the desirable option that I have sought and that many here have sought, the UN authority to use force if Iraq rejects the option of a peaceful withdrawal. The House will remember, and no one in our country should forget, that the use of force began on August 2 when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. It is now up to Saddam Hussein to determine whether the international community will have to use the authority of the United Nations to achieve our collective goals through further force.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, Liberals welcome this opportunity to discuss some of the historic issues touched on by the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

This past August 2, the Iraqi army, acting on orders from President Saddam Hussein, invaded and occupied Kuwait, a sovereign member of the United Nations.

Since that date, we have witnessed dramatic and unprecedented events. Today there is fear that we are moving ever closer to war in the Persian Gulf with thousands of lives at risk, some of them Canadian lives.

Liberals are strongly supportive of the broad international consensus that has condemned the Iraqi aggression and which has called for the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait.

Let there be no mistake, Liberals strongly and unequivocally condemn the action Iraq has taken against Kuwait, and support calls for the immediate withdrawal of Iraqi troops from this sovereign nation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the United Nations, Iraq is expected to abide by the UN Charter. It is expected to abide by the established rules of international law. However, it did not. We are convinced that all Canadians who are concerned about fairness and justice believe, as does the Liberal Party, that this flagrant violation of the UN Charter and international law is intolerable and must cease.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, we believe that Saddam Hussein must understand that his aggression and expansionism do not and cannot pay dividends. As a member of the United Nations, and as a nation committed to peace, Canada must not let Iraq succeed in its unlawful occupation of Kuwait. The United Nations is of the same view.

As we know, on August 2, 1990, in an emergency session, the United Nations Security Council passed resolution 660, condemning Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and calling for its immediate withdrawal. On August 6, the council voted unanimously to impose sanctions amounting to an economic blockade of Iraq. On August 25, the council authorized military action to enforce these sanctions.

[*Translation*]

However, on August 10, two weeks before the United Nations gave its authorization for military action, the Prime Minister gave a press conference to announce he was deploying substantial numbers of Canadian troops in the Persian Gulf. Unlike his British, French and U.S. counterparts, however, our Prime Minister did not consult this Parliament to discuss the matter and reach a decision.

[*English*]

Instead, Canadians saw this government side-step immediate parliamentary debate on this matter by sneaking through a loophole in the National Defence Act.

The position of my party has been clear throughout this crisis. From the beginning we have insisted that the government should commit forces to the Persian Gulf only under the auspices of the United Nations, and only after consultation with Parliament including full parliamentary debate.

• (1610)

In September, the Liberals as a parliamentary party, strongly endorsed the actions taken to that date by the United Nations Security Council.

Soon after the House was recalled in that same month, the government did place a resolution before it concerning the Persian Gulf crisis. That draft resolution originally was merely an effort by the government to pat itself on the back and try to get *carte blanche* to pursue whatever course it saw fit. It was only through the efforts of the opposition critic for external affairs and others in our party that the government finally agreed to modify its motion, agreeing to an expanded role for parliamentary debate and for greater recognition of the role of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, modified through efforts by Liberals, unequivocally condemned Saddam Hussein for invading Kuwait. Canadians were shocked and dismayed when the NDP voted against it.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of the efforts of our critic for external affairs who has travelled to Iraq with members of other parties to seek the release on humanitarian grounds of Canadian hostages being held there and in Kuwait, and we are pleased to learn today that a number of these Canadian hostages are going to be released.

**An hon. member:** No thanks to Joe.

[*Translation*]

**M. Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, we have consistently condemned the unlawful invasion of Kuwait by Iraq. We in the Official Opposition believe that the Conservative government failed to put the necessary emphasis on the role that can be played by the United Nations in resolving this crisis. We also feel that the government abdicated its duty to inform Canadians, fully and on a regular basis, on developments in the Persian Gulf, and to involve them, through their elected representatives, in this country's decisions.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, the failure of the government to keep Canadians informed is not only wrong, it is a departure from the precedent established here by my party when in government. More than 40 years ago, following the attack by North Korean troops on South Korea, Lester B. Pearson, then the Secretary of State for External Affairs, reported every day to the House of Commons. There was extensive discussion of that crisis in the House which was then sitting.

Mr. Speaker, in the summer of 1950 the House of Commons was prorogued, that is, the session was formally ended. And on the eve of that prorogation, Mr. Pearson pledged that if necessary the House would be recalled to deal with the crisis. On August 19, 1950, the House was recalled for an emergency debate and members of Parliament were given a full opportunity to discuss the Korean conflict and Canada's role in it.

**An hon. member:** What a difference, the right Prime Minister.

[*Translation*]

**M. Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, the crisis was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. Both Chambers were asked to adopt legislation which subsequently provided the basis for Canada's participation in the Korean War under the aegis of the UN.

[*English*]

I want to emphasize that both Houses of Parliament were recalled to participate in a debate on the Korean crisis and to actually vote on legislation authorizing the participation of Canadian Armed Forces in that crisis, all in a comprehensive manner. This stands in sharp contrast to the approach taken by this Conservative government in the current Persian Gulf crisis, starting back last summer when the government refused to recall this House to discuss the crisis before it sent troops to the Persian Gulf, a departure from the precedent created by Liberals during the crisis of the Korean War.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, more than 40 years later, the Liberals stand for the same approach, full consultation, open debate in and decision by Parliament and involvement with and through the United nations.

This government has a duty to consult and seek the approval of the House of Commons during such crises. When Canadian lives are at stake, the Canadian people deserve nothing less. Yet, what do we see from this government? As I said, the Prime Minister authorized the sending of Canadian men and women to the Persian Gulf, into a battle zone, more than two weeks before the United Nations authorized the use of force.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has also now taken to sabre-rattling. Just last month, he made a virtual declaration of war while speaking at the University of Western Ontario. "We should not rule out the possibility", the minister told his audience, "that young Canadian soldiers, men and women, will not return to this country for celebration but will stay there for burial". Later, before a parliamentary committee, the minister said that Canadian Armed Forces could be involved in offensive action against Iraq even without United Nations authorization. So much for the commitment of this minister and his government to the principle of operating under the basis and umbrella of the United Nations. In his speech he used all sorts of nice words about support for the United Nations, but he spoke quite differently before a parliamentary committee not long ago.

Through the statements and actions of the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs, it is clear that this government is embarking on a path that could lead to war. It does not appear to be sufficiently interested in determining first whether the United Nations approved sanctions have been working. It does not appear to be sufficiently interested in finding a constructive and a peaceful solution. It seems to be primarily interested in furthering a risky agenda for a military solution that will be anything but quick and anything but painless.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday my colleague, the hon. member for Northumberland, asked the government to provide the House with the fullest possible documentation on the effectiveness of the United Nations sanctions. On Tuesday, I asked the Prime Minister whether the government shared the view of international experts, including a former American Defense Secretary, James Schlesinger, who in testimony before a committee of the United States Senate, said that sanctions are working and need more time to take full effect. In both cases, the government has not yet bothered to provide the full information we requested on the effectiveness of the sanctions.

In his speech, the minister said: "We now recognize that sanctions in and of themselves are not sufficient to force withdrawal of Iraq". I ask the minister, where is the evidence of this? How and when did the government reach that conclusion? The government did not answer these questions in any way, shape or form in the minister's speech. Maybe the government is reluctant to let us in on the facts about sanctions because there is evidence that the sanctions are working. Since the Second World War, no country has been disciplined so strongly and so completely in this way for its international aggression. With what have been described as near airtight sanctions, it is difficult to imagine how Iraq could consider itself in any way better off for having invaded Kuwait. In fact, the opposite increasingly appears to be the case.

It has been reported that 90 per cent of Iraq's food imports have been stopped and rice, flour and cooking oil are being rationed. Forty per cent of Iraq's industrial capacity has been shut down and Saddam Hussein has been forced to close non-essential factories to conserve lubricants, spare parts and electricity. Sanctions are estimated to be costing Baghdad more than $1.5 billion American per month in lost oil revenues and international authorities have succeeded in freezing virtually all Iraqi and Kuwaiti overseas bank accounts.

• (1620)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the lesson for Iraq is that the price of its act of aggression will be serious and ongoing damage to its economy, its isolation on the international scene and a weakened geostrategic position in the long term. This is a lesson given not by the use of military force but by the most imposing international coalition since the Allies in the Second World War, a new coalition acting on the resolutions of the UN Security Council.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, this new coalition may well reflect a new international order that is rising out of the ashes of the cold war. At no time in the past 40 years has the United Nations been able to forge this kind of consensus. There is a real need for such a coalition, a new kind of coalition involving countries of the east and west, the north and south, a coalition that would have as its goal the effective maintenance of international peace and security.

The prevention of war was among the founding goals of the United Nations. The preamble of the United Nations Charter of 1945 begins: "We, the peoples of the United Nations determine to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war".

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, as our leader, the hon. Jean Chrétien, said in a speech a few months ago, we can do far more to upgrade the tools available to the international community to resolve disputes before they degenerate into armed conflict or, if appropriate, to make it possible for parties to reach an agreement without outside intervention. The task was a difficult one during the cold war, but now that east-west tensions have relaxed, there is hope that we can consolidate the institutional framework for international co-operation.

Mr. Chrétien went on to say that we must give the UN some muscle. Canada was the first country to get involved in peacekeeping operations. Our soldiers have taken part in a number of operations and they will continue to do so. It is in our higher interest to use our influence to enhance the capabilities of the United Nations, expand its peacekeeping mandate and make it a forum where all nations will be able to resolve their disputes in an atmosphere of trust.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, in response to the current crisis and in keeping with the founding principles of the United Nations, the Security Council has imposed near airtight sanctions against Iraq. UN member countries are enforcing those sanctions with the help of a broad-based multinational military force.

At this time, we are not convinced that sanctions have failed. On the contrary, as I have said, experts are pointing to increasing evidence of their success.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals believe that instead of rushing into a military offensive, we should maintain and reinforce sanctions to make Saddam Hussein understand that aggression does not pay.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, starting a war is all too easy. Anyone who knows anything about the Middle East knows that finishing a war in that region is going to be exceedingly difficult. The consequences of war will be enormous. We must, therefore, think always of the human cost of waging war.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, with thousands of lives at stake, we must move heaven and earth to find a peaceful solution. Only when we are convinced that all peaceful means of getting Saddam Hussein's troops out of Kuwait have been exhausted, should the United Nations consider further military action.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, in its resolution today the Conservative government is asking Canadians to give it a blank cheque. It is asking for support of a vague motion before this House that may translate into support for any and all future UN resolutions, the exact contents and purposes of which no one can foresee.

In the view of Liberals, the draft Security Council resolution is premature. It is also vague. It authorizes any country individually, on its own, to do anything that country considers right; to use any means it considers necessary to achieve the goals of resolution 660 in this matter anywhere in the region, without any consideration of UN command or accountability.

I say, Mr. Speaker, the comments from the backbenches by the Secretary of State for External Affairs indicates he knows he has a weak case, otherwise he would be sitting and listening, as I did to his speech, even though I had plenty to say about its gaps and weaknesses while he was speaking. His comments show that he knows he and his government are on the wrong track.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**An hon. member:** Right on.

**Mr. Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, asking this Parliament to endorse the current draft Security Council resolution we believe is asking far too much at this time.

We will not, through supporting this government motion before the House today, give the government a blank cheque for any and all further action regarding the Persian Gulf. I do not think that this is what Canadians expect this House to do.

While I do not rule out the possibility that the United Nations may eventually have to make a decision on the use of force, Liberals do not believe that this point has yet been reached. We believe that the United Nations sanctions must first be given sufficient time to work. Liberals insist that before Canadians are called upon to participate in any offensive action, such participation

must first be brought before Parliament and voted on here in the way it was done at the time of the Korean conflict.

The approach I have outlined is consistent with the support of Liberals for the evolving role of the United Nations in the development of a new post-cold war international order for the maintaining of international peace and security. It is consistent with our rejection of the aggression of Saddam Hussein. Above all, it is consistent with the role and responsibilities of this House of Commons.

Therefore, by way of conclusion, I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all of the words after the word "its" and by substituting the following:

"current efforts to ensure compliance with Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions adopted as of 28 November 1990, and that this support shall not be interpreted as approval of the use of Canadian Forces for offensive action without further consultation with and approval by this House."

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The Chair has had an opportunity to look at the motion and will agree to the motion.

• (1630)

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As you are aware, under the rules of the House, now that there has been an amendment placed, the only procedure subsequent speakers could use to have anything else put on the floor would be to present a subamendment. We have had discussions with the parties and the other groupings in the House of Commons and believe that our proposed wording may not meet the criteria for a subamendment.

However, with consent of the House and because of the importance of this issue, we are asking that the motion which would be put in the name of the member for Victoria be treated as a further amendment and therefore be allowed.

It is a very important issue. I do not think this is the type of issue that we would like to see anybody in the House playing procedural games on. We are asking unanimous consent to do this and to make sure that the House has a very clearly worded motion on such an important issue.

**Mr. Gauthier:** I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I can understand the difficulties the New Democratic Party is in.

Of course the rules would not allow another amendment to be put to the main motion. They would have to put an amendment to our amendment which has just been tabled by my leader. That would be called a subamendment.

The motion that is before us right now, as amended, would have to be exceptionally further amended by the NDP if it so wishes. It would be unusual for a motion to have two amendments, but we would, in the interest of fair play and in the interest of getting the message across from the NDP, allow it maybe to put it as an amendment; but by exceptional circumstances only do we accept it. There are no precedents being set here.

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate as well that we have no problem with this procedure. The fact that we would allow the NDP to put an amendment, by consent, certainly is acceptable to this side of the House.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Lapierre:** Mr. Speaker, I will not repeat what was said by the hon. member for Ottawa–Vanier, but I heard him mention the words fair play. Since that is not a rule customarily observed in this House, I do not see why we should give our consent. I suggest that the principle of fair play could be applied to the decisions of the Board of Internal Economy. Consequently, we will not give our consent.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, of course I have to express our disappointment that we are not able to present our particular amendment to the motion before us. I hope that in my remarks I will be able to make our position eminently clear. The motion before the House—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I would just like to advise hon. members that pursuant to Standing Order 43 the first two speakers had unlimited time, with no questions or comments. We are now entering a period of 20 minutes plus 10 minutes for questions and comments.

**Mr. Brewin:** The motion before us calls on the House to support "the United Nations in its efforts to ensure compliance with Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions".

The amendment of the Liberal Party would have the effect of clarifying the meaning of "subsequent resolutions". It would make very clear that this House only supports those resolutions which have been adopted to date. It does not imply support for the resolution that is going to be coming up before the Security Council tomorrow or any other future resolutions. Our party will support the Liberal amendment.

If we had had the opportunity and if something could have been worked out, we would however have gone further than the Liberal amendment. We would have asked the House for a further amendment, to make it absolutely clear, as follows:

> That this House opposes the use of force against Iraq until sanctions and other UN measures have had time to succeed and urges the government to seek amendments to the currently proposed Security Council resolution to that effect.

I had hoped—and I am sure most members of the House had hoped it—that the Secretary of State for External Affairs would have in fact made it absolutely clear that the government had a narrow interpretation of the motion before the House. He failed to do that. He simply said with regard to the motion that he expected there might be further debates on the question of Canadian participation. He made no commitment to further debates before Canadians are committed to war in the gulf.

He further cast his remarks entirely in support of the proposition that Canada should vote for the motion before the Security Council tomorrow, thus making it clear that the government sees this motion as not only endorsing resolutions of the UN Security Council adopted to date but very clearly implying support for future resolutions including the resolution tomorrow. We are going to proceed on that basis. If the amendment the Liberals have proposed is lost, this party will stand in this House and oppose the resolution and the motion presented by the government.

This is a very difficult issue, not only for this House and for Canada, but for the world. I would like to say at the outset that this House is not divided on support for the United Nations, support for the United Nations system, or support for the proposition that the Security Council is the appropriate forum for the world to be dealing with this crisis.

Our party has from the beginning been the firmest of supporters for the United Nations, and we do not step back from that for one minute. The Secretary of State for External Affairs and the government, however, cannot translate support for the resolution that comes before the United Nations tomorrow into support for the system itself. The very fact that Canada is a member of the Security Council leaves it open.

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** What nonsense. It is like your position on the GATT.

**Mr. Brewin:** The minister says: "What nonsense". The minister simply does not understand that being a member of the Security Council imposes an obligation on Canada to act independently, sensibly and sensitively and, further, for the government to be prepared to accept the advice of this House on the action that Canada should be taking tomorrow.

There is no blank cheque to be given to the Security Council or to the permanent members. It is critically important that Canada, which was elected to the Security Council by the votes of the General Assembly, exercise its independent judgment on the issue that is coming before the Security Council tomorrow. That is not against the UN system. In fact it is entirely supportive of the UN system. We are expected to exercise our judgment. We owe it to Canadians. We owe it to the General Assembly. We owe it to the world to use our judgment and to present our views before the Security Council tomorrow.

It is our submission that that exercise of independent judgment calls on Canada to seek amendments to the presently proposed resolution and, failing amendment, to vote against the resolution in the Security Council tomorrow. That is what our independent judgment must lead us to.

There are a series of arguments presented on how to deal with Iraq, all of which spring from the proposition that the crisis must be dealt with. Let me emphasize that. I have first emphasized our party's support for the UN system. Let me go to a second support.

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** Except when it counts on it.

**Mr. Brewin:** Not at all. What do you do? Check your brains at the door when you go into the office of the Security Council? Not at all. You don't check your brains at the door. You exercise judgment. You reflect Canadian opinion. You are sensitive to what the world requires in this. The government cannot simply be a lap dog to the superpowers of the UN. It is expected to exercise judgment. That is what it is there for.

The second proposition must be clear. No one in this House forgives what Iraq did on August 2. We all start together on the proposition that Iraq is an international criminal. It has broken international law in invading Kuwait. We go further. The regime of Saddam Hussein has one of the worst human rights records in the world. Saddam Hussein is dangerous to his neighbours and to the world. He has developed and shown a capacity to use chemical weapons against his own people. He has developed and used biological weapons. He is in the process of developing nuclear weapons. It is a regime which is unacceptable to civilized opinion around the world. The acts that he committed on August 2 and, subsequently, in Kuwait are not forgivable.

• (1640)

This party takes second place to no one in its condemnation of Iraq's actions and of Saddam Hussein's regime. What we do say is that the issue before this House and before the international community is how to deal with the breach of international law committed by Iraq. It is at this point that we begin to differ from the approach of the government, the Government of the United States, and the other superpowers.

What we say is that while Iraq is a dangerous enemy, the United States, in compiling military force and seeming to be dogged in its persistence that military force is the only solution, is a dangerous ally. It is a necessary to send a message, not just to Iraq but to the hawks in the United States who we watched on television just last Thursday. They seemed to treat war as some kind of football game.

It is absolutely important that Canada speak as a peace-maker in the world, that Canada speak at the United Nations as the voice of caution, as the voice of wisdom, as the voice of peace, and not as the voice of war.

There are two propositions which I submit are virtually self-evident. First, sanctions are working in Iraq. The minister has said it. The Canadian forces in the Persian Gulf are employed in seeing that the UN boycott is effective. They are doing an outstanding job, as are the other forces that are enforcing the boycott. Iraq's neighbours are enforcing the boycott: Iran, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan. The countries of the Middle East, as the minister indicated, are united in the proposition that the sanctions must be made effective.

Estimates are that they are 99.9 per cent effective. But, equally, the government would have the world community ignore all the evidence of expert opinions that it takes time for sanctions to succeed in the sense that they affect the behaviour of regimes. We have seen in South Africa that it took years for sanctions to bite. In Rhodesia it took years for sanctions to bite. I submit it will not take years in Iraq. It will take months, but those months should be invested to avoid war, because in the Iraq situation there is absolute unity of the international community in the enforcement of sanctions.

Further, Iraq has come into this situation virtually bankrupt. Iraq invaded on August 2, 1990 simply because it was broke after a 10-year war with Iran. For months prior to August 2—and the minister indicated some of this in his speech—it was going cap in hand to its Arab neighbours, Kuwait, Egypt and other countries, to the Arab League, seeking a handout because of the financial condition it was in. When it failed to get that and when, I might add, the United States failed to give it the appropriate signals in terms of a response to invasion, Iraq took its fate into its own hands. That was not only illegal, it was a serious miscalculation. But it should be understood that Iraq has gone into this situation in a very weakened position and that the effect of sanctions is going to be that Iraq's capacity to continue will be rapidly eroded.

The Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade of the House has been hearing witnesses. The witnesses have persistently said that sanctions will take four, six, eight, or ten months before they work. It is our view that the effect of war is going to be so catastrophic that it is critical that the international community give sanctions every opportunity to work. Sanctions combined—

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** Except when it counts on it.

**Mr. Brewin:** If the minister would be patient for a minute I will get to the rest of it.

Sanctions and the political isolation of Iraq will, in fact, if given time, produce the desired result. That is proposition number one.

Let me give you a second proposition.

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** Tell me about political isolation and how you achieve it without military means.

**Mr. Brewin:** The minister asks how we can achieve isolation without military means. The minister's thinking is locked in the Second World War.

It is a tragedy that the minister and the leaders of the international community have not been prepared to take the additional time necessary to understand that the continued isolation of Saddam Hussein will, in the long run, produce the results that are necessary. Turning him into a martyr to international exterior power will itself be a problem, but beyond that the minister completely discounts the impact of war in that region. Innocent civilians—

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** I do not.

**Mr. Brewin:** The minister says he does not. Let me suggest the minister fails to make an adequate balance between the cost of military action and the desired effect and object.

The desired effect and object is to bring Saddam Hussein to his senses over time, have him move out of Kuwait, and produce the kind of solution that the international community needs. All of the evidence is that sanctions, if given time, will work. Sanctions undercut prematurely, as the UN resolution proposes to do, will in fact move us to war much faster.

There is the bluff theory. I know the Secretary of State for External Affairs to be a peaceful person and I suspect, deep down in his heart, that he believes in the bluff theory, that if the Security Council passes this resolution, somehow between now and January 15 Saddam Hussein will see the light and back away. The problem with the bluff, Mr. Speaker, is that Saddam Hussein appears to be the sort of person who may well call the bluff of the international community.

The Secretary of State himself said that it is important that he get the message we are not bluffing. A resolution at the United Nations is not going to do that. No resolution will do that, because he is still going to be persuaded, I suspect, that all that is happening here is a bluff and he will be very tempted to call the bluff of the United States. That appears to be the way in which he works.

The risk is that, on the other side of it, the international community has given itself a deadline beyond which it must move. If he calls the bluff, the options of President Bush and others have been removed and those in the United States who urge war will have their way. What happens on January 16 if he has not moved? What happens if he has not moved on January 17?

The minister says this was not a deadline that could be interpreted as an ultimatum and that would be counterproductive. Precisely, Mr. Speaker. There should be no deadline. Sanctions should be given every chance to work and that should be the message to the international community.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Brewin:** Mr. Speaker, it is important, of course, that one consider carefully the effect of all of the permanent members of the Security Council, save perhaps China, appearing to be ready to vote for this resolution.

Let me contrast briefly the experience of the permanent members of the Security Council with that of Canada and suggest that our different perspective and our different experiences are also worth something and should be expressed clearly and independently at the United Nations.

The superpowers, perhaps by their nature and by their history, see military action differently than we do. All of them in their different ways have, from time to time in their history, shown a propensity to rely on military force to achieve political solutions: the United States in Vietnam, and in other places such as Panama and Grenada most recently; Britain in Argentina; France with its nuclear testing in the Pacific; and the Soviet Union in Afghanistan.

• (1650)

We, in Canada, I submit, have quite a different experience. It is critically important that this experience be reflected at the United Nations. Our experience is

that when there is no choice, such as in the Second World War, we are ready to do our part, but clearly when there is no choice. In Korea, we did our part.

But our essential experience from the end of the Second World War is that military action is in fact counterproductive in producing useful solutions to difficult crises and difficult problems. Our experience is that it is important to work through the problem. It is important to contain militarily a country such as Iraq, and that is being done. It is critically important to apply economic sanctions and we have supported that against South Africa, for example, and in Rhodesia. But it is equally important that war not be acted on precipitously.

When I was home last weekend, it was interesting for me to talk to some of the people from Victoria. A Second World War veteran said he had two ships shot out from under him. He said the push towards war in the Middle East was madness.

A widow who lost a husband and a son said she could not believe that the international community is contemplating war in the Persian Gulf. Young students at Monterey Elementary in Victoria, got together to write letters to the Prime Minister, urging him to speak at the United Nations on behalf of Canadians, saying there must be peace and not war in the Middle East.

It is time that the government listened to Canadians. It is time the government acted independently of the United Nations. It is time the government was a voice for peace and not war.

This is a difficult issue, but it is one that calls for patience and that calls for sense. I would urge the government to speak for Canadians tomorrow at the United Nations, to commit itself that Canadians will not go to war in the Middle East without the full approval of this Parliament and until it is absolutely clear that there is no option.

We call on the government to act with sensitivity, to act with patience, and to act on behalf of Canadians. If the amendment of the Liberal Party is not adopted, we will vote against the resolution and continue to urge this government to act on behalf of Canadians.

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this debate, a debate in which we are discussing a motion put forward by the government to support the resolution expected to come forward tomorrow at the United Nations which would provide further opportunities for the UN to find ways to resolve the situation in Iraq.

I would like to talk a little bit today about the role of our Canadian Armed Forces in the current situation and bring both the House and those members of the Canadian public who are watching up to date on our activities.

First, Mr. Speaker, it is important again to come back to the groundwork of the issue that we are dealing with. On August 2, the Government of Iraq launched a massive invasion of Kuwait. This unprovoked aggression was quickly followed by Baghdad's declaration of a comprehensive and eternal merger between Iraq and Kuwait, an ill-disguised phrase for Iraq's outright annexation of Kuwait.

The speed and brutality of this invasion aside, it is the maintenance of civilized norms of international behaviour that is at stake in the Persian Gulf, namely, how Canada and like-minded members of the world community can best forestall similar behaviour in the future by compelling Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait. We all know the lessons of history and that we cannot allow appeasement, we cannot allow incrementalism. It has been quite a unique experience how the world community has come together on this issue to say: "We will not allow one country to take over another country".

As my colleagues on all sides of the House are aware, a vital component of Canada's international defence policy is to work toward maintaining a stable international environment. It is in support of these long-standing objectives of both Canadian foreign and defence policy that our ships and aircraft have been committed to the Persian Gulf region.

By agreeing to participate in the multinational effort in support of the United Nations, we have indicated that this invasion will not stand. Saddam Hussein must recognize that it is unacceptable for larger, more powerful states to attack or to intimidate their weaker neigh-

bours. Canada stands by those who seek to affirm the Charter of the United Nations, and signal that such gross violations of the charter will not be tolerated.

That is why I was surprised to hear the member for Victoria saying that Canada should act independently of the United Nations, when it has indeed been the very history of our country to support the United Nations in these efforts for international peace. This example is a unique example where the United Nations has indeed been able to bring together east and west on this issue. We should be doing everything we can to support the United Nations efforts.

I would like to assure the House and Canadians that the government considers the deployment of our Canadian forces abroad to be a matter of utmost seriousness. As such, any discussion of our participation in the multinational effort to support the United Nations' efforts to dislodge Iraq from Kuwait also compels us to conduct a very sober assessment of the Iraqi military capabilities.

On the whole, from the information that we have available, the reinforcement of Iraqi forces in Kuwait and southern Iraq would appear to have as their objective the consolidation of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. These capabilities are impressive, but I must emphasize that a thorough assessment of Iraq's posture—something that is being conducted on an ongoing basis by my department—shows that our air and naval personnel are not at undue risk in performing their duties under their current mandate.

The size and the deployment of the Iraqi ground force contingent make it well positioned to defend Iraq's gain in Kuwait. However, in the event of hostilities, Iraq would likely find that the task of co-ordinating and resupplying its forward-deployed troops to be beyond its current capabilities. In addition, allied air and naval superiority would go a long way in addressing Iraq's ground force advantages, while the morale and training of many Iraqi troops in Kuwait also remains a major question mark.

I have alluded to some of the capabilities of the multinational forces that have been deployed in the gulf. Upon closer examination, the composition of these forces reflects an unprecedented degree of international consensus on the need to provide a substantial military underpinning to the United Nations efforts to compel an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait.

At the moment, over 30 countries have committed, or have indicated their willingness to commit, military assets in support of the UN effort, while some 24 countries have currently deployed these resources in and around the Arabian Peninsula.

The diversity of the coalition is striking. The Secretary of State for External Affairs mentioned this as well. There are western countries, including Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Italy, Germany, the Netherlands, and Spain. There are Arab states including Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Morocco, and even Syria. There are non-Arab states with substantial Muslim populations such as Pakistan and Bangladesh, as well as a number of African countries including Niger and Senegal. Additional support has come from the new democracies of central Europe—Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Poland.

• (1700)

This remarkable array of countries has contributed forces which are formidable in and of themselves; these are capable of deterring further Iraqi aggression and enforcing strict implementation of the United Nations embargo. The manpower total for these multinational forces currently exceeds 300,000 and is expected to grow to some 500,000. Some 17 countries have deployed over 110 ships in the Persian Gulf, the Gulf of Oman, and the Red Sea. Allied air power is prodigious, with over 1,500 aircraft deployed from 11 countries. As I mentioned earlier, allied forces enjoy overwhelming naval and air superiority and this will substantially redress the Iraqi advantage in ground force capabilities in the event of hostilities.

The contribution of the Canadian forces to this effort has been prompt and significant. The Canadian naval task group has been assigned to a critical zone in the Persian Gulf, and although our three ships comprise less than 3 per cent of the total multinational naval deployment, our personnel have been involved in more than 20 per cent of the activities surrounding the enforcement of the maritime embargo. Our squadron of CF-18s has also carried out its air defence role with great proficiency. If I may echo the remarks of the all-party group from this House which visited the Canadian forces contingent in mid-November, Canadians can be very proud of their men and women who are serving in the gulf.

As we know, Canada's commitment to the multinational effort involves nearly 1,700 men and women. Some 950 of these are with the Canadian task group, while our deployment of eighteen CF–18s and their associated support staff accounts for an additional 570 personnel. Both elements of our contribution are under the command of Commodore Ken Summers, whose joint task force headquarters reports directly to the Chief of the Defence Staff here in Ottawa, thus ensuring that our forces are employed only in those roles to which the government has agreed. Tactical arrangements for the employment of Canadian forces personnel as part of the over–all multinational deployment have been arranged for the Canadian task group and the CF–18s.

As all hon. members are aware, the deployment of the Canadian task group was announced on August 10 by the Prime Minister. After the ships were prepared for departure, they sailed across the Atlantic and through the Mediterranean before passing through the Suez Canal on September 16. That task group began its patrol in the assigned areas of the Persian Gulf on October 1 and has been able to utilize port facilities in Bahrain and the United Arab Emirates.

The deployment of the eighteen CF–18s from 409 Squadron, which is based in Baden–Soellingen, was announced by the Prime Minister, the Minister of National Defence, and the Secretary of State for External Affairs on September 14. These aircrafts are based in Qatar, and have been flying defensive air patrols over designated areas of the Persian Gulf since the middle of October, and Squadron 409 will soon be replaced by Squadron 416 from Cold Lake, where I visited last week.

The Canadian task group and the squadron of CF–18s have been deployed as part of a multinational effort to deter further Iraqi aggression and to ensure strict implementation of the United Nations embargo. As I noted before, Canada has certainly pulled its weight in this endeavour. At one point, Canadian ships and aircraft have been involved in the monitoring and interception of nearly 1,000 ships in pursuit of effective maritime trade sanctions against Iraq. Beyond this, they have participated in a number of actual boardings, all of which have taken place, fortunately, without incident. In addition, our squadron of CF–18s has been able to increase its number of daily patrols when required, and has been asked to cover critical air space over the Persian Gulf.

I think all Canadians can take great satisfaction from the way in which the skill and professionalism of the Canadian forces personnel has contributed to the controlled, yet effective enforcement of the UN trade embargo. What has been especially striking has been the way in which our personnel have adapted to the very challenging circumstances. Not only have they adjusted to the extremely demanding climate of the Persian Gulf, but our naval personnel and pilots have received outstanding support from Canadian forces personnel in Canada, Germany and in the gulf, all of whom have responded with innovation and a great deal of hard work in organizing and sustaining Canadian air and maritime operations there.

In summary, quoting the all–party committee that went over, as it reported, it said:

> In summary, we give top marks to the Canadian contingent in the gulf. They are contributing in a proficient way to Canada's highest traditions of outstanding international service in the cause of peace.

I want to say, as well, how much we appreciate the support of many individual Canadians: school children, business people, Canadians across the country who have been sending letters, calling and showing their support to Canadian men and women. It really means a lot to them when they are over there in the Persian Gulf.

Canada's security also depends on a stable international order. To this end, a continuing feature of our foreign and defence policy has been a broad–based commitment to promote international peace and security. We have pursued these objectives over the years in a variety of ways, in collective defence arrangements and multilateral peacekeeping operations. Canada has an outstanding record in those areas, one of which we are very proud.

However, Canada's commitment, as well, to international order has also entailed and must continue to oblige a commitment to collective security and defence, a commitment which we have seen as Canadians have fought in Europe in the world wars and in Korea. Since 1945, Canada has helped create a system of collective security which looked to Europe as the first line of defence. These commitments have taught us that security at home is meaningless unless all members of the

international community can feel secure from military threats and intimidation.

I want to emphasize that the government is not considering the prospect of conflict in the Persian Gulf in anything but the gravest terms. As Canadians, our abhorrence of war is informed by the sacrifices that we have made in the past in the pursuit of a better world: in two world wars and in Korea and as part of peacekeeping operations, which have given us a very sober approach to conflict. Certainly, no one must have a keener sense of this than the families and friends of the Canadian forces personnel who are currently serving in the gulf, and I am sure that the thoughts of all hon. members are with them at this time.

Iraq's brutal invasion of Kuwait once again presents Canada with a severe challenge. How we respond will be a test of our maturity as a society, and of our willingness to actively pursue the principles which will promote the type of world community we keep for ourselves and future generations. Our ultimate objective, after all, is a safer and more secure world.

What Canada and the rest of the multinational coalition are doing in the gulf supports the goals of peace and security contained in the Charter of the United Nations. We are adhering to the notion that peace must be protected if it is to be kept. The best guarantee of peace is the guarantee that unprovoked attacks will not be tolerated.

I submit that it is imperative for Canada to insist and assist in enforcing the ground rules of a new international order where the kind of outrageous behaviour we have seen by Iraq is not tolerated. This new order is within reach, but only if it is supported and strengthened by all civilized nations, by the United Nations and of course Canada.

• (1710)

Mr. Speaker, I know that my time might be up but in conclusion I would like to indicate that at this point I want to emphasize that the UN resolutions in themselves do not in any way change the mission assigned to the Canadian forces and that any change of mission that the Canadian government might assign to the Canadian forces in the future would indeed be commensurate with our capabilities. Should that occur I wish to reiterate that it would be on the basis of a deliberate decision made by the Canadian government.

For now, Canada, along with the other members of the UN Security Council and like-minded nations around the world, endeavour to ensure that future measures are implemented under UN auspices. This has been our preferences from the very beginning of the crisis. We are also mindful of the need to provide the multinational force with additional options so that it may better implement the aims of the UN resolutions.

Of course, we hope and will continue to do everything to try to ensure that war does not break out. But if wiser counsel does not prevail, rest assured that our men and women in uniform are equal to any of the tasks that may be demanded of them. Most important, they are not only serving the interests of security in the Middle East, but also of peace and stability in the world at large.

**Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. minister for her presentation. I think she really brought us up to date with some of the facts, figures and numbers of the operation in the Persian Gulf. I was particularly pleased to hear her compliment the men and women of the Canadian forces who are over there, who are prepared to put their lives on the line to protect our way of life, peace, liberty and freedom.

I have a question, and it is important to me. Even the three, four speakers that we have had, and with the follow-on speakers that we are likely to have for the rest of this debate, I think it is important that we focus on any differences that we may have. I think it is very important that those men and women, of whom I just spoke, understand that if there are differences in this House, that the differences are substantive, that they are not for partisan reasons and that legitimate concerns are shown where there are differences. I think it is very important in an issue of this kind that that principle pertain.

To that end, I have great difficulty in understanding, if indeed the deadline of January 15 is in this particular resolution that we are asking for support, why we are asking for a deadline of any kind at this particular point in time. My understanding is that the sequence of events should be, as far as the United Nations is concerned, that identification of aggression has taken place. That certainly has taken place. There is call for compliance, non-military sanctions and blockades, which is where we

are to date. Only if these measures fail do we consider military enforcement.

I have here a record of the sanctions and their descriptions. I see that on August 25 sanction 665 was invoked. It called upon maritime forces to use such measures as may be necessary. My understanding is, using the best information I can get, there seems to be general agreement. I have heard it mentioned a couple of times here in this House this afternoon that in order for the allies, or the United Nations if you like, to find out if the sanctions are biting they need from six to twelve months.

There is general agreement that sanctions can work because the economy of Iraq is semi-developed. It needs to import three-quarters of its food. Most on its manufactured goods and foreign currency depends of the export of oil, which it cannot do now. We are looking at February 15 as the minimum time that sanctions are likely to bite, or perhaps up to close to the end of 1991. I would like the minister to explain to this House why we seem to be taking this premature action to talk about all necessary means, which I believe certainly includes force. I equate all necessary means, the ultimate being force. Why are we entering into that debate at this particular point in time? Why not give embargoes a chance to work?

**Mrs. Collins:** Mr. Speaker, I know my hon. colleague from Bonavista—Twillingate has had a long and honourable career with the Armed Forces. I know his sincere interest for the well-being of our men and women serving in the Persian Gulf and has much knowledge of their activities.

I agree with the member. This should not be a debate along partisan lines. It is something we are all concerned about. It is the future of peace and security in the world, and the role that our people will play there.

The hon. member has raised a very important question. The Secretary of State earlier today during Question Period tried to respond to the question about sanctions, are they working?

As I understand it, through the United Nations there is a committee which is asked to review the enforcement of the sanctions, particularly dealing with resolution 661, which was the overriding resolution involving sanctions. Canada serves, I believe, as the vice-chair of that committee.

It is the assessment that the sanctions are not working effectively in the sense that while indeed the ordinary person in Iraq may suffer and there may indeed be shortages of various commodities, it is not affecting those who are empowered to make the decisions. As long as Saddam Hussein keeps his own agenda of maintaining his involvement with Kuwait ahead of the well-being of his own people, it is not really having the kind of impact that we would like it to have.

Among the international community there is a consensus that we have to keep the pressure on. As my hon. colleague knows, the resolution coming forward at the United Nations tomorrow provides this pause—this time of goodwill—in a sense saying: "Okay, we give you a chance to get out of Kuwait".

As the Secretary of State for External Affairs said earlier, perhaps there is even some provision there for discussion on some of the grievances that have been involved through the United Nations. But there will come a time when through the international community, we will be prepared to say that other methods or other measures may be required. The resolution does not say they will be, but it does indicate that they may be. It creates a pressure to get this issue resolved because it is apparent that to date at least the resolutions of the UN do not seem to have had that bite and that kind of impact. There has to be that continuing pressure.

It is for that reason that certainly Canada, along with other countries on the Security Council, believes that it is important to provide for this further resolution; provide for that option. It does not necessarily say it will happen as I have indicated, and as I think the Secretary of State for External Affairs has indicated. It does not change Canada's role in and of itself because that would have to be a discussion and a debate at a further time. It does create a new sense of pressure which we hope will have an impact on Saddam Hussein and bring him to his senses to realize that he is not going to win. He cannot win in the long term. He might as well cut his losses, get out of Kuwait and have peace and stability restored to that part of the Middle East.

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the minister. I listened with care to her assessment of the sanctions not having a bite against

Saddam Hussein and those who are in military control in Iraq.

Those members of the House and those Canadians who have taken the time to read UN resolutions 660 to 674 know that the intention of the UN and of the Security Council was, through a variety of measures and resolutions, to make the sanctions against Iraq increasingly airtight, to make sure that all kinds of commodities that could get in or get our of Iraq were being controlled by the international community. Is the minister suggesting that it is the view of the committee of the United Nations that the sanctions are not working or is that the minister's interpretation? Certainly those of us who have taken the time to read the views of international experts on sanctions know that they have said the real bite of sanctions *vis-à-vis* Iraq and its economy, both military and non military, is not expected until some time either early or perhaps well on in 1991. That is where the targeting of the January 15 date does not makes sense in terms of the information made public by international experts who have observed sanctions in many different situations.

• (1720)

Is it the view of the committee of the United Nations that the sanctions are not working, or is that the interpretation that the minister and perhaps her government are giving to the matter of sanctions?

**Mrs. Collins:** I thank my colleague for his question.

I think sanctions apply differently in different situations. Obviously the time frame can vary. I think in South Africa it was a very different kind of situation than we are facing here in Iraq and that one cannot necessarily compare as some people have tried to do from some of the information I have seen. As I understand it, not only is it this government's view, similar kinds of concerns have been expressed by the committee which is involved in review and has that responsibility at the UN.

While I think the blockade from my understanding is working well, there may be possibilities of things coming in and out in other areas. We recognize it has not had the impact on deterring or changing Saddam Hussein and those others who are involved in making that decision. That ultimately is what has to happen. That is what this is all about. We cannot simply step back and take the attitude that it is okay and we will just wait. There has to be continuous pressure put on Iraq and Saddam Hussein so that he knows all the time that the international community is watching carefully and will not tolerate this, and that increasing pressure of turning the vice on him is what hopefully will bring him and others in Iraq to their senses.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions and comments are now terminated.

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank you for recognizing me, but before we continue debate on this very important motion, pursuant to Standing Order 26(1) I would like to move:

> That the House continue to sit beyond the ordinary hour of daily adjournment for the purpose of consideration of government business No. 24.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The House has heard the terms of the motion moved by the government House leader. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker:** According to the provisions of Standing Order 26(1)(6), if 15 members rise in their places to object the motion is defeated. Shall the motion carry?

*And fewer than 15 members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker:** There not being 15 members rising in objection to the motion, according to the provisions of Standing Order 26(1)(6), the motion is deemed to be carried.

Motion agreed to.

**Mrs. Stewart:** At the beginning of this debate I would like to outline some of the points that were mentioned in the last debate that we had in this House on this issue.

First, I think it is extremely important to say in this House that I, and all members of the Liberal Party, condemn outright the actions of Saddam Hussein in his invasion of Kuwait in August of this year. However, we continue to be appalled by his subsequent actions taken in that area of the world.

We heard reports yesterday in the United Nations and from other sources of atrocities that have been perpetrated against Kuwaitis. This should not come as any great surprise to us because we have known for years of

the horrible human rights abuses that this man has perpetrated against his own citizens in his own country.

We have been aware of the fact that this man used chemical weapons against his own population in the past. We should not be surprised that subsequent to his actions taken in August of this year that he has continued to abuse the people not only of Iraq but of Kuwait as well. I think it is important to make that statement.

I also think it is important to clarify here in the House that we do support current UN resolutions taken with regard to the Middle East crisis which endorse the use of sanctions against Iraq, and demand the withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait.

As well, I think it is extremely important to say here at the outset of debate that we totally support the United Nations as an institution, in particular as outlined by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. We support the founding principle of the United Nations, which is the prevention of war. We want to see this continue to be the major binding principle of the United Nations.

However, if we provide such total support to the United Nations as an institution, it is important that we be very vigilant about the instruments which the UN puts in place. We support the UN resolutions that have been approved to date with regard to Iraq, but we do not, on this side of the House approve of the draft resolution that is proposed to come before the Security Council tomorrow at the United Nations.

As well as not being able to support at this time such a UN resolution which will endorse the use of force in the Middle East, we cannot support the government's Motion No. 24, the resolution which we have before us in the House today. One of our major problems with the government's resolution today is that thereby we are giving a blank cheque to this government to carry out in our name, members of the House of Commons, in the name of all Canadians, whatever action this government deems responsible and appropriate. We cannot agree with giving that power to this government.

However, it is important to add what do we support, and to say that indeed we do support the motion that is on the floor of the House today, as amended by the Hon. House Leader and seconded by myself. Perhaps to clarify again, I will read what that amended motion says we do support.

It reads:

> That this House, noting that the Government of Iraq has not complied with the United Nations Security Council resolutions concerning the invasion of Kuwait and the detention of third country nationals, supports the United Nations in its current efforts to ensure compliance with Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions adopted as of 28 November 1990, and that this support shall not be interpreted as approval of the use of Canadian Forces for offensive action without further consultation with and approval by this House.

If it is not possible for this House to approve the amended motion, the Liberal Party will be unable to support the resolution of the government.

• (1730)

Before dealing with some other points, I would like to address in particular the comments made in the speech today by the right hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs. I would also like to draw attention made this day by the Prime Minister. As I understand it, he was saying today that he felt any nation that did not support a UN resolution—and the UN resolution he had in mind was the resolution proposed for tomorrow at the United Nations—should be condemned. Yet, in the past two weeks we have heard the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs say that this government was prepared to use force in the gulf with or without UN resolutions.

I feel there is quite a discrepancy between the Prime Minister's comments this morning with regard to the Middle East crisis and what we have heard from the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs in past weeks. It appears that the Prime Minister is prepared to support whatever policy supports his position at the time. It also seems obvious that this government wants to use force in the gulf. That is why we have on the floor today the motion from the government which we cannot support.

I go on to speak to some of the comments made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. He commented that the actions of Saddam Hussein were a terrible breach of faith to the United Nations. It is illegal and abhorrent internationally for any nation to invade and occupy the territory of another nation. He talked of the evil of Saddam Hussein, the fact that he has not only the

capability to use chemical and biological weapons in war, but the fact that indeed he has used chemical weapons against his own population.

Is it not that we sometimes prefer to forget or not look at human rights records, in this case the human rights records of Saddam Hussein which we have ignored?

The Secretary of State for External Affairs stated that there was a steady flood of conventional arms into the Middle East, and particularly into Iraq. I would say that prior to the particular crisis we address today we as a country were involved in assisting the steady flow of conventional arms into Iraq, despite all the comments made and written by Amnesty International about the horrible human rights abuses perpetrated by Saddam Hussein.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs explained that all peaceful means have been explored and that we have done everything, but we still arrive at where we are today. He said that he hopes sanctions will help to convince Saddam Hussein but, to quote the Secretary of State for External Affairs, "sanctions in and of themselves are not sufficient".

One of the most important questions on the floor today is: What are the criteria by which the Secretary of State for External Affairs can make such a statement? The fact is that despite questions no material has been provided by the government with regard to sanctions.

Twice this week I have put questions to the House asking that the government provide us with information concerning the effectiveness of sanctions, so that we could be involved today in a full and informed debate on what is happening at the United Nations. In response to my question on Monday, the Minister for International Trade stated with respect to the gulf situation generally:

> —I am quite sure that the Secretary of State for External Affairs is quite prepared to make available to the House, or to the Standing Committee on External Affairs, the full information on how effective the sanctions policy appears to be.

Yesterday a question was put to the Prime Minister in which I asked him to fulfil the promise made in the House and to table information. The Prime Minister said that he would see what information was available. He also said:

> —but I will ask to see what information is available that might be relevant.

Despite persistent calls subsequent to Question Period yesterday, no information whatsoever has been provided to the House to tell us what the government's impressions are and what the experience has been in the application of sanctions and how effective they have been.

The hon. House leader explained that there is international evidence that sanctions are working. In addition to what has been quoted already as material indicating that sanctions are working, it seems to me that it would be important, before decisions are made about Canada's stand tomorrow at the Security Council on the proposed draft UN resolution, to listen to the evidence from our parliamentary delegation which is currently returning from Baghdad. Through telephone conversations with them while they have been in Baghdad, we have statements which suggest from their view that sanctions are having an effect.

Yesterday, in testimony before the Senate armed services committee in the United States, James Schlesinger said that he believed sanctions were having an impact. Also he said: "A year to me seems to be in the right ball park". That was his comment in response to questions from the committee. He went on to say that the economy in Iraq would be in severe difficulty in 10 months' to a year's time, but that it may take somewhat longer for those difficulties to lead Iraqi President Saddam Hussein to change his mind and withdraw from Kuwait.

It is important to understand, no matter what the costs of imposing sanctions by UN resolution at this time, that the cost of maintaining the embargo against Iraq is much less than would ever be the cost of becoming involved in a war in the Middle East.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs went on to say that Canada would participate tomorrow in debate in the Security Council on the draft UN resolution which, in his words, would authorize use of whatever means necessary to remove Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. In support of Canada's supporting this UN resolution, he commented that international order was at stake.

On what basis do we feel or what evidence do we have to guarantee that using force in the Middle East at this

time to roust Saddam Hussein from Kuwait will bring about peace, maintain or improve international order?

The Secretary of State for External Affairs went on to say with regard to sanctions that many believed a peaceful solution was impossible, whatever their desire. Yet, again I say, we do not have enough evidence from this government upon which we can base such a statement. He also said whether or not the UN resolution will mean using force was entirely up to Saddam Hussein.

• (1740)

In describing the draft UN resolution which is to come before the Security Council tomorrow, he made a very curious statement. He talked about what he called the built-in constructive proposal which we see, in other words, as a deadline. I found it personally amusing to hear the Secretary of State for External Affairs comment that the Prime Minister interprets deadline as a pause of goodwill and that a pause of goodwill cannot be misconstrued as a deadline. It is important for the Prime Minister to make this fine distinction because our Secretary of State for External Affairs is on record for believing that a deadline, in his view, is artificial and should not be used. Now, instead of talking about a deadline, we talk about a pause of goodwill. To my mind, in reading the UN resolution, by any other word that means deadline.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs went on to talk about the post war situation *vis-à-vis* Iraq and about what accommodations could be made. It sounded so unrealistic, as if a war in the Middle East would be a very clean, neat operation. I reiterate that it is important for people to understand that a war in the Middle East will have enormous costs in terms of human life, if nothing else.

Saddam Hussein is somebody who has been known from past experience to use the weapons at hand that he has. There is no reason to believe that he would not use those weapons again. The weapons in hand would have a tremendously devastating effect, not just on Iraq and Kuwait but on the whole region. However, the loss of life will be beyond reckoning anything that we could condone or support, certainly at this time.

There were a few encouraging notes from the Secretary of State for External Affairs—and I hope it is so—in his comments wherein he said that this crisis had given us a new sense of urgency to deal with other Middle East problems. If this is so, we welcome it. I personally feel that the addressing of other Middle East problems is long past due.

Also he said that there must be elements of a peaceful resolution of this conflict. I think all of us would like to see a peaceful resolution of this conflict. I believe that at this time it is possible to do so in a peaceful way and not to have to use force through supporting the draft UN resolution which will come before the Security Council of the United Nations tomorrow.

I know that my time is nearly up. As a final point I just wish to say that the Liberal Party on this side of the House for which I speak cannot approve of the blank cheque the government has presented to us today with regard to the situation in the Middle East. We can support an amended resolution and hope that the government would agree with it.

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with care to the speech of the hon. member. She began by saying that the Liberal Party condemns Saddam Hussein for what he has done. I am not sure he will toss and turn in his bed at night worrying about our condemnation, if that is all we do.

**Mr. Allmand:** Sanctions too.

**Mr. Friesen:** Sanctions too, yes. She went on to say that the UN was created to stop war. Nobody would deny that, but I wonder why she stopped there. Let me read the first article of the UN charter:

> The Purposes of the United Nations are:
>
> 1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.
>
> 2. To develop friendly relations—

And so on. I think she may have read this herself at some time. It continues:

> 3. To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

4. To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

I wonder why the hon. member stopped only at the fact that it was created to stop war.

In responding to the Secretary of State for External Affairs' address, she went on to say that there has been a flow of arms to Iraq, and I hope I quote her accurately, and that Canada was wrong in assisting in the steady flow of conventional arms to Saddam Hussein.

In light of the fact that Canada has very strong legislation proscribing the flow of arms to countries such as Iraq, I wonder if she could give us evidence to support her claim that we assisted in the flow of arms to Saddam Hussein?

**Mrs. Stewart:** Mr. Speaker, I would begin by answering the hon. member's first comments about the UN Charter. There is nothing in the Charter that the member read here in the House with which I would disagree. I support that totally. It is how we institute and bring about those principles that is important.

In the United Nations itself we have all been so pleased with the universal adoption of UN resolutions imposing sanctions against Iraq and the participation of so many countries from all areas around the world in trying to make sure that those sanctions bite.

At the time that those resolutions were put in place, the thought was that through this peaceful means we would be able to get and convince Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait. There is evidence internationally today that those sanctions are beginning to bite. They are beginning to work. The problem is that we have not had provided to us, as requested, any information from this government which would lead us to believe that those sanctions are not being effective.

We listened to experts world-wide who are saying that it requires more time for those sanctions to be effective. If we can provide for those sanctions to be effective, we will have achieved our goal of driving Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait in a peaceful manner. That surely is our objective. We should be doing everything we can, in keeping with the principles of the United Nations, to work in a peaceful way for peace and security in our world.

With regard to the flow of arms into Iraq and the implication of Canada being involved with that, it is well known that the disclosure procedures and records of the government are inadequate. There have been constant and repeated requests for improved recording of Canada's trading in arms world-wide.

Canada is very involved in the production of parts of armaments that do not necessarily go directly to the end user of those parts. We need better records and a better method of disclosing publicly how arms flow around the world. There certainly have been strong allegations to the effect that indeed Canadian production has been implicated and that arms with Canadian parts at least have found their final residence in Iraq. We want to see measures taken by the government to prevent that occurrence in the future.

• (1750)

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** First, I want to thank my colleague for her address. I found it most useful and helpful. I appreciate that she has put forward our party's position. I am going to make a comment, but with a series of questions that have been raised by my constituents. My colleague may choose to answer any one of them, or perhaps none at all, depending upon the time.

The constituents have called about a series of three concepts. The first is why the government did not consult Parliament before committing troops to the Gulf. There is a real concern that, whenever there is a possibility of major conflict, that should be discussed openly in the House of Commons.

The second question relates to the debate today. Why will the government not accept to wait for UN authorization before considering armed conflict, unless attacked of course? There is a real concern there that we ought to be going forward only with the UN resolution.

There is a concern, I believe, in further discussions, that this motion is really quite vague. I do not say that in a partisan or unkind way. Perhaps it is a blank cheque. The government is looking for a lot of flexibility and manoeuvrability and where will this lead?

Concerns are also related to casualties. For example, there is the whole question of what are the expected casualties if we were to go to war. That is a very important question that has not been addressed. When I

tried to raise it on the *Order Paper*, it was ruled inadmissible.

What is the expected cost of hostilities for a day, a week, or a month? I am informed that if we were to go to war, the total costs of a 10-day conflict—and that would be a short conflict, I suspect—would equal the total cost of the United States conflict in Vietnam for one year, ten days equal one year. Those are astronomical sums.

Why the January 15 deadline? It seems quite artificial. Of course, related to that is: Have we really had the time to know whether or not the sanctions have worked?

Why is Canada, so rich in energy resources, still dependent on foreign oil? This is a major concern of Canadians. What is the government doing to control the price of fuel, including gas for Canadians? Will there be shortages? That is the second series of questions.

[*Translation*]

Finally, Mr. Speaker, where does the government find the money to send three ships, a squadron of F-18s and the necessary troups to the Persian Gulf when it is unable to adequatly help at least 5 million Canadians who are poor? Among those poor are senior citizens, a majority of women and more than one million children.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member has a minute to wind up.

**Mrs. Stewart:** Mr. Speaker, with respect to the number of casualties that will be envisaged, there are discrepancies in numbers, but one of the numbers that is bandied about is 65,000 dead if war were to break out in the Gulf at this time.

In terms of other costs—the costs of lives is no doubt the greatest cost that we are concerned about—we can be assured that the cost of war will be far beyond any cost of maintaining sanctions at this time.

I have just a final comment with regard to the UN resolution itself that we cannot support at this time. We feel it is premature. We believe that sanctions can work and the wording of it is very vague in what it authorizes, "that member states use all necessary means to uphold and implement Security Council resolutions and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area".

Any of the western allied countries could take action under this resolution. That includes Syria.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Marie Gibeau (Bourassa):** On August 2nd last, Mr. Speaker, Iraq launched an unprovoked attack against Kuwait, a small neighbouring state, which, to defend itself, sought the assistance of the international community, as it was authorized to do under the United Nations Charter.

Concerned that the Iraqi forces would go beyond the Kuwaiti borders, Saudi Arabia also asked for international assistance to check the Iraqi threat. The United States and a group of other countries from Europe, the near East, Asia, as well as Africa, responded by dispatching forces to Saudi Arabia.

On the basis of a strong international consensus never achieved before, the Security Council quickly condemned Iraq and ordered it to leave Kuwait immediately. It is clear today that the decision of the Security Council has the support of almost all nations.

**Mr. Lapierre:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The Hon. Member for Shefford rises on a point of order.

**Mr. Lapierre:** Mr. Speaker, while thousands of Canadian soldiers are probably risking their lives, there is not even quorum in the House. If I may, Mr. Speaker, I should like you to check whether or not there is a quorum. Because of the tremendous importance of this debate, I suggest it would be worthwhile.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member asks if there is a quorum.

*And the count having been taken:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** There are 20. There are enough people for a quorum.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Gibeau:** So, Mr. Speaker, I continue.

It it therefore clear today that the decision of the Security Council has the support of almost all nations.

Ever since its first resolution, the Security Council has constantly reaffirmed its will to force Iraq to leave Kuwait. This will was reaffirmed in a number of other resolutions whose purpose was to give force and effect to the initial decision. Clearly, the world community speaks as one when it asks Iraq to fully respect the decision of the Security Council.

The impact of the Iraqi invasion extends far beyond Kuwait's borders. Saddam Hussein has caught in a trap thousands of third country nationals and created long lines of refugees. For weeks on end, we could watch on television Egyptians, Sri Lankans, Pakistanis, Filipinos and many more leaving Kuwait. We especially witnessed the suffering inflicted by the Iraqi invader upon these people who, having lost their jobs, houses, possessions and savings, were forced to return to their respective homelands to face an uncertain and precarious future, even darker days.

To these human tragedies was added, for all the countries involved, an economic and social burden which they can hardly carry. Most of the refugees had in fact come from developing countries already grappling with poverty and a lack of resources. The return of these refugees adds to the hardships already suffered by these economically weak nations.

Fortunately, the community of nations was quick to respond to the refugee problem. As a matter of fact, Canada was one of the first nations to financially contribute to the patriation operation. Later on, our Prime Minister announced that for humanitarian purposes, an additional $75 million would be provided to the countries most affected by this influx of refugees.

However, the Iraqi aggression made other innocent victims among other third party nationals whose situation in a way is far worse than that of the refugees. Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the hundreds of people, including Canadians, who are forbidden by the Iraqi authorities to leave either Iraq or Kuwait. These people, who had done nothing to deserve such a treatment, are detained against their will by the Iraqi authorities.

These human beings are nothing but pawns in Saddam Hussein's hands. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the hostages may be free to travel anywhere in Iraqi territory but they cannot leave and are thus used as human shields. Some of them—not Canadians—are held in strategic sites and this is an obvious attempt to discourage any attack against these military facilities. The international community has strongly condemned Iraq's use of hostages and the Security Council has asked that these people be released immediately.

• (1800)

**Mr. Lapierre:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member for Shefford on a point of order.

**Mr. Lapierre:** Mr. Speaker, I have been listening closely to the remarks read by the hon. member and I seek your guidance. Is there a Standing Order to the effect that a member must make a heart-felt contribution to the debate on the basis of personal knowledge rather than be content with reading a text which has obviously been prepared by others? Would you enlighten me on that rule?

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** In this House we do have an opportunity for a person to reflect on notes used in debate and we have done this continuously. I think I recall that the hon. member at one time had an opportunity to do that too. The hon. member for Bourassa has the floor on debate.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Gibeau:** Mr. Speaker, all the more so since my heart was so moved that I would have been hard-pressed to say everything I want to say within the time allocated to me. So I will continue to read my notes. Thank you very much, dear colleague.

Iraqi officials recently announced that they would free all hostages between Christmas and March 1991. If they can free them then, why can they not do so now?

In fact there should never have been any hostages. Iraq will have to own up to this despicable gesture and admit that the Security Council made a wise decision when asking that the hostages be released unconditionally and forthwith. Iraq's stubborness in not coming to its senses makes the injustice of its attack against Kuwait still more flagrant.

The United Nations organization was set up at the end of World War II to protect the international community against acts of aggression and to maintain peace and stability in the world. Canada is one of the UN founding

members and its support for the organization has always been strong.

Mr. Speaker, I see that my heart-felt remarks are driving out of the House our colleague who was so upset earlier because we did not have a quorum.

Lester B. Pearson was the driving force behind the peacekeeping efforts to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the preservation of world peace and security. But it is not always good enough to intervene after the dissenting parties have found a compromise which calls for supervision. What happens when one of the protagonist is too weak to defeat the invading forces? Obviously that is a case where there is a need for United Nations protection.

If somebody attacks your neighbour, takes over his house and holds captive a visitor who happened to be there, you will immediately conclude that the neighbourhood is no longer safe and you will undoubtedly want to correct the situation. Canadians have always been the champions of the rights of others, not only because they support justice but also because they have utmost respect for the principle that breaching the rights of a person is tantamount to attacking and threatening those of others.

Law and order are essential to the well-being and peace of a community and its neighbours. And so it goes for each nation and for the international community as a whole. The United Nations is an organization which is essential to protect the international community.

Were we to remain passive or at best indifferent if a country invaded its neighbour, particularly a weaker neighbour, we would undermine the very foundation of international justice, to the detriment of all. Were we to make one exception on the pretense that the country invaded is thousands of kilometres away or that it does not deserve our consideration, we would be throwing our doors wide open to anarchy.

In the early years the United Nations was never able to exercise full influence. The cold war divided the world and thwarted the efforts of the United Nations, yet in spite of that—perhaps more by chance than as a result of enlightened management—it did successfully intervene in Korea.

We now have an opportunity to call upon the U.N. to play the role for which it was created, and that is make the world safer for all countries—large or small, strong or weak, rich or poor. This action—the will to object to undue use of force—involves a risk, with all the consequences and costs that go along with it. If we fail, as has happened in the past, the potential danger and the price to be paid will be even greater.

The United Nations reacted quite properly to the Iraqi act of aggression. Canada was involved at the Security Council level and has tried to maintain the remarkable consensus of all those who wish to see Iraq abide by the decisions of the Council.

It has been several months since the Iraqi invasion, and many official representatives of various countries, including Canada, have sought ways to make Iraq see reason. However, Iraq remains unmoved and the hostages are still being held.

So far, the UN has proved its mettle but has failed to reach its objective. Even the vigorous application of global sanctions decreed by the United Nations and the presence of a multinational force on its doorstep have failed to persuade Iraq to change its course.

We do not want to go to war against Iraq. We merely want it to abide by UN decisions that have received universal support. Mr. Speaker, anyone who took Latin in high school is familiar with descriptions of Roman military strategy, which included a basic principle expressed as follows: *Si vis pacem, para bellum*, which means: If you want peace, prepare for war. That is more or less what is happening today. In its actions and decisions, the UN has always tried to avoid provoking hostilities, but at the same time, Iraq should be well aware of the firm resolve of all who support the United Nations in this crisis.

The UN is a highly valued institution which Canada holds in high esteem. If we fail the UN now, it will be at the peril of the global village to which we all belong. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that in the final instances, the House will support the motion before it today.

[*English*]

**Mr. Gilbert Parent (Welland—St. Catharines—Thorold):** Mr. Speaker, I want to make a short comment on what the former speaker was mentioning and to pose a question to her, if she would accept it.

The hon. member said: "If you want peace, you should prepare for war". There is another truism that we must face and it is that there are very few nations in the history of man who have prepared for war and readied their weapons who have not actually used them. As a matter of fact, in the history of man, there have not been any weapons developed that have not been used in war. It would seem to me that it is always better to dialogue, to speak, than it is to take lives.

We, who are in this Chamber, make the decision to send our young women and men into combat. It is important that we exhaust all other avenues before we even contemplate taking that decision. I am of the opinion that it is better for us to negotiate for as long as we can. No, not from our knees, Mr. Speaker, but from a position of strength, that is to say the strength that comes from knowing that what we are doing is right. We must negotiate from a position, also, of knowing that by speaking now, we may avert war. We know that war, if it does come, is going to finish some time. Once again, we must go back to the table and speak, either with our defeated enemies or at least our wounded enemies.

The hon. member mentioned Kuwait, which is the country Iraq attacked. I wonder if my hon. colleague would address herself to the fact that Kuwait, after all, is not a democracy as we know it. My understanding is that the rulers of Kuwait leave a great deal to be desired in the field of human rights. I would like the hon. member to give us her opinion as to why, exactly, we are going to fight there. If it is to free the Kuwaitis, what are we going to replace it with or is it a fact, very simply, that we are fighting for oil rather than principles?

• (1810)

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Marie Gibeau (Bourassa):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for his questions. I may remind him of the Latin saying: "If you want peace, prepare for war". I did not say wage war.

There are two comments I would like to make. First of all, I would like to remind hon. members that our government is not, to use the English expression, trigger happy. This summer we had the so-called native crisis. There might have been casualties, but for the exceptional restraint and dignity of our military forces in the face of all kinds of provocation. I think that what happened this summer, considering that it was very close to home and very violent, offers ample proof of the fact that our Canadian forces and our government are not trigger happy.

My second comment, Mr. Speaker, is that last week I had the privilege of being in Rome and discussing this matter with Italian parliamentarians who had been talking to some of their counterparts from other European countries. During those discussions, I had the distinct impression that Canada, through our Secretary of State and our Prime Minister, helped to moderate the urges and sentiments of certain other countries that were eager to start a war immediately, a war they felt could be over very quickly.

I also had the distinct impression that our leaders were determined to make use of all diplomatic resources, all peace mechanisms, negotiations and discussions. As you mentioned earlier, it was certainly not a matter of rushing in and acting like medieval knights on a quest, entirely oblivious of what was involved, not just at the geopolitical level, but also as far as the lives of our Canadians were concerned. I am going to say something terrible, but I am sure that the first Canadian corpse to come back would be a nightmare for each and everyone of us.

**Mr. Duceppe:** We do not have a quorum, Mr. Speaker!

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Just a minute, let us see.

*And the count having been taken:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Yes, there is a quorum. Where did the hon. member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie go?

**Mr. Gauthier:** He disappears.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member for Bourassa has the floor.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Gibeau:** Mr. Speaker, I think a comment is in order. I deplore the fact that members of one of the parties in this House should find it necessary to indulge in such childish stratagems while we are discussing this dramatic situation. I find it very upsetting that junior members of this House should show an utter lack of respect for the House during a debate of this kind.

I will answer the hon. member's question. I shall proceed, Mr. Speaker, because his comment was quite sensible. Mr. Speaker, the last part of the hon. member's question was about what we were going to defend in Kuwait, which did not necessarily have a spotless record on human rights. I think it should be pointed out that we are not going to defend a political system but a principle that says a nation is sovereign and that other nations have no right to attack or violate the territory of a sovereign state.

That is why Canada went to the Persian Gulf. What Canada is asking now, through the motion tabled by the government in the House today, is that the principle of a country's sovereignty is respected.

[*English*]

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence):** Mr. Speaker, I do have a comment or two to make to the hon. member since she brought up the precept that if you want peace you have to prepare for war or at least be prepared to go to war. It seems that we are preparing to go to war.

The Canadian forces sent into the Persian Gulf were initially there to perform picket duty outside the zone and ensure that sanctions would be effective. In that regard, our members have already indicated that there is an element of effectiveness that the government is refusing to acknowledge, elaborate on, or at least refusing to take into consideration when it is discussing what step we must take next.

The government has already authorized our forces to move into a very active role of intercepting within the military zone and participating very actively in offensive American military manoeuvres that, unlike UN manoeuvres, are not sanctioned by our Parliament.

If we are to prepare for peace, we should not only prepare for war, which is what the member has suggested that we must do. The associate minister for defence took pains to demonstrate in a very detailed fashion that we are represented by Armed Forces that are second to none in quality. That is not the issue that this House should be considering. The question of the quality of our troops, the quality and commitment of our personnel in the Persian Gulf is not at issue.

Let no one for one moment suggest that to question the government's policies in the Persian Gulf is in any way questioning the commitment and the quality of our men and women stationed there. It is absolutely irresponsible of the government to do that. It is very important that no member of the House on the other side be allowed to raise that issue again. What is at issue is whether the government really believes the commitment which it says it is addressing. That is the one of peace.

If we are going to be preparing ourselves for a new international order, which this member suggests and the associate minister for defence says we are doing, are we making plans for the peace that must follow the end of this crisis? What steps is the member from the government side willing to divulge to this House as part of the government's plan to prepare for the re-orientation of the military, economic, and political realities of the Persian Gulf which it sees as being so very important as to require the deployment of military activities—I am just about finished, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** There is only going to be a minute left for her to answer.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Marie Gibeau (Bourassa):** I thank my colleague for his question, Mr. Speaker. This is the place to express our views. I would like to come back to the subject of the sanctions. They are probably beginning to work, as they were intended to by the members of the international community participating on the blockade, and that is precisely why it is working.

The problem is that we must remember that, while this is going on and starting to work, a territory is being violated, people are detained as hostages and crimes are being committed on some territories. Someone mentioned human rights earlier. You probably noticed—you must be following the events on TV—that some people's physical integrity is certainly not respected, nor their intellectual, political, or other rights.

Nothing proves for the time being that the sanctions will work. There is no way of knowing when Saddam Hussein will give in, but since he is not known for his logical and coherent actions, we have to make alternate plans. That is precisely what the international community is doing.

Its ultimate goal: peace, a peaceful resolution in the form of Iraq getting out of Kuwait. That is their goal. That is why the international community will make a decision tomorrow through the United Nations Security

Council. I therefore urge my colleague to support the motion.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions and comments are now over. On debate, the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce.

[*English*]

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party, as pointed out by my leader earlier this afternoon, cannot support this Conservative government motion, Motion No. 24, because it asks for a blank cheque to approve subsequent UN resolutions that we have not seen. We cannot do that, Mr. Speaker. It is too open-ended. It is too vague. The government is asking for *carte blanche* and, as I say, a blank cheque to approve subsequent resolutions of the United Nations that we have not had an opportunity to examine and do not know the content of. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, we do not support this motion as it stands and have suggested an amendment. We do support the first part of the resolution which asks that we support the United Nations in its efforts to ensure compliance with Security Council resolution 660. Then it says "and subsequent resolutions".

• (1820)

We are proposing an amendment which would say that we support the efforts of the United Nations to ensure compliance with Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions until this day because we know what the subsequent resolutions are until this day, but we do not support any resolutions that might be submitted tomorrow or thereafter until we examine them.

Does it mean that we are against the United Nations because we will not support a vague, open-ended resolution as the government submits to us today? No, it does not. We in this party are strong supporters of the United Nations. We are the party of Lester Pearson, a man who won the Nobel Prize for his innovative proposals for peacekeeping at the United Nations. We have long been a supporter of the United Nations and we remain a strong supporter, but we do not accept this proposal put to the House today by the government nor, Mr. Speaker, do we support the draft resolution to be put to the Security Council tomorrow.

I will comment more on that in a minute. Just because that resolution might win support by those governments which are on the Security Council at the present time does not mean that we would necessarily support it. We do not, and I will explain that in a minute.

I want to make very clear to this House and the Canadian public that we voted for the government's resolution, as amended, on October 19. In that resolution we in the Liberal Party joined with other political parties in this House condemning the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq and asking for the immediate withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait. We also approved in that resolution the imposition of economic sanctions against Iraq as a result of that invasion and also the military support of those economic sanctions.

We have so far supported the government in its initiatives except, I might say, the fact that it sent those troops to the Middle East in the first place without the support of Parliament and sent them at the request of the United States and not the United Nations.

After the UN intervened, we have been on side with the government so far in this matter, and with the United Nations.

I say we cannot support this resolution or the draft resolution to be submitted to the United Nations tomorrow. At least we cannot support it in the form in which it was distributed to us today. Let me refer to the key paragraph in that resolution. This is the one to be presented to the Security Council tomorrow. It asks that the Security Council authorize its member states to use all necessary means to uphold and implement Security Council resolution 660 and all subsequent resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area.

Let us examine that. This resolution does not ask for the authorization for the United Nations to use all necessary means. It asks for authorization for member states to use all necessary means to implement Security Council resolution 660. This means they are asking for the United Nations Security Council to authorize Syria, Egypt, the United States, individually as member states, to use themselves all necessary means to uphold and implement the Security Council resolution 660.

It goes on not only to uphold and implement resolution 660, but to restore international peace and security in the area. What is meant by "the area"? How broad is that to be interpreted? Does it mean all of the Middle East? Does it mean just the Arabian Peninsula? Is it just the Persian Gulf?

Does "This resolution is to be presented to the United Nations" mean that we are giving authority to states such as Syria to use all means necessary to restore peace and security to the region? What are the implications of that?

I first of all criticize the resolution to be presented tomorrow for its wording, which I think is very loose and, in many respects, says things that none of us would want to support.

This is the main reason for not supporting it. We think it is premature. It is too soon to authorize member states to use all means necessary, which means military force at this point. It is premature because the economic sanctions were only authorized a little over three months ago. They have not been given enough time to bite.

For years we have been supporting economic sanctions against South Africa, for example. No one suggested after one, two, or three years that we should give up on the economic sanctions and send our troops into South Africa. No. We believed in economic sanctions, and we pushed hard with them. We improved them. We tightened them over the years. We made them more effective.

A little more than three months is not enough to test the efficiency of the economic sanctions against Iraq. In the testimony that has been presented to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and Foreign Trade, all the experts said that we must expect to wait at least six months to a year for those sanctions to bite hard and to have some effect.

Those people who are watching closely feel that they are beginning to take effect, but they will not have the full force of their effectiveness for some time yet.

I point out again that it is premature to suggest that we authorize all means necessary, that is outright war, to accomplish our purposes at this stage.

Economic sanctions are not the only measure that is being used in trying to achieve a peaceful settlement to this dispute. We are also using, and the government has pointed this out very often, diplomatic initiatives. As a matter of fact, if some of these diplomatic initiatives were taken more seriously, they could lead to a peaceful settlement, because there have been compromises suggested on both sides that could form the basis of discussion that might bring about peace if the two sides were not so inflexible.

Another major difficulty with the use of military force at this time is the double standard in doing so.

If we look at this attempt to use military force against Iraq, in other words to drive Iraq out of Kuwait at this time, and compare this initiative with what we have done in other similar examples around the world in recent years and which still exist today, we will see that there is a great deal of inconsistency and hypocrisy.

There are many examples where today sovereign territories and countries occupied by the armies of other states has been condemned by the United Nations, but where there have been no sanctions and no military action taken against the aggressor. I refer to the U.S. invasion of Panama about a year ago.

If you look at that case, Mr. Speaker, it really gives rise to some of the suspicion of hypocrisy and so on in this case. At that time there was a motion put to the Security Council on December 23, 1989, to condemn the United States for its unilateral military action in Panama, asking it to withdraw and respect international law.

What did the United States do at that time? They vetoed the resolution. The very sort of resolution that they want us to support today, at this early stage before the sanctions have been given a chance to work, they themselves vetoed before the United Nations Security Council on December 23, 1989.

• (1830)

I want to point out, talking about respect for United Nations resolutions, on December 29 the General Assembly did pass a resolution condemning the United States for its unilateral military invasion of Panama and asked them to withdraw and to respect international law. The United States paid no attention to it.

We also have the examples of the Soviet Union invasion into Afghanistan a few years ago—there were no sanctions, no attempt to use chapter 7 of the UN charter—the U.S. invasion of Grenada, the Chinese takeover in Tibet, and the present deplorable Indonesian

occupation of East Timor. Where is all the self-righteousness in the world with respect to that? Here we have a country like Indonesia invading and occupying East Timor, with some pretty terrible human rights violations. Where is the consistency in principle? We also have the invasion of Lebanon by both Syria and Israel at different times in 1982. The same approach was not applied at that time.

To give other examples, we have the attempt by Morocco to occupy the western Sahara. We have the example years ago of Turkey occupying the northern part of Cyprus, and it still occupies the northern part of Cyprus. We have the examples of the U.S. complicity with respect to the overthrow of the Government of Nicaragua, the funding of the Contras, and the mining of Nicaraguan harbours contrary to UN resolutions and contrary to a decision of the World Court.

Today we hear the brave statements from the President of the United States about respect for international law, respect for the United Nations, and respect for the World Court. Where were they a few years ago when confronted with these decisions of the World Court and the resolutions of the United Nations?

When we are considering what is being attempted tomorrow in the United Nations, one must also understand the suspicion with which many nations of the world look on this attempt by the major powers at this time to do things that they did not accept themselves, whether the Soviet Union, the United States, or other countries, when they were in similar positions, when they unilaterally occupied and invaded territories which were not their own.

We are totally in favour of a new order at the United Nations where there would be no acceptance of unilateral offensive military action, where all grievances against other states would be dealt with through the United Nations, the World Court and other international bodies, and the use of UN military action against aggressors as suggested in the resolution with respect to Iraq to be presented tomorrow. We would accept that as a new world order if it was to be consistent and universal.

Would the countries that are putting forward the resolution tomorrow at the UN be willing to amend that draft resolution to adopt a universal policy against all aggression, and not simply this aggression of Iraq against Kuwait? Would they be willing to apply the principles that they are putting forward with respect to Iraq? Would they be willing to put those into operation against all cases of occupation of foreign territory which are presently existing in the world today? Would they make it apply to cases which might come up in the near future? In other words, would the major powers renounce all unilateral aggression on their own part and accept the same sanctions that they want to impose against Iraq?

If we were to cast ourselves back to a year ago, would the United States agree now with respect to Panama to the same sort of regime that it is suggesting with respect to Iraq? I might say that Noriega is just as serious an international outlaw as Saddam Hussein. Both of them are not people to be congratulated. They are people to be condemned for their actions internationally.

The question is: Do you deal with the Noriegas and the Husseins of the world by unilateral military action, or do you deal with them through the United Nations? Do you pick and choose according to your own national self-interest when you do that? In other words, you suggest one plan of action through the UN when your oil and energy interests are at stake, but when there are some other interests at stake, you do it another way.

One might ask: Why this double standard? Why this lack of consistency? There is no doubt that it has something to do with energy resources. If we look at statements of the American government over the years, we see that it has always considered the energy resources in the Middle East to be of utmost importance.

In the 1940s the State Department issued a statement that the Arabian Peninsula constituted a stupendous source of strategic power and one of the greatest material prizes in world history. Later President Eisenhower described the Middle East as the most strategically important area in the world. As a result, a driving concern of the United States over the years has been to protect its energy resources in that area.

I want to refer to an excellent article on this whole subject by Noam Chomsky in the October issue of *Z Magazine*. In analysing the whole situation in this article, Mr. Chomsky said the following:

> Also worth discussing would be the striking fact that from Mussolini until today, fascist killers and tyrants are quite acceptable allies as long as they line up on the right side of important matters—such as keeping the world safe for profit—but suddenly become beats who must be exterminated when they reveal a lack of appreciation—for the same doctrine.

In other words, the non-democratic countries, the Chiles, the Philippines, are quite acceptable. You can tolerate them as long as they vote with you at the UN and support you in international affairs, but when they stop doing so, you must take steps to get rid of their dictatorial government. You also try to get rid of those so-called dictatorial governments which do not agree with you at the United Nations whether they are dictatorial or not.

It is interesting to note how strongly the United States supported the same Saddam Hussein and the Government of Iraq only a year ago, a man they now denounce in the strongest terms. Once again referring to Mr. Chomsky's article at page 23 of *Z Magazine*, he said:

> It was also necessary to deal somehow with the fact that prior to Hussein's attack on Kuwait, the Bush administration and its predecessors treated this murderous thug as an amiable friend, encouraging trade with his regime and credits to enable it to purchase U.S. goods. Before that, Washington had supported his invasion of Iran (and perhaps more, we may learn some day), and then "tilted" so far towards Iraq in the Gulf War that military forces were sent to "protect shipping" from Iran—

He pointed to an example of an Atlanta based bank which extended $3 billion in letters of credit to Iraq, $800 million of it guaranteed by the Department of Agriculture.

He went on to point out that the United States became Iraq's largest trading partner just a few years ago. As a matter of fact, from 1982 Iraq became one of the biggest buyers of U.S. rice and wheat, purchasing some $5.5 million in crops and livestock. Also he said:

> According to 1987 data, the latest available, over 40 per cent of Iraq's food was imported from the United States, and in 1989 Iraq received $1 billion in loan assurances, second only to Mexico. The Reagan and Bush administrations scarcely reacted when Iraq purchased U.S. helicopters and transferred them to military use in violation of promises, used poison gas against Iranian troops and its own Kurdish citizens, and relocated half a million Kurds and Syrians by force, among other atrocities.

• (1840)

All this went on just a short time ago, but Mr. Hussein was a friend of the United States. Despite those atrocities they supported him, gave him economic development funding and credits, and so on. One might view with some suspicion the principles involved in this action that is going on at the United Nations.

I will repeat once again that we have supported the resolution before this House condemning the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq. We have asked for the withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait. We have supported the economic sanctions and the military support for those economic sanctions. But we are not going to give the government a blank cheque and we are not giving the United Nations a blank cheque. We want to have input into the United Nations so that it truly does what it was founded to do, which is to preserve peace with the least conflict necessary. That is what we want, and we do not think that the resolution to go to the United Nations tomorrow is acceptable. We do not think the resolution to go to this House is acceptable. We want it amended as we proposed, and then we will support it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Before I go to questions and comments, I believe there is a point of order.

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, you will find there is consent for the following motion:

> That the following provisions, respecting the conduct of business in the House, be made, notwithstanding any order:
>
> (1) That today, Wednesday, November 28, 1990, the House continue to sit, to consider Government Business No. 24 (motion respecting the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq), beyond the normal time of adjournment until 1 o'clock a.m. or until no member rises to speak in debate, whichever occurs first, at which time the debate shall be deemed adjourned and the House shall adjourn; provided that no dilatory motions or quorum calls shall be receivable this day; and
>
> (2) That on Thursday, November 29, 1990, the Speaker shall interrupt Routine Proceedings, if required, at 11.20 o'clock a.m., when the resumed debate will be called on Government Business No. 24, with each of the three recognized parties to have the opportunity for debate as each sees fit, at the conclusion of which time but no later than 12.30 o'clock p.m., the Speaker shall interrupt any proceeding then under way and put forthwith and successively, without further amendment or debate, every question necessary to dispose of the said business and any amendment thereto, with one 15-minute bell to call in the members, if required, following which recorded division the House shall recess until 2 o'clock p.m., when Statements by Members and Oral Questions shall be called in the usual manner until 3 o'clock p.m. when

resumed debate on the report stage of Bill C-40, an act respecting broadcasting and to amend certain acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunication, shall be called and continue until 5 o'clock p.m., when such debate shall be adjourned and Private Members' Business and proceedings on the adjournment shall be called in the usual manner.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Members have heard the terms of the motion. Is it agreed?

Motion agreed to

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I believe the hon. member for Victoria is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, in the same vein, I believe I have unanimous consent to put a further amendment to the motion that is on the floor at this point. The motion would read as follows:

That the motion be further amending by adding the following words:

"and further, that this House oppose the use of force against Iraq until sanctions and other UN measures have had time to succeed and urges the government to seek amendments to the currently proposed Security Council resolution to that effect".

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** On the same point, I must say that this is an exception to the rule. There will be two amendments to the main motion, not a subamendment. It is two amendments to the main motion.

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston):** Mr. Speaker, this particular motion was put earlier and unanimous consent was denied. Now, there ought to be some fair play around here. I understand what is happening, the members of Parliament that did not give their consent to this particular resolution are absent from the House at this point in time. So I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to determine whether it is appropriate to bring forward a motion that it was already dealt with by the House.

I would like to also ask you, sir, whether this would, if adopted by the House unanimously, set a precedent. The NDP are asking that the rules be changed in order to accommodate them. The rules quite clearly state that they would not be in a position today to put an amendment.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond to the hon. member who raises a concern. First, yes, the motion had been put previously but the House can do again by consent whatever it chooses to do. Second, because it is done by consent, it is very clear that it does not establish a precedent or a change in our procedures. They are legitimate questions and I just wanted to speak to those.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The consent is to have two amendments to the main motion.

Questions or comments. I will ask the hon. member for North Island—Powell River for the first question and then go to the hon. member for York South—Weston for the second question or comment.

**Mr. Ray Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** Mr. Speaker, in the member's speech, he alluded to something that agrees with my point of view on this and I wonder if he could confirm it.

This motion before the House will be construed by the government as the authority to deploy the Canadian Armed Forces in the Persian Gulf and engage the Iraqis in active warfare if the United Nations declares that that is going to happen. What we are in fact debating today, in the minds of the Prime Minister and the government, is actually a declaration of war, or the equivalent of a declaration of war.

If the United Nations subsequently authorizes force, Canada has already had its debate on that issue in the mind of the government. The House will go forward. There is much talk about adjournment and we will not come back until March. In all probability, we could have become involved in a major war with Iraq in the Middle East by that time.

Consider the vagueness of the United Nations motion. It is a fact that any member nation can use whatever measures it requires. The scale of this war could be enormous and any measure could mean even the use of nuclear weapons, or theatre nuclear weapons, if the costs on the United Nations or United States side were thought too great. The hon. member's point about the vagueness of the government's position and the vagueness of the United Nations motion were well taken.

Are we, in fact, looking at a declaration of war and will we not get another attempt to debate this? Is the government in fact looking at this as their authority to deploy Canadian troops in a war in Iraq?

**Mr. Allmand:** Mr. Speaker, the resolution that is before this House today asks us not only to support Security Council Resolution 660 and all subsequent resolutions up to this date, but it is asking us to support all subsequent resolutions, including those that may come after this date, including one that will be presented tomorrow to the Security Council.

The government is asking us to support the resolution which will go to the Security Council tomorrow and the draft that I have before me would authorize member states to use all means necessary to implement Security Council Resolution 660 and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area.

Quite clearly, Mr. Speaker, if we were to vote for this government resolution as it stands, we would also be approving the draft resolution to be presented to the Security Council tomorrow which would allow the United States, or any other individual member state of the United Nations, to use all means necessary—I guess it could include nuclear weapons, it is horrible to think about that, but that is what the resolution says; there is no limit on it— to implement the Security Council resolution and all future resolutions, including the restoration of peace and security in the area.

This is virtually giving a *carte blanche* to the government and to the superpowers at the United Nations. It is not acceptable. It could in fact be a declaration of war.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member for York South—Weston, then the hon. member for Athabasca, and the hon. member for Davenport.

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston):** Mr. Speaker, at times I have to pinch myself to determine if what we are doing here in the House of Commons is real, and if this discussion is fully comprehended by the people of Canada.

What we are doing here in the House is debating a resolution that would authorize war, that would authorize the United States and other member states to use whatever means possible to force Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait.

• (1850)

I do not think Canadians have been sufficiently involved in this debate for the House to take this position tomorrow, when the vote is called. I certainly was not elected to support war, or to support the sending of our troops to fight in battle, anywhere in the world. I certainly was not elected to support American foreign policy that could result in the loss of hundreds of thousands of lives. We have to ask ourselves why the United States and other states are asking for this authority to declare war and, in effect, to attack Iraq or Kuwait.

Let us not lose track of what the situation is. We went to war in the First World War and the Second World War for principles and those principles were democracy and freedom. Those values were important to fight for to ensure that people around the world were free.

What is the principle that the government wants us to fight for today? It wants to risk hundreds of thousands of lives, but for what? It is not freedom and democracy. It is aggression. As the hon. member has pointed out in his speech, there are all kinds of inconsistencies, hypocrisy and double-standards when we talk about this very principle of aggression.

Does the hon. member believe that the circumstances that exist in the Middle East justify war, whether it be today, tomorrow, or at any point in time? In other words, does aggression by a state—whether it be Iraq, the United States or the Soviet Union—justify declaring war? That is the question I would like to put to my friend and colleague.

**Mr. Allmand:** Mr. Speaker, I want to make clear that this party and I, personally, do not support the aggression of Saddam Hussein. We are totally opposed to that. I tried to make it clear that we condemn that. But we also approve of a means of dealing with it: economic sanctions, supported by military forces, and diplomatic initiatives.

Every expert will tell us that the diplomatic initiatives and the sanctions have not been given enough time. So, in answer to my hon. colleague, this is not the time for war. We must exhaust every possible means to settle this politically, through diplomacy and through economic

sanctions, before we consider sacrificing the lives of thousands and thousands of individuals.

I point out to the House that, in the other examples that have happened over the last number of years, we used economic sanctions. Such was the case in South Africa, where we have used economic sanctions for years and have been hoping that they will work. We did not think of a war when the Soviets invaded Afghanistan. We condemned them in the United Nations, but we did not suggest a war.

In this case, it suggests that we are moving into a new order because the cold war is over. Good, Mr. Speaker, I want to see this new order, but I do not want it to apply selectively. If it is going to apply here, let us make it universal, and let us make sure that all nations, including the superpowers—the Soviet Union, the United States, France, Britain, and China—will accept for themselves the same sort of regime that they are suggesting to others.

**Mr. Jack Shields (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend suggested that this is no time for war. No time is a time for war, and I think we all accept that in the House.

There were accusations of a double-standard when comparing actions that we have taken as a government against Iraq's occupation of Kuwait, and the American invasion of Grenada and Panama, and things like that.

There has been the accusation, in the media and obviously by my friend across the way who just finished speaking, that we are applying a double-standard in the approach to the present crisis in Iraq. That has become a recurring theme in the debate today, this double standard.

Canada has been forthright in its attitude in the Iraqi occupation. The opposition is saying that we did not show the same firmness when faced with other similar breaches. Well, it would be wrong to consider this act of aggression of Iraq against Kuwait in the same way, regardless of their context. Is the hon. member suggesting that all kinds of supposedly similar historical incidents can be brought up to argue that the world is behaving differently toward Iraq? The Canadian position on other issues is very clear, well known, and well justified.

For example, I would if ask Canada's policy with regard to the occupied territories is a matter of record. We have opposed consistently the occupation of the West Bank and Gaza by Israel. That is clearly on the record. But to compare the situation of a more powerful nation such as Iraq, heavily armed, unilaterally moving in and taking over another country, to fully occupy that country—not to occupy, restore order, and then move out, but to fully occupy that country—with the atrocities that are going on, to rape and pillage that country, and to announce clearly to the western world that it is going to annex that portion of Kuwait to the country is entirely different.

Does the hon. member not see a difference in the invasion of Grenada to restore order, peace, and government and then move out. It is entirely different. The United States at no point in time ever said that it was going to occupy permanently Grenada. The same thing happened in Panama. To use these, to me, just does not make sense when we hear Hussein in Iraq saying that it is going to occupy Kuwait, period. It is going to happen. It is going to keep the territory and it is going to annex it. It is entirely different.

**Mr. Allmand:** Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept that. I do see similarities. In the cases of Grenada and Panama, the United States had certain grievances with respect to those governments. Instead of proceeding through the United Nations, it proceeded unilaterally with the use of its own armed forces and violated the principle of international law that every country is a sovereign state.

I am not saying that those countries, such as Panama, should not have been dealt with, but they should have been dealt with by the United Nations and that was not done. The Americans flaunted the resolutions of the United Nations which were similar to the ones that are now directed against Iraq.

If the member wants an example with respect to double standards, I will refer again to the still-existing occupation of East Timor by the Indonesians. We trade and have diplomatic relations with Indonesia. Why are we tolerating this occupation? The reason we tolerate that occupation, overlook it, and bury our heads in the sand, despite the human rights violations, is that there are no energy interests in that country. There are no interests to the United States, such as I pointed out

when I referred to the declarations of the State Department in the 1940s and of President Eisenhower.

For years and years, the Americans have considered that the energy resources of the Middle East and of the Arabian Peninsula are of great strategic value to them. Here they act in a different way than they have done with respect to other places. It is not just the United States. It is China in Tibet. It is the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. It is Turkey in Cyprus, and so on.

We have turned a blind eye to those things. I am not saying that is right, but if we are going to do this this time, let us be consistent. Let us act on principle and have it apply to everyone in the same way as we are doing now. That will be a new world order and I will support it.

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, in congratulating the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, I would like to ask him if in his view, the Secretary of State for External Affairs in his speech this afternoon discharged the onus of demonstrating to the House that there is an urgency and inevitability and that it is absolutely necessary to subscribe in advance to a resolution which is a potential declaration of war through the United Nations?

**Mr. Allmand:** No, Mr. Speaker, he made his case. What the government, through the Secretary of State for External Affairs, was attempting to do was to gain the support of the House for an exceptional measure, a measure which would give the member states of the United Nations all necessary means, including war, to implement the resolutions of the United Nations. That is an exceptional request of the House and the burden of proving it and gaining support for it was with the minister. He did not give us enough evidence to support it. As a matter of fact, he did not deal with the questions that were raised. Most experts think that sanctions, given time, will have an impact on Iraq and will work. If diplomatic initiatives were used with greater imagination, they would work as well. He did not make his case. The burden of proof is with him. This party will not support him in that resolution.

• (1900)

**Mr. Patrick Boyer (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Security Council of the United Nations again takes up the issue of the events in the gulf. Tonight, we again debate this very difficult question in the Canadian House of Commons.

We find ourselves these days in a desperate conundrum: committed to peace but constrained to show a willingness to use force to resolve the gulf crisis. I am as uncomfortable with this state of affairs as I think anyone else in our country is. I want peaceful resolutions to international conflicts and would certainly prefer the deliberate process of discussing the reasons for disputes before they turn into something more serious. Yet we are now beyond that point.

Iraq has already attacked its neighbour, Kuwait, and has begun to efface from the earth all evidence of the existence of that small country. The world cannot allow that sort of aggression to go unchecked, or it will invite further aggression and intimidation. All that stands between the collapse of respect for international order and the obliteration of a member state of the United Nations is the will of other member states that this must not happen.

Last week, I met with the new ambassador from Ethiopia to Canada. I asked him what he thought about the situation in the gulf. He pointed out that his country, Ethiopia, was one of the founding members of the League of Nations. He also pointed out that when Mussolini, the head of Italy, bombed, invaded, and occupied Ethiopia, the other members of the league stood by. While they lamented the development, they, in effect, did nothing about it. It is the ambassador's view that Adolf Hitler, watching that unwillingness of the League of Nations to respond to the wholesale occupation of one of the other league members, a charter member become emboldened in the subsequent course of events that unleashed an unspeakable terror in Europe and throughout the rest of the world in the late 1930s as Hitler occupied the Sudetenland, then Austria, Poland and Czechoslovakia and the low countries and everything that came in the wake of that.

In this crisis, the United Nations is facing its first real test since the end of the cold war and international law, and order must be upheld. If there was a peace dividend at the end of the east-west conflict, which ran virtually unchecked since 1945, it was the prospect of a more rational approach to the regional conflicts and of a smoother road to their resolution. We now see how fragile and, perhaps even naive, that hope was. Iraq has not only violated the sovereignty of another state, it has breached the human rights of the Kuwaiti people, as a

demonstration at the United Nations earlier this week clearly showed. In the process, it has violated the rights of a number of citizens of third countries, including Canadians.

It has caused economic chaos, seriously affecting oil importers in the Third World and their fragile economy, who see oil prices going beyond their reach. As well, in a very real sense, it has upset the prospects of many nations heavily dependent on remittances from workers in Kuwait.

In the interests of buttressing his uncertain position, Saddam Hussein has tried to open up rifts between those opposed to him, cynically attempting to exploit every possibility for division and dissension.

In the face of this, our country has, on the diplomatic front, worked tirelessly since the beginning of this crisis at the United Nations. There we have played an active part in our role as a member of the Security Council and in our contacts with countries around the world.

The 10 resolutions which have been passed to date on the gulf crisis were the result of the careful attention to the concerns of all the members of the Security Council. It was Canada's expressed aim to ensure that maximum agreement would be achieved.

The result was the absolute unanimity of the permanent five on all 10 resolutions and the unanimous support of the entire membership of the council for five of those resolutions.

Canada co-chairs the 661 committee concerned with the monitoring and enforcement of the sanctions.

The Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs have had dozens of meetings with other world leaders. We have used Canadian diplomatic resources world-wide to develop and maintain a united international position on the unacceptability of Iraq's invasion.

That is what we have done diplomatically. Militarily, we have sent Canadian forces to the gulf region to deter further aggression and to assist in the enforcement of United Nations sanctions against Iraq.

[*Translation*]

Respect of the sanctions has been what one could have expected. The problem is knowing whether they will have the desired effect in the near future.

Imposition and continued application of the sanctions has not been and will not be sufficient *per se* to compel the government of Iraq to withdraw, if it continues to give a higher priority to its occupation of Kuwait than to restoration of everyday life for its citizens. It must be remembered that over the past few years, Iraqis have become accustomed to certain hardships because of the eight-year war with Iran from 1980 to 1988.

The invasion of Kuwait was a disastrous decision on the part of the government of Iraq. It underestimated the opposition of the international community and did not take into account the new spirit of co-operation between the superpowers. It misjudged the acceptability of such ventures for other Arab countries.

The United Nations showed unparalleled unity in voting a series of resolutions which unequivocally condemned Iraq's initiative. Canada played a major role in obtaining and maintaining that unanimity.

Some wonder why the international community initiated such harsh measures against Iraq when other disputes and inequities persist.

It is because, in the history of the United Nations, this is the first time one member state tries to wipe out and wholly absorb another.

Past errors by the international community cannot be allowed to stand in the way of a solution to this crisis. The remarkable consensus obtained in the face of Iraqi aggression may show how to resolve other disputes. This is why the United Nations came into being. If a positive and unequivocal example can be made in this case, it may facilitate future solutions.

• (1910)

[*English*]

The progressive destruction of Kuwait, the immense costs of maintaining the military build-up in the gulf, the slowness with which the sanctions are apparently making themselves felt, and the isolation of Saddam Hussein from the reality of his situation, have now brought us to the stage where we face the need for further action.

The isolation of Iraq within the international community is virtually absolute, but Saddam Hussein seems unaware of it or unwilling to admit it. Perhaps he believes his own propaganda, according to which the steady stream of foreign visitors indicates weakness among his opposition.

Every other indication, however, contradicts such a view of his propaganda. For example, the universal acceptance of sanctions is one. Another is Saddam Hussein's condemnation in those forums which were important to him, the United Nations and certainly the Arab League. A third is the fact that the military forces lined up against him across the border in Saudi Arabia include his fellow Islamic and Arab nations. All of these things contradict the Iraqi propaganda line.

Under the old cold war system he could have perhaps counted upon comfort from his eastern allies, but they have all forsaken him. The Soviets, his former chief armourers, have spoken strongly in favour of his withdrawal from the territory that he has militarily seized.

Clearly the time has come to give a further signal about the international solidarity opposing Iraq, an unmistakable signal of the determination to see the invasion so crudely attempted reversed. That is why the United Nations must act again. That is why we must pile resolution upon resolution. That is why there must finally be adopted a resolution authorizing the use of force if Iraq does not respond to the other calls which the international community has issued through the United Nations to date.

The Security Council resolution does not make war inevitable. It authorizes but does not call for the use of force. The resolution gives Saddam Hussein a further chance to remedy the situation by complying further and fully with the Security Council resolutions on the situation. The resolution is a clear signal that a peaceful solution is still possible but Saddam Hussein must understand that the choice is up to him.

Furthermore, there is a disposition to set a deadline to allow a pause of goodwill before which force will not be used—I stress, before which it would not be used—to allow Saddam Hussein every chance to comply fully with United Nations resolutions and to ensure a peaceful solution. Following that pause, for however long the Security Council decides it should be, force becomes an option available to the countries of the coalition with the full authority of the United Nations. This is a very clear signal to Saddam Hussein about the importance of full compliance with the Security Council resolutions.

We must hope that reason will prevail and that Iraq, faced with the irrefutable evidence of the will of the international community, will at last comply.

I see the positions that Canada has taken in this as the natural extension of the internationalist spirit which animated the foreign policy of our country for the last 30 or 40 years. When the United Nations was created in those dark, final years of the Second World War, it was hoped that a new approach would be possible in international conflicts. Almost without exception, however, international communities saw the regional conflicts resisting treatment in the United Nations because it was neutralized by the division of the UN membership into the blocs, fostered by the cold war.

Now that the old cold war blocs seem to have dissolved, the United Nations again, and in a sense for the first time, has a chance to act in a manner consistent with the intention of those, including Canadians, who framed the UN Charter.

I referred earlier to this gulf situation being a test for the United Nations, and I take this very seriously. Canadian hopes for the maintenance of international security and peace, despite the situation in which we currently find ourselves, have never been higher. I find this when I speak to people around my Etobicoke—Lakeshore constituency, to other members of Parliament and to people who write to me from coast to coast in our country.

Canada's interests lie in the strengthening of the United Nations and in the enhancing of its capacity, through the co-operative action of its members, to act in such circumstances as these. It is not only the fate of Iraq and Kuwait which is at stake, but the global system for the maintenance of peace and security.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of attention to the hon. member. First of all, I wish to compliment the hon. member; his French was excellent; his message was very interesting and I sense that he shares a feeling of great concern about the well-being of young people, and the potential for war is as abhorrent to him as it is to us or to me. I will put it that way. Certainly none of us wishes to

send young people into war, and that would be the last option.

As a member of the Liberal Party, I have been very supportive of all actions taken with respect to support of the United Nations and the Security Council and rejoice in the fact that, for once, the world is starting to stand up and speak with a concerted and joint voice about actions that are abhorrent to all of us. At the same time, I have serious concerns and reservations as I read the resolutions. I really would like some guidance and help from my hon. colleague.

First of all, in the government's business, Motion No. 24, the government intends to direct the vote tomorrow so that we would accept all subsequent resolutions that come out of the United Nations. I have a worry about that. Knowing my hon. colleague, I do not think he buys anything without seeing the contents or knowing the ramifications of the letter he might sign or the endorsement that he might give.

Knowing that about my colleague and seeing this suggestion to support subsequent resolutions, I looked very carefully today at the resolution that the United Nations is suggesting in its draft before the Security Council. That really has concerned and upset me because of what this resolution says, and perhaps the member can clarify. It authorizes member states, co-operating with the government of Kuwait, to use all necessary means to uphold and implement Security Council resolution 660 and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area.

I ask him: can he define who can authorize this member state? Can any member state take an activity or an action that it deems worthy without going through the United Nations; and, second, who is and what is the area? Is that what the hon. member wants us to sign? I am really concerned.

• (1920)

**Mr. Boyer:** Mr. Speaker, it is an excellent question. I think that the wording is vague enough that it has given rise to several different interpretations. In a situation like this, it is most unfortunate that there would be any ambiguity because the stakes are very high in what we are dealing with.

I am looking at the text as it is printed in today's Order Paper. It reads as follows:

> That this House, noting that the Government of Iraq has not complied with the United Nations Security Council resolutions concerning the invasion of Kuwait and the detention of third country nationals, supports the United Nations in its efforts to ensure compliance with Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions.

In other words, I take this, Mr. Speaker, to mean the resolutions that have been passed to date.

**Mrs. Finestone:** Not the resolution for tomorrow.

**Mr. Boyer:** That is correct. I raised this matter with the senior-most officials of External Affairs and others whom I consider to be knowledgeable, and this is also the interpretation. Therefore, I hope I can allay the hon. member's concerns about this. Certainly I do not feel that we in this House are being asked to, or for that matter ought to be asked to give some kind of blank cheque or to look into a crystal ball as to what subsequent resolutions might be passed at subsequent dates.

What I see this as being is another step in the systematic efforts of the Security Council and the United Nations to take this step by step. We are dealing here in the gulf with an extraordinarily complex and difficult situation which to date has been very well handled. It has been handled very well in great measure because of the comity of nations; the effort of Canada giving leadership to try to have unanimity at all stages and to take it step by step.

I will conclude my answer to the hon. member by saying very directly that as a Canadian and as a parliamentarian, I would not expect that the next stages where Canadians would be sent into a combat situation would be taken without the process being before the Canadian Parliament.

**Mr. Ray Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the hon. member. I am very surprised at his comments. On this side of the House we feel that this is a declaration of war, that the Prime Minister has deliberately worded this in a vague fashion and in a manner to give approval to subsequent resolutions and to the present one, that is to allow any member state to take whatever action necessary.

The Prime Minister has a track record on this particular issue of authorizing deployment of Canadian military forces without the sanction of Parliament to the Persian Gulf.

It is our feeling on this side of the House that this is a declaration of war or the government will interpret it as the right and sanction of Parliament to have this. Parliament will adjourn. There is a lot of discussion that it will not come back until March. It is also our feeling that this is Parliament's last opportunity to debate this issue. We are debating an extremely vague motion.

I would say that anyone in the House who expresses the concerns that the member has, along with the vague resolution, should be voting with us against that resolution because I think your Prime Minister is going to betray you on it.

In the bottom line, if we are right, how many Canadians will be killed? What will be the casualty over there if they engage their Iraqi army, along with the Americans?

The other thing is how many Iraqis will be killed by the multinational force? There will be hundreds of thousands of Iraqis killed and injured in this.

In the final analysis, the sad tragedy of this is that blockade will work. It will take time to work. It may not suit the United States and its belligerent war-like effort there, but certainly those sanctions will work if they are given a chance. We ought to be working ourselves as hard as we can to impose those sanctions so that the Iraqis leave Kuwait peacefully, and then sort out the remainder.

There is no way Canadian Armed Forces should be deployed over there when we have a safer, much better and more effective opportunity to use those sanctions to achieve the ends without killing anybody.

**Mr. Boyer:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is doing a lot of crystal ball gazing not only as to when Parliament will be rising or being recalled, and all of that—which is quite an uncertain thing—not taking into account the ability to be recalled to his casualty statistics for what may or what may never happen.

**Mr. Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** But it may happen.

**Mr. Boyer:** He is saying that it may happen.

**Mr. Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** You said it may happen.

**Mr. Boyer:** Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on which the hon. member is making his comments, I was very deliberate and very clear about the sequence of events that are possible.

I talked about the time deadline that is going to be included in this resolution and the opportunity that that gives again to Saddam Hussein to recognize what he is up against and the seriousness to the whole international community of what he has done.

I think there is a tendency to sort of obscure the sincere efforts of a lot of people around the world to try to deal with this situation in a way that can contain it and preserve peace. As time goes by and the annexation of Kuwait continues month after month, there will come a point where it is *de facto* part of Iraq, and the world community will be standing there not having succeeded in what, since the day of the invasion, has been an almost unanimous view of the international community.

I know that the hon. member and the leader of his party have said that they view this as a declaration of war.

This interpretation is more of a statement than I would certainly be prepared to make. On the other hand, that interpretation by the New Democratic Party of Canada may certainly help to contribute to the psychological warfare that is necessary at this stage against Saddam Hussein to try to break through to him some realization that, in this century after all the wars and killings because of all the invasions and annexations, finally the United Nations has got an opportunity to say: "International law and order cannot tolerate the armed annexation of neighbouring countries."

**Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina):** Mr. Speaker, I am very glad—I mean it—to have a chance to speak on this subject. It has meant a lot to me for most of my life.

When I was a boy, I heard the effective beginning for us of World War II in church one Sunday morning, that is that Britain had declared war on Germany. I know that was not the first event, but that was what brought it home to Canadians.

It is not by coincidence that since then this has, for me, been not only a political question but a religious one.

On the religious side, I will in this forum simply say that I believe the world was made good, meant to be enjoyed by all and that there are troubles in it. The intention of our Creator is not to wipe us out, even through our own act but to cure what is wrong. That is the basic point of view from which I look at today's debate.

When I look at the government's motion, I feel that it is defective in the sense that we say we support the United Nations and its effort to ensure compliance with the Security Council resolution 660, and subsequent resolutions, with the ambiguity that is loaded into that word "subsequent"—which the Prime Minister refused yesterday or today to make any effort to clarify. If this is not a declaration of war, it is far too close to one. There is too much emphasis on punishment and on destruction.

• (1930)

The reason I prefer the resolution that the NDP supports is that it emphasizes more fully, and I think more realistically, the possibility of change for the better. We oppose the use of force against Iraq until sanctions have had the opportunity to work. We urge the government to seek an amendment to the Security Council resolution requiring member states to give sanctions and other UN efforts time to work and call on the government not to send Canadian Forces into military action beyond the current enforcement of UN sanctions without further approval from this House. The hon. member who just spoke feels sure there will be an occasion for that, but we want it to be laid down clearly because last summer we were denied that very right and responsibility.

In fact the position I am taking and that our party is taking is consistent with the position of the United Nations Association in its testimony before the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade on November 6 when it said:

> Let us be quite clear about this. The harsh economic sanctions which have been imposed on Iraq have not had time to produce results and there are other measures that could be taken before resorting to force. It may be useful to recall that even during the worst moments of its war against Iran, Iraq was still able to continue its oil exports. Under the current UN sanctions, this is not the case.

Others have gone into that question more fully and I do not intend to repeat most of what they have said. It seems to me that at this time and in the foreseeable future, in the coming months, war, which is envisaged in the resolution of the Prime Minister, would be premature. It would be too harsh both to our foe—and Saddam is our foe; there is no question—and to ourselves. He has broken the law. If he has a complaint, which is quite possible, he should have taken it to the United Nations with some patience, rather than unleashing the beginning of what could be an unimaginably wide war.

If we join as war makers in that, the damage to our enemy, to ourselves, and to many others who may not even be party to it, is beyond our ability to measure and contain at this time.

I was willing in the 1940s, in World War II, to volunteer for the Canadian forces because I thought there was no other way, as far as I could see, to do what was necessary. Some of my acquaintances were conscientious objectors. I did not see their view as mine. I was willing. I have not changed my view on that occasion. In principle I believe that should still in the present situation be a possibility in some cases. I have sons and daughters of an age where they must consider this same question. I know they would think responsibly on this occasion and on others like it.

On this occasion I think it is too soon, both too soon in the case of Iraq and too soon following on these other examples that have been mentioned: the invasion of East Timor, tolerated; the U.S. invasion of Vietnam and its years of war there; the U.S. action in overthrowing the elected Government of Guatemala, the elected Government of Chile, and the elected Prime Minister of Iran; the invasion by the U.S.S.R. of Afghanistan; China's invasion of Vietnam; and France's hard-hearted continuation of testing of nuclear weapons in the Pacific, poisoning the land and the ocean.

These are all members of the United Nations, most of them members of the Security Council, that is to say of the big five, the permanent members. I do not think the record shows that these members are to be trusted with the blank cheque that is in the motion before the United Nations tomorrow, which the Prime Minister has asked us to endorse. Especially they are not to be trusted when oil is one of the major concerns. That is not only my opinion. That has been stated by many others much closer to the responsibility. That is the trouble with the government's motion.

There was no call to Parliament in August. It gives us no confidence that Parliament will be called again unless it is absolutely, clearly guaranteed now before war.

There was no wait for the United Nations decision. When the ships were sent, it was in consultation with President Bush and with NATO officials in Brussels, with General Verner who had said that perhaps now that there is no danger from the Soviet Union we should use our armies in other parts of the world to protect our oil. In other words, oil was a major element in the NATO backed decision of Canada to send those ships to the Middle East.

Now sanctions have been agreed in the UN, but the present UN motion is flawed as has been pointed out. It gives unlimited rein to member states with no UN command, no definition of the goals, no one responsible for defining the goals to tell one country or another it is time to stop: "We won. Don't go on fighting". Every country just does what it thinks best.

However, I am encouraged by some of the remarks of the Secretary of State for External Affairs this afternoon. I am very glad that he made his visit to the Middle East. I do not agree with everything that the newspapers attribute to him there, but that is a common problem we all have. I took note of some of the things I heard him say today. He mentioned that, rather than an extreme of punishment to Saddam or Iraq, he finds in the region a willingness to live with Iraq. He goes on to say if Iraq has complaints against Kuwait, there is the United Nations in which to take them up.

He also mentioned the possibility of an Arab force likely for the future defence of Kuwait and that there could be further attempts to resolve regional problems such as the Arab–Israeli dispute, in which he said there is a new sense of urgency to resolve it, or words very close to that.

I commend the minister for raising that point. It is a very delicate, difficult point to raise. I think it is necessary to raise it whether we agree or not with the argument that the Arab–Israeli dispute cannot be dealt with at the same time as the Iraq dispute. At least he said that it has to be done in that context or in the aftermath. I am much encouraged by the fact that he reports helpful conversations with Israeli and Palestinian leaders and that he takes this occasion to reiterate that arms control must come to that region.

I am encouraged by those remarks of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I take them as ground for listening carefully to the many people who have told us, including the minister, that there is evidence that the sanctions are working and therefore ground for giving them time.

I want to state three reasons why I believe we should not only rely on sanctions but avoid, as long as we honestly can, the declaration of war or the ordering of a military attack on Kuwait. One reason is that we have for 1,000 years, give or take a century or so, had hostility between the nations and cultures of Europe, the nations and cultures of North Africa and the Middle East, and now south central Asia, even east Asia.

• (1940)

Roughly speaking, it was the Christians against the Muslims. In school I thought that was old history. Now I find it is very present history with us. It never really ended. Perhaps what has ended is the European expansion into the rest of the countries of the world. That may be giving us some heart searching. Certainly there has been manipulation by European countries and by the United States of the oil that is so plentiful in the Middle East. That attitude seems to be that it is our oil.

The Prime Minister of Iran in 1953 thought that it was oil belonging to the Iranian people. He wanted to raise the price, and the United States arranged to have him overthrown. There has been no stability nor democracy in that country from 1953 until now. It is very unfortunate that the United States preferred to introduce a tyrant, the Shaw, in order to get cheap oil.

For us now to send an armada against Iraq may very well detonate a war that would spread much wider than Iraq. We know that there is sympathy with Iraq among some of the people even in some of the countries whose governments are officially allied with us or have sent troops. There is a possibility of a very widespread war, if we seem to be just renewing what was undertaken 1,000 years ago in the Crusades. We have to be very cautious on that account.

I would like to refer to the minister's remarks, quoted Tuesday in *The Globe and Mail*: "The Palestinian question must be dealt with as part of the process of dealing

with the after-effects of dealing with this gulf crisis". I hope that will be kept in mind.

If a full-scale war breaks out, what will happen to Palestine, either to the Israelis there or to the Palestinians. I do not think they will be in as good shape after that war as they are now. I do not think the bitterness that has made it impossible to resolve the partitioning of that land will be any less after a war that we might start with Iraq.

Second, it is reliably reported that there are 500 nuclear explosive devices or nuclear bombs in the gulf area. Most of them are on American vessels and some of them are on the vessels of other allies.

The question is: Why are they there? If our allies do not mean to use them, why have them there? If we do mean to use them, when, on what occasion, for what purpose, and how many? Five hundred nukes? How many are we going to detonate under the phrase given by the United Nations: "use any means necessary."

I remember at the beginning of World War II when Hitler experimented with carpet bombing with stuka bombers, wiping out the civilians in the cities and towns of Poland. President Roosevelt said: "No civilized nation could possibly do a thing like that." It wasn't many years before Britain fire bombed scores of thousands of civilians in the centre of Dresden, until the United States atom bombed scores of thousands of civilians in Hiroshima and again at Nagasaki. We should not assume that those nukes will not be used. Those are just two nuclear bombs. With 500, it could not wipe out just Iraq. It could perhaps wipe out the world or the human part of the world and perhaps all living parts of it.

We are not ready for a controlled war, as seems to be offered to us. We have no guarantee, no reason to think it would be controlled.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe another reason why we should hold off from pushing to the possibility or probability of war tomorrow is because even in the United States and in other allied countries, there is growing unease about the ramifications, about the uncontrolled possibilities of ordering an attack on Iraq, which seems to be the issue. I have a statement here quoted in a small paper that I picked up in Kingston recently, *Between the Lines*, from one U.S. marine corporal, Eric Larson. He says:

> On April 21, 1986 I joined the Marine Corp to defend the American dream, which first attracted my parents to this country in 1958. I emerged from boot camp three months later, a fully indoctrinated fighting machine willing to go anywhere in the world to defend the ideals and freedoms stated in the Constitution of the United States of America.

I will not read his whole statement, but he says further down that after further consideration:

> I realized I could no longer blindly follow orders from my Commander-in-Chief but that my actions were ultimately accountable to a higher authority— namely God.
>
> My deeply rooted moral convictions have lead me to declare my objection to the escalation of tensions and seemingly inevitable war in the Middle East.

And further down:

> I declare myself a conscientious objector. I am no longer a Marine.

Mr. Speaker, there are anti-war demonstrations developing across the United States in many cities. They are anti war demonstrations in many cities of Europe. Recently French dockers refused to load certain ships that would be carrying war materials to the Middle East. It is not only demonstrators in the streets. I was amazed to read the transcript of the interview a few days ago or a week ago perhaps between Barbara Frum and Dr. Brzesinski, a former adviser to President Jimmy Carter and one generally considered to be a hawk. He says:

> And while I abhor the occupation of Kuwait, I also abhor the occupation of Cambodia by Vietnam or Afghanistan by the Soviet Union, or Lebanon by Syria, but I'm not prepared to advocate a war in every case and I do not see any overriding American national interest in America having to undertake a very risky and very costly military operation in the place of sanctions being applied against Iraq and which are punishing Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, this and the demonstrations in the cities of Europe and in the cities of Canada are only beginning as an opposition to the war. Therefore, I want to reiterate the position of my party.

There should be no attack now or in the foreseeable future. We should concentrate on making sanctions work. Some people have referred to the 1930s, to Ethiopia, to Spain and so on and what happened when we allowed Hitler and Mussolini to go unchecked. That is not the situation that we have. United States, France and Britain refused to impose sanctions on Franco when he was overthrowing the lawful government of his country. They refused to do anything to stop Hitler and

Mussolini from sending troops to support Franco in the overthrow of the lawful government. That made World War II inevitable.

We now have an almost total world-wide agreement on sanctions against Iraq. We have a much stronger organization to guide it than was the old League of Nations. I believe that it is our moral duty to see to it that we make those sanctions and other political means work and make war unnecessary now. The old slogan of "a war to end war" was made out of date by the bombing of Hiroshima.

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have listened with interest and some shock and amazement at what the New Democratic Party is saying here today.

• (1950)

One of the advantages of a debate like this is that people have to stand up and be counted. They have to be counted for some kind of consistency in their policy.

For years, we have listened to members of the New Democratic Party say: "Canada should work with the United Nations. Canada is a part of the United Nations. When we act, we should act in concert with all of the other countries. Canada should not go it alone". Today, we hear the spokesman for the New Democratic Party say: "It is time for the government to act independently of the United Nations". I could not believe what I was hearing. I could not believe it. For all these years we are supposed to work together and now is the time to act independently.

I think the message is clear. It certainly is clear to the House. I am sure it is clear across Canada, and I am sure it is clear among our allies, never count on these people for friends. They say they are friends when the times are good, but when the times are tough, they say: "Please, do not call on us". Then, the time is not now, no. We have to wait a while, you see.

Second, for years we have been listening to these people say: "Help the oppressed. You have got to help the oppressed, those who are hurting". Now, we hear reports about people being killed in Kuwait, hostages in Iraq, women being raped, and children being thrown out of incubators, and these people say: "Oh, the time is not now". No. The Soviets have 3,000 hostages there, the U.S. has so many, Canada has some, but the time is not now. Presumably, not enough people have died yet. I wonder what it is that makes these people tick. We hear their friends from the Peace Coalition say: "Canada and its leadership are warmongers".

Here is Saddam Hussein, with his tanks poised on the Saudi Arabian border, with a million troops in arms, who has obliterated the boundary of another nation, and Canada is the warmonger? Give me a break. How come the tables have all of a sudden turned?

I know this member believes in peace. Does he believe in peace at the cost of freedom? Which is more important? If he believes in peace more, would he have the freedom to stand here and say what he says today?

**Mr. Heap:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to correct a misunderstanding in the beginning on the part of the hon. member. As I understand it, what my colleague, the member for Victoria said, was not that Canada should act independently of the United Nations, but independently at the United Nations. I invite my hon. colleague to check that in yesterday's *Hansard*. In other words, independently of the United States, which would be very desirable. I fully stand by that and the NDP always has.

On the second point, about oppression, there are oppressions sometimes where we can do something immediately and there are others where we cannot. When the United states massacred more than 3,000 civilians in Panama, Canada's government did not even attempt to do anything about it. Let us not just talk in a vague generality about oppressors.

Finally, on the question of peace or freedom, I believe freedom is essential to peace and peace is essential to freedom. We do not have any of them perfectly, but I do not believe we are going to make either more peace or more freedom with 500 nuclear bombs in the Persian Gulf.

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence):** Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of remarks that my hon. colleague from Trinity-Spadina might comment upon. He has just finished with what I think was a very nice statement, and I want to compliment him on it.

What the government is doing by requesting approval for this motion is, in essence, a whitewash, a blank cheque to go ahead and engage the country in war without coming to Parliament to ask for the opportunity to go in. The parliamentary secretary, who has already indicated that he is unaware of exactly what the ramifica

tions of the resolution are, is going to go back and try to figure it out with his department. That is fair. I am not calling into question his motives and his understandings, but there is a problem.

This House has a right to know what is on the government's agenda when it is going to ask Canadians to support its initiatives that are absolutely war-like.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has already, in all of his declarations, indicated that, as far as he is concerned, Canada is headed toward war. The presence that will soon be 400,000 American troops accompanied by 2,000 tanks, four aircraft carriers and the addition of other troops indicates that that is where we are going.

The Minister says that we are moving from peacekeeping to peacemaking. In other words, we are going to go from conflict co-operation to conflict resolution. That indicates that the government has in mind a policeman's role in the area. If the government is that willing to go forward, then will it come before the House and say: "We want to preserve peace, and here is our agenda?"

Has the member for Trinity—Spadina been given any indication from the government side, since it is so prone to looking at the examples of the 1930s and early 1940s, and even as far as 1950 and 1951, that the government is doing what the many governments of the western democracies were doing before the end of World War II at Quebec City, at Casablanca, at Yalta, with the Marshall Plan that emerged, and with McArthur plans for Japan, when they were beginning to reconsider a reorientation of the societies that were going to come after the war?

In other words, the government is making such hay in saying: "We want the opportunity to blow everybody up, because what we want to do is to ensure peace". Has it got a plan where it is going to plan for peace? What is that plan for peace? Have we been given any indication? Are we likely to get any indication from that?

Is the hon. member aware of any indication from the minister or the government that says that this motion is going to lead us in the direction where we are going to be talking about the way we establish and maintain peace in an area where we have already destabilized an integral and strategic part of the world?

**Mr. Boyer:** We have stabilized.

**Mr. Volpe:** The parliamentary secretary is confused about what the resolution calls for, and he is unaware of what is going on. If he would like to answer the question for the member for Trinity—Spadina, let him do it. Maybe the hon. member could advise him as well on how to go toward peace.

**Mr. Heap:** Mr. Speaker, I will try to make a very brief answer to the hon. member.

Until today, I had not heard any sign of the willingness that the hon. member speaks of. But today, I thought I heard two signs. The remarks of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, which I referred to, and some of the remarks of the hon. parliamentary secretary suggest to me that the reason that the word "subsequent" is so adamantly maintained—in a totally ambiguous sense in what the parliamentary secretary seemed to say, unfortunately—suggests to me that there is serious division in the ranks of the government party.

I hope that the letters that are beginning to come in to me and to others, and the public demonstrations that are going to be heard from, will press the government ranks and the back-benchers of the Conservative Party to re-examine that word and to press for a meeting of Parliament to settle this matter clearly, instead of ambiguously.

It is only a hope, but I said I believe the world was made good, and we should hope for change for the better. The signs are very small, and I will be watching carefully for more. In the meantime, the sign that would make it work would be for the government to adopt the amendment that has been put forward by the NDP.

• (2000)

**Mr. John Reimer (Kitchener):** Mr. Speaker, as we debate this motion tonight, the world finds itself intricately wrapped in a very serious international crisis. The stage for this crisis was set on August 2, 1990, the day that Iraq blatantly, ignoring international law, invaded its unsuspecting neighbour, Kuwait. Consequently, Canada, along with numerous other nations, finds itself facing the

difficult question of whether to use other means beyond the economic sanctions which are already in place.

No one wants war, but Iraq started a war with the brutal and merciless invasion of Kuwait. No one wants war, but Iraq's continued attempt to eliminate the identity and very existence of a member state of the United Nations cannot be ignored. No one wants war, but Iraq must clearly understand the firmness of international resolve. That is the reason why the Security Council will be adopting a further resolution tomorrow and why this House should support the resolution before it tonight.

The Persian Gulf is in conflict tonight. There can be no denying of this fact. Not only has Iraq acted belligerently toward Kuwait, it has since held captive third country nationals as hostage, contrary to the principles of the United Nations.

Bernard Wood of the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security stated the following in an External Affairs and International Trade committee meeting:

> First of all, let us be clear, there is a war in the Persian Gulf right now. There is an aggression that has taken place, and it has not been rolled back. Saddam Hussein declared and acted in an active war and it has not been resolved. It is therefore not the burden of the international community at this stage to say that we are the ones who are advocating war. What is at stake? I think it is important to choose our terms carefully in this regard. We are talking about enforcement action of international peace and security under the terms of the Charter.

Therefore, can we, as a peace-keeping nation, stand idly by as another nation, fully aware of the United Nation's charter, in fact a member of the United Nations itself, rapes and pillages another member country? Our collective conscience should answer that question.

Alex Morrison of the Canadian Institute for Strategic Studies recently stated to the External Affairs' standing committee:

> Canada and Canadians have always been ready to respond appropriately—and may I say more quickly than some of our allies in this century—to calls for contributions to the preservation and defence of international peace, security and stability. In the case of the gulf crisis we have done it again.
>
> Ought we always and ever, without fail, stand aside in the face of clear calls for action? Of course not. Are we only right when we disagree with the United States? No, not at all. Are we wrong when we agree with the United Nations Security Council? No, we not. Are we wrong when we join some 30 other countries in a multinational military effort to deter aggression? Of course not.

Mr. Speaker, later in that same meeting of the External Affairs committee, Mr. Alex Morrison went on to state the following:

> I think it is a very great misperception and it is wrong for Canadians to assume and conclude that Canada acts only under pressure or persuasion by the United States. I have had some experience in this during my six years as a member of the Canadian mission to the United Nations, and I can say that this is not the truth.
>
> It is, however, the truth per se that the opinion of the United States, our greatest ally, certainly is a factor in the determination and in the formulation of Canadian foreign policy. But, as has been said, we were active in 1914, not three years later.

As were the Americans.

> We were active in 1939, not two years later.

As were the Americans.

Let us remember that Iraq did not simply pop into Kuwait only for a drink and a friendly discussion. They invaded the country with decisive military force and since that time have systematically attempted to wipe out all traces of Kuwait and its people.

We are talking about a Stalinesque effort to remove all traces of a legitimately constituted nation and its population. Iraq has made no attempt to explain or justify its brutal acts, other than to offer the flimsiest of historical claims to Kuwait. Not satisfied with encouraging the flight of hundreds of thousands of people into the desert from Kuwait on August 2, Iraqi occupation forces have conducted a campaign of terror against those who have remained.

Yesterday at the United Nations some survivors of the ongoing Iraqi atrocities gave stirring accounts of the condition of their homeland and its remaining people. The Iraqis have spared no one from the suffering, the young as well as the old.

I firmly believe that the fundamental issue in this crisis is morality in international behaviour. Consequently, it is Canada's international responsibility to ensure that nations adhere to and fully respect international law. Without this consensus, the world would be captive to every despot's whims and wishes. We must re-establish international order. Without it, as history has clearly shown, chaos and then war are inevitable.

As the Prime Minister stated on August 10 of this year:

> The international community must do everything possible to ensure the respect of international law and to prevent its transgression. The lessons of history are clear—no civilized nation is excused from its broader responsibilities to the world community for international peace and order.

Since its inception, the United Nations, was designed to be the primary conduit of action on the international stage. Ever since 1945, the United Nations has sought to uphold international law and order. Unfortunately, from 1945 to as recently as this past summer, the cold war prevented any solidarity by the United Nations. Now, however, and in fact beginning with this crisis, for the first time the United Nations is working as it was originally designed. Since 1945, few other nations have worked as loyally and as diligently within the United Nations as Canada.

Since August 2, the United Nations Security Council has passed no less than 10 resolutions pertaining to the Persian Gulf crisis. Contrary to popular belief, propagated by some in the media and some in the socialist party on the other side, it is the world community and not simply the United States, that has acted quickly and decisively in response to this crisis. The UN Security Council resolution 660, which Canada, under the leadership of Ambassador Yves Fortier co-sponsored, states: "Determined that a breach of international peace and security had taken place, and therefore condemned the Iraqi invasion, demanded its withdrawal from Kuwait and called upon Iraq and Kuwait to negotiate".

Clearly it has been the world community, under the auspices of the United Nations, that has stood up to Iraq. Let us not be misled into thinking that we have blindly and naively followed just the United States into the crisis; we have not.

• (2010)

Again, Alex Morrison of the Canadian Institute for Strategic Studies has said:

> We (Canadians) act differently from the Americans in many ways. We have a different South African policy, a different Cuban policy, a different Middle East policy, a different Central American policy. At the United Nations, where I was part of the delegation for six years and a member of the Security Council delegation, Canada voted differently from the Americans on international security and arms control issues 66 per cent to 75 per cent of the time each year.

This situation is no different. Canada, in fact, has played an instrumental role at the Security Council. In fact, nine out of the 10 resolutions have been co-sponsored by Canada. Additionally, according to a *New York Times* article, of August 30, 1990, at a time when the Americans were considering acting alone with naval interdictions of Iraqui commerce at sea, Canada's United Nation's representative, Yves Fortier argued, and I quote from *The New York Times* article:

> —that the Security Council should instead take a step-by-step approach under the Charter's Article 42, which provides for blockades and other military actions but only with explicit Security Council approval.

Subsequent actions by the Americans attest to the strength of the Canadian argument.

Nevertheless, there can be no denying the importance of the leadership that the United States has provided in this crisis. Acceptance of their responsibilities as a world power may even have prevented greater international repercussions and perhaps forestalled any expanded attack by Iraq on the oil lines in Saudi Arabia itself.

Mr. Speaker, what has led to the impression that Canada is subservient to the Americans? The question is deeply disturbing to me and, I am sure, many other members of this House. Obviously, our role at the United Nations has been overlooked by our own media. How else can we explain the lack of media coverage of the positive actions of Yves Fortier at the United Nations?

**An hon. member:** There is no positive action.

**Mr. Reimer:** I am not alone in my concern. Dr. John Sigler, political scientist at Carleton University in Ottawa, in response to a question at the external affairs and international trade committee meeting, stated—and I invite my socialist friends to do a little listening for a change. Instead of talking from the seat of their pants, why do they not listen and then speak a little more in informed debate. Dr. Sigler said:

> We do not have someone, as far as I know, in the Canadian media who is an expert on the United Nations, who sits there and systematically has told the story of what has happened. We have all read *The New York Times*. The French do a much better job.

And then Dr. John Sigler went on to say, and I quote:

> I only learned, frankly, that Fortier had strongly stood up to the Americans on the blockade from (the) cable news network from Atlanta. I never saw any of it here. There was quite a story there about the fact that Canada, France, and the Soviet Union had taken a strong

lead in criticizing the United States for moving unilaterally. I do not think I can find that story back in the Canadian media.

Mr. Speaker, nor could any of us. Tragically, our media was not even there to inform us. How could it be that a country, with membership on the Security Council of the United Nations, would not have media representation at such an important juncture in our history? Is our media provincial, only concentrating on pasta demonstrations, or is it a reluctance to report the truth when it goes against the chosen political philosophies of some in the media?

**An hon. member:** Shame on you.

**Mr. Reimer:** Surely this must be remedied.

Mr. Speaker, what we are dealing with tonight, implicitly at least, is the United Nations Security Council resolution that will come to a vote tomorrow. For the record, let me read into *Hansard* section 2 of the draft resolution which will be voted on tomorrow at the Security Council:

2. Authorizes Member States cooperating with the Government of Kuwait, unless Iraq on or before January 1,—

—or the 15th, which will be decided tomorrow—

1991 fully implements, as set forth in Paragraph 1 above, the foregoing Resolutions, to use all necessary means to uphold and implement the Security Council Resolution 660 and all subsequent relevant Resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;

Accordingly, as I have already mentioned, the Security Council passed, unanimously I might add, resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions, including 661 which imposed strict economic sanctions against Iraq in accordance with article 39 and 41 of the UN Charter.

I would also like to quote from article 42 of the United Nations Charter which states:

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate, or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockades, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations.

It is important to note that article 42 should only be implemented after the economic sanctions of article 41 have been tried. That is exactly what resolution 661 did.

The resolution that will be presented to the Security Council tomorrow reiterates article 42, chapter 7 of the United Nations Charter. Additionally, a majority of member nations on the Security Council have committed themselves to supporting this motion. The Soviets will support it. The French will support it. The British will support it. The Finns will support it. The Americans will support it. So, too, should the Canadians.

Support for the motion before us tonight is a vote for peace and security, not war. It is a vote for international law and order. It is a vote against Saddam Hussein and his armed forces. It is a vote for Canadians still trapped in Iraq. A vote for this resolution before the House and that of the one before the Security Council of the United Nations builds in a pause of goodwill. This pause offers one more opportunity for Iraq to withdraw. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is a vote for the resolution to the Persian Gulf conflict.

It places the entire conflict back into the hands of Saddam Hussein and it is his decision whether it should be resolved peacefully or by other means.

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston):** Mr. Speaker, the member and his party are supporting a resolution that would in effect give the UN resolution if passed tomorrow, and there is no doubt that it will pass, authority to the Americans and other member states to use whatever means necessary, whatever type of force necessary, in order to remove Iraq from Kuwait.

• (2020)

In effect, he is saying that this Parliament should support a declaration of war, not as a defensive means, but as a way of removing an aggressor from Kuwait.

I believe that it is important that the member ask himself what precedent is being set here. It is important for Canadians to understand the circumstances which that member across the way and others are suggesting exist to warrant the declaration of war and the potential loss of hundreds of thousands of lives.

We know what the principles were in the first and second wars. We know why the Americans were in Vietnam. We know why they lost. We know why 57,000 Americans lives were lost. A lot of people regret the fact that the Americans went into Vietnam. But what exactly is the principle? What are we trying to defend here by allowing the Americans and others to go to war? Why are we asking Canadian men and women in the Armed Forces to put their lives at risk, to remove an aggressor from Kuwait? What kind of precedent do we have?

That is my question to the member. What kind of precedent will be set here if that is the reason why we would allow member states of the United Nations to declare war or to go to war? Would it mean that in the future, it would be acceptable if the Americans were to invade Panama or another similar country? Would the precedent be set today to allow the Soviet Union or another country to declare war on the Americans?

If we were to have another regime similar to the South African regime that supported and endorsed the system of apartheid, would that be enough? Would that be sufficient reason to allow the declaration of war? I think not. War is brutal. It is ugly. It is hideous. It is the mark of madness to support war. Frankly, I am concerned about the direction this House and the world is going with respect to this particular set of circumstances in the Middle East.

I would like to ask the member: What type of precedent will be set if this particular resolution is passed in the House and at the United Nations?

**Mr. Reimer:** Mr. Speaker, there is one point on which I can totally agree with the hon member and that is when he said: "War is brutal. It is ugly. It is hideous". There I totally agree with him. There is no question about that, and no one wants it. We are both saying the same thing.

He went on to ask what precedent was being set. He wanted to know what we were engaging in by putting this motion tonight, and then the Security Council approving the motion before the United Nations tomorrow. Was it a declaration of war.

No, it is not a declaration of war. I have read the resolution. It says that that it will authorize member states co-operating with the Government of Kuwait, that unless Iraq on or before January 1 or the 15, to be resolved tomorrow, fully implements resolution 660 and all the other 10 resolutions. Then it authorizes them to "use all necessary means to uphold and to implement the Security Council resolution 660".

The member said the only definition or interpretation he places on that is a declaration of war. That is the only one he places on that.

What it also does is send a clear signal to the Government of Iraq: "Look, we are giving you a pause of goodwill. Seize it. You can solve this problem. After all, you started it". The United Nations is saying to Saddam Hussein: "You decided in a classic case of aggression to aggress upon your unsuspecting neighbour. You did that. Now we are saying to you, for six months we will have had economic sanctions and you have not withdrawn".

Then we are saying we are now authorizing all of the member states of which there are many, not just the United States—and we are just one of over 26 others—to use all the necessary means to uphold and to implement the Security Council resolution 660. That is what it says. So, what is the principle? What is the fundamental issue at stake? Well, as I said in my comments, in my opinion the fundamental issue in the Persian Gulf is morality and international behaviour. Iraq broke it. The UN has now put in economic sanctions. The UN is now saying: "Here is another period of time. Think seriously about it because the consequences are severe". That is what we are saying.

**Mr. Ray Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** Mr. Speaker, the deliberate vagueness of this motion and the motion before the United Nations can only lead a person to conclude that this will authorize this Prime Minister to engage the Canadian Armed Forces against Iraq. I am convinced of that. I am convinced most Canadians believe that will happen. We are tonight dealing with a declaration of war.

I challenge the member for Surrey—White Rock—South Langley to debate this issue in any place in British Columbia that he chooses. They will stone him off the platform, if he has the guts to take up that challenge.

I am also convinced of how serious this is and how deceptive the Prime Minister is, that people in Canada will have to go into the streets in order to stop Canadian Armed Forces from engaging in a military action in Iraq. That is how concerned I am. That is how concerned people in the opposition are that there will be a betrayal

by this Prime Minister. He will use the Canadian Armed Forces in Iraq and he will use them without any further consent from this House of Commons. Fourteen per cent of the people in this country support this government. Everyone else holds them in nothing but contempt. It is earned contempt.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I don't know whether there is a question there. That was a comment.

I think I will allow the hon. member a short rebuttal.

**Mr. Reimer:** Mr. Speaker, just a very brief response. I am amazed at how our socialist friends can always find the right statistic to quote and all the right ones to ignore. When it comes to this issue, he uses the one statistic that is in his favour. What about looking at another that we saw on the CBC news last night, if we watched the CBC national news. It said that if we were working in concert with the United Nations, as we have from day one, then 67 per cent of Canadians support that decision. Why did he not quote that 67 per cent instead of selectively looking at one other statistic that has nothing to do with the issue before us tonight?

**Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception):** Mr. Speaker, I have sat in the Chamber all day and listened to the various comments made, and I trust the public is being instructed in precisely what is happening here. It may be difficult because I must confess to a certain amount of confusion myself as to what the points are that have been made without belittling or denigrating any of my colleagues. There are a number of issues that are under consideration here.

What I would like to do in the next 20 minutes or so is to just look at where we are now, what we have all approved in this Parliament of Canada, what it is we are debating here today, my position, some of the reasons I take that position, the position that my party has taken, and then I would like to cast ahead a little bit to the future.

Without reading the motion to which we agreed and was passed in the House, this is the point at which we are now, that this House condemn the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq, that it demand the immediate unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait and that it affirm unequivocally its support for Canada's action in the Security Council and its support for all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions adopted since August 2. This was at a point in time when that automatically included resolutions 660, 661, 663, and 664. I want to talk a little later about those resolutions.

• (2030)

We went on to say: "and for the sending of members, vessels and aircraft of the Canadian Forces to participate in the multinational military effort in and around the Arabian Peninsula, and in recognition of the seriousness of this matter, accept the undertaking of the government to present a further resolution to this House in the event of the outbreak of hostilities involving Canadian forces in and around the Arabian Peninsula."

I am not sure right now whether that is the debate that is going on. I do not believe it is. I believe there has been a disclaimer that that is the debate that is going on.

Let me move on now to what I believe we are discussing. I think there are three things before us today. There is the motion that has been put forward by the government, as amended by the Liberal Party and as further amended by the NDP. There is the United Nations resolution to which that motion refers, and that has been discussed here today. Then there is an unspoken thing that we are really thinking about, but we do not really know how to describe it because we are predicting the future. The only thing right about predicting the future is that you will probably be wrong.

We are looking at what happens after. After what? The way I see things with the positioning of forces that we have in the Persian Gulf now, with 26 nations, we are looking at 500,000 men and women, 115 ships and 1,600 aircraft. It is a large force, and it is there for what reason? I think the objective is Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait, to begin with, but I think the follow-on is important: with enough effective constraints being placed upon it so that it will not menace its neighbours again. I think that is the ultimate objective.

I am sure the government has asked itself questions about where we go from here, if indeed through the numbers that the government has this resolution is approved and is subsequently approved by the Security Council. I would like to have some indication of how our force is going to be used. Is it going to continue in the interdiction blockade role? Are we going to take more participatory action? Are we going to stay longer when Hussein gets out of Kuwait? Surely it has to end either

by peaceful means or by other means with Saddam Hussein getting out of Kuwait.

I do not know the answers to those questions, but those are questions that are called up by the motion put forward by the government and by the resolution that will be put forward and discussed in the United Nations tomorrow.

My party has rejected the motion put forward by the government for a very simple reason as discussed by my hon. colleague, the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce. It is because we are giving a blank cheque for subsequent resolutions of the United Nations. We have always supported the United Nations. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that my party has always been behind the actions of the United Nations, but only after discussions.

It has taken us from August 2 to September 25 to have the 10 resolutions that we now have. Presumably there was a lot of discussion. How can we now say: "Yes, and all follow-on discussions we will give you blank agreement for?" What we are about to embark on, whether it is this month, next month, six months or a year from now, deserves much more discussion and debate than that.

I am sure the public listened to resolutions 660, 661, 662, et cetera. We have now a total of 10 resolutions passed by the United Nations, all voted on and agreed to by Canada. Time does not permit that we go through them all, but I took the time to look at them and tried to relate them to what it is we are trying to do in the United Nations and in Iraq.

I believe the United Nations action that has taken place so far has been a model of the way the United Nations was supposed to operate and had not been able to operate because of the difficulty of the larger members of the Security Council not being able to agree.

In other words, it was the unique and remarkable unanimity of the Security Council that has allowed us to get these resolutions that we now have. We began first of all by identifying the aggressor. This was done on August 2 with resolution 660. It stated that there was a determination that a breach of international peace and security had taken place, and they condemned the Iraq invasion.

The second sequence in this drill is a call for compliance. This was achieved in resolution 661, which stated that Iraq had not complied with resolution 660 and affirmed the right of individual and collective self-defence under chapter 7 of the United Nations charter.

The next procedure was the declaration of non-military sanctions. That too was achieved by resolution 661, where it was stated that there would be an imposition of strict economic sanctions on Iraq until it complied with resolution 660.

Then the next step in the procedure was to call for compliance. This was done on August 9, a week after the invasion, and the resolution said that there was a decision that the annexation of Kuwait by Iraq was null and void and demanded that Iraq rescind its declaration of the annexation.

The next step was military sanctions. This was achieved by resolution 665 that called upon maritime forces to use such measures as may be necessary to halt all maritime shipping in order to prevent cargoes from reaching Iraq.

The next level is force. That is agreed. The next level has to be force, but only if these measures that we have discussed and that have been debated in the United Nations from August 2 to pretty well the end of September do not work.

My major concern with the resolution of the United Nations is that I believe it is too early. I have difficulty understanding why the deadline of January 15 has been used. I agree there has to be a deadline, but I would like to spend a few moments talking about the reason I have difficulty with that deadline.

It is agreed that military sanctions can work. I am not going to go through a great litany, but it goes back a long time. Britain maintained naval blockades of the main French ports during the Napoleonic Wars and they were successful. During the U.S. Civil War the union navy was unable to do a lot of things, but it was able to prevent the south from exporting cotton and getting cash so that it could buy weapons. That was a factor in determining the outcome of the Civil War. During World War I, the allies

blockaded German ports, stopping supplies of war material and food from reaching the Kaiser's realm. By the end of the war in 1918, I think it was agreed by everybody that the Germans were hungry and they were short of munitions.

There were other examples where sanctions did not work. I refer now to the invasion of Ethiopia by Italy in 1935, where the League of Nations did impose sanctions for two years and they did not work.

A set of rules has been worked out by the experts addressing the question as to whether or not these sanctions will be able to work. The determinants are not difficult. There are four questions that you use in the litmus test, if you like.

The first one is that the country under embargo must have a weak economy. Iraq is a semi-developed country. It relies on its foreign exchange for the export of oil. It imports three-quarters of its food and most of its manufactured goods. As we stand in the House today, the Iraqis have spent billions of dollars. They have difficulty. They cannot export their oil, and their foreign exchange is being spent at a rate that they cannot replace. Therefore we answer yes to the first litmus test.

• (2040)

Second, there should be a relatively small number of geographical or financial points which international action can control. Iraq is surrounded by countries that are basically friendly to us, with one exception. It has 29 miles of coastline and is looking for more. Because of the confluence and the nature of the Persian Gulf, the Gulf of Oman, and the fairly narrow Strait of Hormuz, it is an ideal country in which to operate economic sanctions.

Another test is that its domestic political conditions must a little shaky. I do not think I need to go on about that. Any country that has to use chemical warfare on its own citizens to keep them in their place would come under the guise of being a fairly shaky country.

Finally, and I think this is very important, the leaders of the international community should be as clear as possible about their own objectives, which must be widely supported. I think we have that. Certainly in my knowledge of warfare and history, this is one of the first times we have had such world order being put together by 26 countries to try to deter the aggression of another country. Force may well be necessary. I agree with those who say that we may have to use force. That is why you have armed forces, so that you can if you have to use force.

Inherent in that statement and inherent in the possibility of new world order, where we may have a United Nations policeman made up of 26 countries and all these forces to which I made reference, it is incumbent on those who do the ordering of force to try every means in the book to make sure that they have tried every possible measure, means, and avenue to ensure that force has to be used.

The embargo started in the middle of August. Wherever I turn and whatever I hear, it is indicated to me that it is going to take six months as a minimum for the embargo to bite, that is to hurt Iraq. It could take a year as a maximum before we know where we are in this situation. We will not be at six months until the middle of February. A year from August is going to be August 1991. This is why I have difficulty with the ultimatum date of January 15. It it were March 15, I may not be making the same kind of presentation this evening.

Let's have a look at some of the costs. I see the Minister of National Defence is here. This not meant as rhetoric and it is not meant to get at the government. I understand how difficult it is to cost an operation exactly. The peacetime cost to Canada is anywhere from $1 million, to $3 million, to $5 million or thereabouts per day. The real cost is in the tension, although the morale is good, created in the country by having forces there. That is the real cost.

How long can we sustain this? We can sustain the peacetime operation as long as we want. We have to suffer, as indeed we have seen last Friday. The cost of force, whether or not it works, is a tremendous estimate. It is anywhere from 250,000 casualties on both sides, 65,000 deaths, and between $65 billion and $100 billion. God knows what will happen to the oil fields and the economies and where it will stop.

World War I started with a small scrimmage on June 28, 1914 when a nationalist killed Archduke Ferdinand of Austria. I do not have to tell the House how big that became. World War II started from a fairly small thing. It started small and ended with 50 million people being killed. I am not conjuring up that kind of an image for this kind of an operation, but the implications of force are fantastic.

If I may be permitted a personal note, in an Armistice Day presentation in my riding we spoke about the remembrance of those who had given their lives in sacrifice to their country. We also talked about those in the Middle East who were preparing to fight for liberty, peace, and freedom. We all hoped that their sacrifice would be in the preparation and not in the giving.

There was a couple there, Mr. and Mrs. McGurk, whose son, Darren, was in the Middle East. Mrs. McGurk went through a terrible evening listening to this. I spoke to her afterward and assured her that this Parliament would make sure that everything in the world was done to have a peaceful settlement of this operation.

My son is an RMC graduate. He happens to be in Montreal now, but he may well be in the next contingent to go to the Middle East. He belonged to a band at RMC, The Happy Days. The lead guitarist in that band is the squadron navigator for the force in the Middle East, Lieutenant Roger Boulet, and I know him quite well.

Another member of the band serves in submarines and he may be going. I talked to him three or four days ago. His name is Chris McLaughlin. He said: "What do you think is going to happen?" I said: "Well, we are all hoping for a peaceful settlement".

In looking at the human dimension of this, there can be no greater dimension and there can be no greater motivation than to try within every single perimeter that we can put on ourselves, in Canada, in Parliament, in the United Nations, and in the world, to try to settle this peacefully.

Few of us, here in the House, have lived through the horrors of war, but most of us know about them. I think it is safe to say that democratic wars, as just as they are, are not small; they are large. They are not short; they are long. They are also bloody.

In all the considerations that the government has, all the motivations—which I am assuming and I am positive are for the right reasons—I do not subscribe to the idea that we are supporting one nation. That is an insult to the 26 nations that are there. I do not want to subscribe to that. I think we are there for the right reasons, but I implore members of the government to look at the human dimension and to seriously consider what they are doing when they stand up to vote. If they all voted, they could, in numbers, pass this motion. This is probably the biggest decision they will make in this Parliament.

**Mr. Patrick Boyer (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I found the hon. member's speech very helpful and thorough. I certainly agree with a lot of the ideas he was expressing including, in his words which were identical to the words I used in the House two hours ago, that we must still hope that there can be a peaceful resolution to this. I sincerely believe that the steps that are being deliberately taken, step by step, is the way to proceed in trying to achieve that.

The hon. member made many observations. I just want to return to one, where he was trying to clarify the meaning of the UN resolution. It struck me, while listening to him, that we had not really progressed in the debate tonight, beyond the exchange that the hon. member for Mount Royal and I had about two hours ago on whether or not this meaning is vague.

The motion refers to resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions. After that earlier exchange and my discussions this afternoon with senior people at External Affairs and elsewhere, and continuing to be concerned that there would be vagueness or uncertainty about this, I spoke this evening with the Secretary of State for External Affairs. He said that he will not support a resolution or resolutions that he has not seen and he will not ask anyone else to do that. One cannot reasonably ask people, including hon. members of the House, to discuss resolutions that do not exist or that no one has seen. This is not what the government is suggesting by its motion before this House. The government is referring to Security Council resolutions which exist or are before us, including the resolution which will be addressed at the Security Council tomorrow. No one has ever suggested that this government will not endeavour to return to this House in the future when the need for that arises. I would say that again because one of the hon. members opposite—.

• (2050)

**Mr. Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** Let's get the Minister of Defence to say that.

**Mr. Boyer:** I make that comment in response to the approach which the hon. member with his own distinguished military career has raised in this House. I hope that clarifies the point.

**Mr. Nunziata:** It doesn't. It doesn't clarify anything.

**Mr. Mifflin:** I do thank the hon. member for those comments and I am delighted that he does share this view. After all it is a very key consideration. If this has clarified it and if that is the true meaning of it, then certainly I am at least more sympathetic to the resolution as it stands. There are still some problems with it but that certainly was one of the major problems.

Again, if I could be permitted, the term 'all necessary means' has been equated by some to mean immediate force. I do not believe that, quite frankly. I am worried about the date. I am worried that there will be another debate. The hon. member, as Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, has assured me that there would be. I will take that as face value. I feel a lot more secure since he has mentioned that, and I mean that genuinely and sincerely.

All necessary means could mean a lot of things. It could mean force in the middle of September next year. There is an important element to this term and let it not be lost on the public that this surely means something to Saddam Hussein as well. I think in fairness to the government and in fairness to the resolution itself, surely that has to be one of the reasons for that term. I do not quarrel with the term. We may eventually have to use it. I do quarrel somewhat with the time.

**Mr. Howard Crosby (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not need to tell members of this House that there is a divergence of opinion amongst Canadians on our involvement in the Middle East crisis situation. There are those who would not support any military action of any kind and I understand and appreciate their view. All I can say is that it is not my view. I think it is the view espoused by the members of the New Democratic Party, but it was not the view espoused by the members of the Liberal Party when they supported the resolution on October 23, 1990. The member was one of those who did support that resolution which made our position very clear. We support the United Nations actions. We condemn the actions of Iraq. We condemn the invasion of Kuwait.

Our difficulty and problem is what we do in light of that condemnation. Our colleagues in the New Democratic Party did not share in that condemnation so they really have no issue to raise in this debate. Surely we must appeal to our colleagues in the Liberal Party to continue to support not the government but Canada in this situation. We call upon all members to support the efforts of Canada because what is at stake is the peaceful settlement of the dispute. It is not governments that are on trial. It is not ministers of defence, it is the process of peaceful settlement.

How are we going to contribute to that process? I cannot believe that the member believes defeat of a resolution proposed in this House will contribute to the process of peaceful settlement. He saw, as I did, our service people sail to the Middle East. He knows the commitment that he made. Surely he will ask himself: What can I do to support the commitment that our men in the armed forces are making.

Does he really believe that defeat of this resolution now before the House will help? We still reserve the right to make the final decision on what our forces do in the Middle East, that is the decision that will always remain in Canada. He knows that. Why would he stand there and attempt to defeat this resolution which is really in support of Canada and our Canadian forces?

**Mr. Mifflin:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. friend from Halifax West, whom I have known for many years. He is not normally this garrulous. I am surprised at his question to me because the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs has indeed suggested and clarified the difficulty I had. When I read these terms, it is the clarification the House has been seeking to ensure the compliance of the Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions up to now, that is up to October 28. He said that, if I understood him correctly, and that the support should not be interpreted as approval of the use of the Canadian forces for offensive action until there will be further consultation. He definitely said that. So, that is the subject of our amendment. What we are trying to do—

**Mr. Nunziata:** He includes tomorrow's resolution as well.

**Mr. Mifflin:** That is where we differ, then. If tomorrow's resolution is included, then that is indeed where we differ. It is a shame that it has taken six hours of debate to sort this issue out.

In response to my friend from Halifax West, I could assume that he would agree with this as well.

I find it somewhat difficult again that there has been this kind of confusion in the House. I will say to the public who are watching that these interpretations are so important that perhaps it is necessary for the Parliament of Canada to debate it word for word, sentence by sentence, phrase by phrase, so that the public does indeed appreciate what is happening. I only wish that we had had this debate before we committed our forces. Those are the kinds of questions that we could have asked and the whole operation itself could have been thought out a little more clearly. The answers to some of the questions that we are now asking could have been at least anticipated.

**Mr. Patrick Boyer (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, just very briefly, because in spite of what I thought was an effort to try to clarify this, it seems there still may be one point that is not clear.

What I said four or five minutes ago was that the government is referring in the resolution to the Security Council resolutions which exist or are before us, including the resolution that will be debated by the Security Council tomorrow. Whereas the Liberal Party amendment, I believe, refers to the date of November 28, which is today. Clearly, the intention—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I think that I am certainly confused by what is going on here. What we seem to get from one Liberal member, the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, is a very clear statement that the Liberal Party is opposed to this resolution.

Now, we hear from the hon. member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception, in response to the parliamentary secretary's assurances that it is—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Ms. Hunter:** I am trying, if you would give me a chance, to clarify for the Canadian public, and I think that is the very least we can do when the issue we are talking about is going to war. If there are divisions in the House, I think they should be exposed.

I would like the hon. member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception to please indicate how he will be voting if the Liberal amendment fails? Is he going to vote in a different way than the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce?

**Mr. Mifflin:** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure why the hon. member is so exercised about this.

**An hon. member:** There's the enemy right there.

**Mr. Mifflin:** She is exercised at the government, I hope.

I think I made it very clear in my comments that I am not going to support a motion that says I signed a blank cheque, irrespective of what has been said. The hon. member is asking me if I would approve the understood version of the government's motion, that is, to approve the UN security resolution, whatever the next one is? Is that the question she is asking?

• (2100)

I think I made it very clear. I have great reservations with that. Normally I do not support something on which I have those reservations.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I have just one very short comment and question for my colleague.

First of all, I want to congratulate our gallant colleague for his remarks earlier today. I want to bring just one issue to the attention of my colleague. He indicated in his remarks that there might be a point in the future, regrettably, where force will be necessary, but we have not reached that point yet.

I think he said that first we must do everything that we can in order to ensure that force is not used.

I just want to remind the House of an expression used by our leader earlier today when he said—

[*Translation*]

"Every possible effort must be made to find a peaceful solution".

[*English*]

In other words, we must turn the world upside down if we have to in order to try to find a peaceful solution. To me, those words were very well put. In other words, we must not spare anything. We must try everything that we can. I think my colleague has told us that we have not reached that point yet. I want him to confirm that very clearly to all members, particularly the one who was

asking a question a moment ago, obviously not having listened as well as she could have, and perhaps for all Canadians, as well, who want to be sure what it is that we stand for.

I am sure I am clear, but at least I want that member who did not hear correctly to be sure as well.

**Mr. Mifflin:** Mr. Speaker, you have been very indulgent and I would like to thank you for that. I do not believe that we have reached the point when we have to use force.

Yet I cannot predict the events. Knowing what I know now, projecting it into the future and relying on the economic sanctions that we are using as a tool, I do not believe we will be ready by January 15.

I am going to end by once more saying that history has shown that democratic wars are not short and small. They are long, big and bloody.

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, being able to observe this debate both in the House and as it is being broadcast, I can assure you and the Canadian public that this is a worth-while debate.

I have some concern about the context in which the resolution we are debating here and the amendments that have been placed by the two opposition parties to the motion that has been put forward by the government. I think it would be important to read the motion that has been put forward by the government:

> That this House, noting that the Government of Iraq has not complied with the United Nations Security Council resolutions concerning the invasion of Kuwait and the detention of the third country nationals, supports the United Nations in its efforts to ensure compliance with Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions.

Canada is a relatively fortunate country. We have little direct military threat. We have great opportunity because of that to play a part in the world that other countries are not allowed to play because of their circumstance and the region within which they are located.

We have an opportunity to work towards a more stable and peaceful world and a better international order. Typically, we have done this through multilateral agreements and alliances. We participate as a country in collective defence arrangements with like-minded nations. We participate, as an example, in NATO. We participate in NORAD.

As a matter of fact, although being large in mass, Canada would not be considered a country of large military capacity. Therefore, we rely on the support of other nations for our own security. We join with other nations to have a secure Canada. I think it is important to understand that in the context of today and in the context of the aggression that Iraq has perpetrated upon Kuwait.

Canada has had opportunities to become involved in resolving disputes. The Canadian forces have joined in some 26 different peacekeeping operations in the world. Some 80,000 members of the Canadian forces have been involved in peacekeeping operations since the Second World War. Canada has participated in all but one of the United Nations peacekeeping missions. As a matter of fact, 78 members of the Canadian Armed Forces have been killed while participating in peacekeeping duties.

We have to take a look at the multilateral operations for collective security that we are discussing today. The last opportunity to be involved under the flag of the United Nations was the Korean war. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that because of the increase in tensions and east-west mistrust and lack of confidence since the Korean war, the United Nations has not been able to act with strength, concert or unity up until this time.

What allowed the United Nations to act this time with the strength it has shown and with the principles that are embedded in its charter for the first time in 40 years was the demise of the cold war. That came about because like-minded nations had the NATO alliance which was strong and steadfast and which assisted in bringing about the end of the cold war.

When we view the current crisis, the original dispute was about production quotas of oil. This escalated as Iraq revived some old territorial claims against Kuwait. As negotiations did not seem to progress, Saddam Hussein started a build-up of his military might along the border of Iraq and Kuwait. This dispute became the subject of intense negotiations and efforts on behalf of the countries in the region. As a matter of fact, Saddam Hussein assured President Mubarak of Egypt that there would not be an invasion of Kuwait and shortly thereafter when

the Iraqi negotiators walked out of the negotiations, Iraq launched its massive invasion of Kuwait.

Since that time Iraq has proclaimed a comprehensive and internal merger between Iraq and Kuwait, offering a series of justifications for its behaviour.

I have heard members from the opposition talk about the action of the United States in Panama. I suggest to them that the United States is not and has not annexed Panama. I suggest to them that the United Nations has withdrawn from Panama. I could suggest to the hon. members that they are comparing apples and oranges and that their visceral distrust and their visceral hatred of our friends across the border sometimes allows them to be carried away with their rhetoric.

But what kind of a nation are we dealing with when we are dealing with Iraq? The hon. member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception just spoke. He identified four points around which he built his argument as to why the sanctions should be allowed to continue and why he believed that they would work in the long run because, as he said, he would accept the use of force reluctantly if there was more time to apply sanctions.

• (2110)

I suggest that his argument would have some justification with a lot of countries and a lot of regimes. But I think the third point in his argument was that they must have a shaky political regime. He suggested that that was the case in Iraq.

Perhaps that would be the case in ordinary circumstances but when you have a leader who uses chemical weapons on his own people; when you have a leader who entered an eight-year war, where a whole generation of teenagers between the ages of 16 to 25 were removed permanently from the population; when you have a leader who refuses to recognize the well-being of his own people; when you have a leader who dominates and controls his people by summary execution; when you have a leader who does not rely on what we would consider to be ordinary norms, then I would say that unless the hon. member really believes Saddam Hussein has a greater feeling for the Iraqi people than he does for the occupation of Kuwait, he cannot accept the fact that sanctions will work on Saddam Hussein as they would on other people.

I draw this to his attention because I know the member understands force and he understands and has said that he would reluctantly accept the use of force if there had been a proven time for sanctions to work.

It is important to understand what we are dealing with. There has to be some limit to the drive that we have seen for the military dominance of the region by Iraq. There has to be a demonstrated willingness by the rest of the world to put a stop to it.

There is a calloused disregard for human life that is not to be accepted in our society or other societies. These 10 resolutions are the most powerful statements of the United Nations Charter since its inception. I believe what the Government of Canada and like-minded nations have done has added to the support and the strength of the United Nations.

For the first time since its inception, the true characteristics that were enunciated in the United Nations Charter to provide peace, security and stability in the world have been enunciated in those 10 resolutions against Iraq.

I want to go on about our own response. Canada's response has traditionally been to provide forces to multinational organizations, and always in the pursuit of a more peaceful and stable world. That is what we debated in this House earlier. That is what the majority of the members of this House agreed should take place.

I would suggest that the speed in which Canada responded, both with its naval and air operations, which were set up under very challenging circumstances, are an appropriate response for a middle-sized power such as Canada.

Members of the House and the public should be aware that although our naval force in the Gulf makes up only 3 per cent of the naval assets in the gulf region, it is doing 22 per cent of the work. As of yesterday, they had been involved in some 1,000 interdictions and hailings and they have been involved in some 8 boardings. The men and women who are serving there, not missing one day on station, are doing a superb job and they are doing it with the professionalism that we all expect of them. When one looks at the CF-18 squadron, which is located in Qatar, one recognizes its ability to change its daily

activity and the numbers of sorties, to constantly keep from 17 to 18 aircraft in operation in a difficult climate and provide cover for ships within that Persian Gulf region.

When we look at the buildup of the Iraqi army, we have to ask, why is it there? As King Fahd said, why was the army built up on the border of Saudi Arabia? Why was the Iraqi army there? Saudi Arabia was not going to attack Iraq so, obviously, one must ask the question, why? I think the answer is quite obvious. There was a determined pattern in Iraq's aggression against Kuwait and it has continued to work toward a military dominance of the region, which is resisted by other countries in that region.

We look at the difference between the conflict, as Canada sees it. We have been opposed to conflict in other areas; we have brought forward resolutions, stating that opposition; we have been involved in peacemaking. I have trouble with some members who would say that peacemaking is not part of peacekeeping tradition. It flows, naturally, in a democracy that is proud of its peacekeeping heritage, as we should be, that peacemaking also is an important part of Canada's heritage and our tradition and is consistent with bringing about a more stable and peaceful world.

When I take a look at the resolution that I see here, and in the United Nations, the resolution commits us to no change in our current status. I hear the members on the other side talking about blank cheques, but I tell you that it commits us to no change in our operations. What it does is send a signal to Saddam Hussein that those countries which have joined together in the United Nations to condemn his aggression, starting with UN resolution 660 and the other nine resolutions that have followed to this point, will not allow him and the Iraqi army to occupy a small country which had legitimate borders, just as Canada's borders are legitimate, which were invaded, occupied and annexed.

I have a lot of trouble with the argument that we should wait before applying more pressure, because what this resolution that will be voted on tomorrow at the United Nations does is give a signal to Saddam Hussein, the Iraqi people and the army of Iraq, that their future is in their own hands, that the world has condemned their action, that the world will respect the legitimate borders of Kuwait, and that that effort and that conviction by the world powers can only lead to one thing: either Saddam Hussein believes that he has to remove himself or he believes that the world will take whatever steps are necessary to restore the legitimate borders of Kuwait.

• (2120)

I believe that the UN resolution is appropriate to the traditions of the UN, particularly to the UN Charter. Obviously, it is not just my belief or Canada's belief, it is a belief of the assembled nations in the United Nations. It is not U.S. led, as our friends in the New Democratic Party would say. That is an affront to all the other nations which are presently in the gulf, all the other nations which have voted to condemn Iraq, all the other nations which are going to vote in support of the UN resolution tomorrow.

**Mr. Keyes:** Wrong.

**Mr. McKnight:** I see the member from Toronto is talking from his seat. His party has consistently said to the government: "Why don't you co-operate with the United Nations?" Tomorrow we are going to co-operate with the United Nations. The Liberal Party is condemning the government for doing just what it suggested we should do.

I suggest this is a difficult time. I really have concern about some of the members in the Official Opposition. I know they find the resolution that has been put forward by their leader difficult to support. They have to understand that any change in the mandate of the Canadian forces deployment in the Persian Gulf will only be consistent with the capabilities of the Canadian forces. I can assure hon. members that if there is a change in the mandate, it will be raised in the House of Commons if and when that time comes.

What the hon. members are saying now to the government is to assume—

**Mr. Caccia:** You didn't do it last summer.

**Mr. McKnight:** They say we did not do it the last time. We had a debate. The hon. member from Newfoundland referred to the debate. I know the hon. member from Toronto was not able to take part in it. It would be interesting reading, I am sure, if he had.

As things currently stand, the government along with the people of Canada, as it has from the start, hopes there is a peaceful resolution to this aggression.

**Mr. Caccia:** Declaring war.

**Mr. McKnight:** The members talk about declaring war. I have one final point. I suggest to them and to the members in the New Democratic Party that war was declared on August 2 when Iraq invaded Kuwait. The world is now condemning that action and is prepared to legitimize the borders of Kuwait. I ask them to support the government in its efforts.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I have five questioners in 10 minutes. I will start with the hon. member for Winnipeg—St. James, then South West Nova, the hon. member for Portneuf, Davenport and Victoria.

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James):** Mr. Speaker, all of us want a peaceful solution. There is no doubt about that. However, we have to live with this resolution that is on the floor.

What this resolution demands of us parliamentarians is that we endorse the use of force. That raises the question that I would like to put to the Minister of National Defence. How far do you go with this particular kind of force and to what end?

With respect to the use of force, does the hon. Minister of National Defence tolerate or endorse any kind of force? Is this government in support of wiping out the entire country of Iraq? Is the government prepared to level Baghdad? Is it prepared to wipe out maybe tens of thousands, if not scores of thousands of Iraqis and Kuwaitis? Is that the position of this government? I think it behoves this government to make itself absolutely clear as to how far it is prepared to go with this kind of force. I do not think the government should be asking us to buy some pig in the poke. When you ask us to use force, you better be very explicit how far you are prepared to go.

The other thing is to what end? Is it your end by using force that you are to settle this dispute once and for all? Does this government think for a moment that it can wipe out Hussein who is a despot, a despicable creature? Does it believe that if it wipes out all his generals and armies, that will be the end, there will be nothing more, the disputes will be settled, calm will set in and there will be peace? Or do you think perhaps that that would just simply—

**Mr. McKnight:** Do you want an answer?

**Mr. Harvard:** —deliver instability in the region? In fact, maybe the confrontation will actually spread.

It is incumbent upon this minister to come absolutely clean.

**Mr. McKnight:** If the hon. member's logic matched his rhetoric, I would not stand up and answer the question because it would be very difficult.

The member for Winnipeg—St. James talked about the use of force. I want to read to him the draft of the UN Security Council resolution. Point 2 authorizes member states co-operating with the Government of Kuwait, unless Iraq, on or before January 15, 1991, fully implements, as set forth in paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions: To use all necessary means to uphold and implement Security Council resolution 660, and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security to the area.

No one wants war. The hon. member throws his hands up and goes like this.

**An hon. member:** Then start answering.

**Mr. McKnight:** I ask the members opposite: What is your alternative?

**An hon. member:** Economic sanctions.

**Mr. McKnight:** What is your alternative?

**Some hon. members:** Sanctions.

**Mr. McKnight:** I hear the bark and the cries of "sanctions, sanctions". I want to ask the hon. members how long we should allow Kuwait—

**Mr. Keyes:** As long as it takes.

**Mr. McKnight:** I see. One of the Liberal members says "As long as it takes". Two years? Three years? While Iraq occupies a sovereign nation? What the hon. member is saying is that the use of the United Nations and the original Charter of the United Nations to bring about peace and security in the world—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Order, please. I was very kind with the hon. member. He asked a couple of questions. There are other people here who would like to ask the hon. minister some questions. Would you please allow them to ask and get an answer to their questions. The hon. member for South West Nova.

**Mrs. Campbell (South West Nova):** Mr. Speaker, my question will be quite short because I know there are others who want to speak. I do not think there is anybody in this House who has any dispute with the process of the United Nations to date.

The government is proposing a motion to go with subsequent resolutions, one of which may be passed tomorrow. One cannot prejudge what those 15 people in the Security Council will do tomorrow.

The government wants us to pass a draft resolution to give it sanction to go ahead. It can then come back tomorrow and say: "We passed that resolution here in this House". I think Canadians are smarter than that.

On top of that, this wording is vague. I do not want to repeat the minister but he referred to No. 2 in the resolution. I want to ask him about "to use all necessary means to uphold the existing and subsequent resolutions". This is the part that galls me. Let us pass that resolution. Let the UN pass it tomorrow, if it goes in this form, to restore international peace and security in the area.

• (2130)

I ask the minister: Are our troops there today for that reason? Is that what the Order in Council said? Or, is the minister going to bring in a new Order in Council next week to change the reasons why our troops are there? There are 26 member states in the gulf. Any one of them can use their interpretation of this and start the war that we are talking carelessly about here. The economic sanctions that were put in place at the UN have not been given the time. I ask him that question for the sake of Canadians out there.

The Order in Council said that it was for economic sanctions in the shipping. I cannot see that we should be even debating future resolutions before they are even passed in the UN. We should not even be talking about restoring international peace when our troops are not over there. They are only 3 per cent. Yes, I know they are good troops. I come from an area where they are trained. I am all for that training.

I think Canadians have a right to know why they are over there. I thought it was to keep the economic sanctions, not for a proposed resolution that may not get passed.

**Mr. McKnight:** Mr. Speaker, I thought I made it clear, as I concluded my address, that if there were a change in the mandate of the Canadian Forces we would have it raised in the House. I do not know what else I could say to the hon. member.

We have indicated that we will provide an opportunity for further debate if there is a change in the mandate of the Canadian Forces. What we are asking the House, and what we would have expected of the hon. members opposite, would be to support the United Nations and the charter that founded that organization, and not to abuse this opportunity provided by the government after there was a request.

A request came from the opposition suggesting that there should be a debate and the government said yes, we would welcome this debate. We have become involved in the debate, and now the members of the opposition are saying that the debate is taking place at an inopportune time, that this is not a good time for this debate.

I would suggest that the time for the debate and the support of the members in this House should be concentrated on the support of the United Nations which, for the first time in 40 years, has been able to bring the member states together, and take a stand that is totally consistent with the charter on which it was founded.

I would expect hon. members to support the government and the men and women who are serving the Canadian forces, to support the United Nations Charter, and to support what the United Nations wishes to do with the world, that is make it a more stable and peaceful place. I cannot believe that the members opposite do not wish to do that.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Marc Ferland (Portneuf):** During the week of November 13 to 17, Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to visit the Canadian forces in the Persian Gulf along with my colleagues from Victoria and Labrador. I was able to see for myself that the morale of our troops was good and that they were doing an outstanding job. I also had the firm impression that the military are fully conscious of their role and of the significance of their presence there.

When we came back last week, we three decided to hold a small press conference and, in the last paragraph of the release we all agreed on, we said: "We urge the government and all parties to take a unified approach so

that the opinion of Canadians on the international scene will carry more weight and so that our troops in the gulf and our team with the United Nations will have the full support they deserve".

I would like to know whether the minister agrees with me and my two opposition colleagues to say that it is of the utmost importance at this time to obtain the support of all members of Parliament so that the Canadian position will be clearly heard throughout the world and that, above all, our troops, the men and women now stationed in the gulf area, will have the clear impression that all Canadians and particularly their Parliament are behind them.

[*English*]

**Mr. McKnight:** I agree, Mr. Speaker, with my colleague. I compliment him on taking the time from his recess, along with two colleagues, to visit the Canadian troops in the Persian Gulf area. I want to thank him on their behalf for that effort.

What I think is important is what my colleague concluded with. By putting forward this resolution and asking for support of the United Nations sanctions and United Nations actions, what we were hoping to do would be to show Saddam Hussein that Canada among the majority of countries in the Security Council was—

**Mr. Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** Mr. Speaker, it might be a bit presumptuous to suggest that this question and answer period began at 9.20 p.m. and it is now 9.35 p.m. We are looking at 15 minutes. The government decided on a deadline here. I gather there are a number of approved speakers who would like to make speeches. If we could limit the period to strictly 10 minutes, we could then accommodate the established group of speakers in the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I must say that it was because it was the Minister of National Defence that I felt I should extend the questions and comments for another couple of minutes.

I am at your disposal. I have one more questioner, and that would be it for the Minister of National Defence. Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. McKnight:** Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to be brief. By using the United Nations and gathering support from the world for increased pressure and condemnation of the action is an important part in getting Saddam Hussein to recognize the world is against his aggression in Kuwait.

What the members opposite are doing is giving him comfort. What they are saying is that they are not against his aggression in Kuwait, and they do not support—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. McKnight:** —the removal of Saddam Hussein from Kuwait.

**Mr. Nunziata:** You are a war monger.

**Mr. McKnight:** The member says that I am a war monger. I draw to his attention that the United Nations, which they say they support, is taking an action to remove an aggressor from a smaller country. Members opposite are saying that the United Nations should not be supported in its action, and the Government of Canada is saying that it should be supported.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member for Davenport.

**Mr. Caccia:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence, but I do not want to abuse the rules. We are running out of time, so I will defer to a later opportunity.

**Mr. Boudria:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry to use up just a moment of the House's time but, in conformity with what we have done in the past, I want to indicate that after the next speaker, the hon. member for Hamilton West, other Liberal members tonight will be speaking in two successive 10-minute slots for the rest of the evening, if that is agreeable to the House.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bellemare:** Mr. Speaker, since the minister has made a speech and is still in the House it would be interesting if we could extend the question period. Other members who will take the floor will certainly have interesting comments to make, but if we ask questions to our colleagues we will get nothing but rhetoric and their answers will not be as specific as those of the minister. I wonder if it would be possible, with the agreement of my

colleagues on both sides, to continue to ask questions to the minister.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** No.

• (2140)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** No. There is no consent. The hon. member for Hamilton West has the floor on debate.

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, I find it quite ironic that we are prepared to ask the Minister of Defence very important questions instead of asking other members across the way. We achieved almost unanimous consent until the NDP decided we did not want to ask any more questions of the Minister of Defence. That is intolerable.

The Prime Minister declared while speaking on the motion dispatching Canadian troops to the Persian Gulf on September 24, that Canadians have never looked for a free ride and would not begin to. I want to begin my remarks with a plea to the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Minister of Defence to exercise patience, to re-examine our role in the Persian Gulf. Take a step back.

Unlike governments before him, the Prime Minister's refusal to recall Parliament once our troops were given their orders further illustrates the Prime Minister's unilateral and cavalier attitude toward Canadian public opinion. That action has brought discredit on this country, which has turned a country once highly praised for seeking peaceful solutions to world problems into a subservient partner of American militarism.

This House will remember that even recently deposed Margaret Thatcher recalled the British Parliament in order to deal with the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq; the French National Assembly in Paris was similarly recalled, but not our Parliament, not our Prime Minister. He was in Kennebunkport, Maine, with George Bush, absorbing, agreeing, and then regurgitating the policies of the American way.

I wanted to speak on this matter earlier this fall, but the debate was extremely short, despite pledges that the House would give ample time and opportunity to discuss the matter. Part of that earlier motion before this House called on Parliament to affirm its support for resolutions adopted by the United Nations Security Council, which imposed sanctions against Iraq over the invasion and occupation of Kuwait. I supported those resolutions. The actions of the Iraqis are reprehensible and are to be condemned. Sanctions are a necessary component of forcing Iraq out of the sovereign state of Kuwait. However, I do not support the resolution which will go before the United Nations Security Council tomorrow, nor do I support the blank cheque, through this blanket motion before us tonight in the House.

In fact, for 18 of the 20 minutes I listened to the Minister of National Defence I did not have much argument with his speech until the last couple of minutes when he enunciated, and made it quite clear that we had to support the resolution, referring to the last three words, "and subsequent resolutions".

Canadians are simply looking to the Minister of National Defence and the Conservative Party to spell out the end of the resolution. That is what the motion by my colleague is prepared to do.

The resolution which will be voted on tomorrow in the Security Council demands that Iraq withdraw from Kuwait by January 15, 1991. It "authorizes member states—to use all necessary means to uphold and implement resolutions 660 and, subsequent resolutions and"—this is a caveat, "to restore international peace and security in the area". Members of this House will know that Canadians—especially Canadians tonight—should know that, if passed, this resolution does not create a United Nations force to kick Iraq out of Kuwait. There would be no direction from the United Nations for any military action. No, the United States would be at the head of any military operation along with its allies, which include Canada. The resolution would merely rubber-stamp the desire to expel Iraq by force.

The caveat is that the resolution has been framed in such a way that it authorizes those nations that have troops and weapons in the Gulf against Saddam to restore international peace and security in the area. This resolution can be construed no other way than not only to permit the expulsion of Iraq from Kuwait by force, but also to continue the battle in Iraq for who knows how long?

Iraq knows it has to go, but stands defiant against the currents of international condemnation. By the time Iraq uses up supplies in its country, it will still take about a year for the sanctions to take their full effect. Analysts have confirmed this to be so. I do not support the ultimatum that says, unless Iraq withdraws, it will be forced out with tanks, fighter jets, bombs, and who knows what else.

Canada has not given the sanctions enough time to work. We keep hearing, how long? We heard it from the Secretary of State for External Affairs. We heard it again from the Minister of National Defence. How long? I screamed out from this side of the House "as long as it takes". The minister said: "What if it takes two years?" Well, what if it takes two years? Is it worth the lives of hundreds of thousands of individuals? We know that is a possibility. We know that the U.S. is going to embark on an air strike. We hear through our television sets and the national news from the United States that that is the way they have to proceed and they would rather not use ground troops. They say: "Let's get them from the air. Let's get them from the sea".

In a Toronto newspaper today, Canadians read the Prime Minister's statement that sanctions are working. The Prime Minister said yesterday that "we seek to defend the interests and the integrity of the United Nations and that we seek to assist in the deterrence of aggression". A curious statement. The Prime Minister, if I have this straight, seeks to assist in the deterrence of aggression with the threat of aggression. Is this Canada talking? No, this is the U.S. talking, a country that has been badgering other nations of the world to fall into line.

In our new and modern world of instant communications and new found democratic freedoms, world-wide war, or even the threat of war, is not the answer. In fact, the prevention of war is one of the founding goals of the United Nations, and I will get to that in a moment.

The trade-offs have been enormous. One day, not a month ago, the Soviet Union's Mikhail Gorbachev declared that time should be given for the sanctions to work. After pleas to the U.S. for aid in helping to stave off a looming famine, Gorbachev is now onside. Such delicate diplomacy usually takes weeks, but the trade-off was made.

China, disgraced by the actions taken at Tiananmen Square, now holds the trump card. As a permanent member of the Security Council, and therefore with a veto over any decisions taken by it, China has promised something, too. Will the American sanctions imposed on China after Tiananmen be lifted, resulting in China abstaining tomorrow. Not vetoing the resolution tomorrow, but abstaining at tomorrow's meeting?

• (2150)

The Secretary of State for External Affairs proclaims, that although he does not like deadlines, he and the government are prepared to back the American call for an ultimatum. Why? The U.S. loses its presidency at the Security Council on Friday, so it wants to push ahead, full steam ahead. But should Canada be prepared to act so hastily?

Canada should be at the forefront of diplomatic efforts right now, not abetting those who would go to war. As the pot is about to boil over, Canada is right there turning up the heat. Should Canada follow along in that pressure-cooker atmosphere of American politics and agree to an early date for a military strike against Iraq? No. There has been no decision and no debate, despite what the Prime Minister says. He and his Conservative government are prepared to support the ultimatum, to go to war, needlessly.

**An hon. member:** What are the Liberals talking about? Appeasement.

**Mr. Keyes:** The hon. members asks if the Liberals are talking about appeasement. No. We are asking that we continue the resolutions of sanctions, that sanctions can and will work if given time.

The Conservative government has reached the limits of its absurdity. The Prime Minister rules by Order in Council. He has divorced Canada, for the sake of cosying up to the United States, from our traditional role in international diplomacy, that of occupying the middle ground, not because we are too weak to occupy any other place, but because we were interested in the welfare of international peace and security.

What has happened to our traditional role, our peacekeeping role? In this situation, Canada has lost that golden opportunity to exercise its influence on the other nations which make up the Security Council.

The United Nations was born out of the carnage of the Second World War. The first sentence of the preamble of the United Nations Charter states:

> We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind—

Again, I say to the Minister of Defence, if it takes two years, we continue sanctions. The preamble then calls on member nations:

> —to practice tolerance and live in peace with one another as good neighbours—

I say, not only is our government forgetting the important place Canada has occupied in international diplomacy, but members of the United Nations are forgetting these important words in the Charter. I stress the word "tolerance" because that is what we are debating tonight. That is what the government is ignoring. United Nations resolutions are not some kind of blank cheque to be used by those able to coerce others into their schemes. Of course, part of the intention of the United Nations Charter is to ensure that armed forces not be used, save in the common interest. We must ask ourselves, is the use of all necessary means—let us be honest here, it is the use of force—truly in the common interests of all UN members. Second, is this of such importance that the guiding principle of tolerance be ignored? Tolerance should be given the greatest opportunity. As the great historian, Edmund Burke, noted: "Our patience will achieve more than our force".

Through the motion before us here today, the government is seeking tacit approval of its actions. Should the House approve this motion, it will be interpreted by the Prime Minister as an approval for the Parliament of Canada to use all necessary means to enact punishment on Iraq.

The motion reads:

> That this House, noting that the Government of Iraq has not complied with the United Nations Security Council resolutions concerning the invasion of Kuwait and the detention of third country nationals, supports the United Nations in its efforts to ensure compliance with Security Council resolution 660 and—

—here is the caveat, again—

> —all subsequent resolutions.

We cleared that up a little bit here this evening, not too long ago. All subsequent resolutions does not mean the resolutions we have brought forward to the 28th of this month, but what will happen tomorrow and beyond?

By carefully couching its words with this blanket search for approval of military force, the government has not been as clever as it had hoped. The wolf in sheep's clothing has been exposed. Yes, we denounce Iraq's action. We denounce the detention of third country nationals. But we also denounce the attempt by the government to manipulate this important and sensitive issue and denounce its unwillingness to prevail over others, show leadership, and allow cooler heads to prevail.

We, in the Liberal Party, support the United Nations in its efforts to encourage understanding and peace among all member nations. In addition, solidarity between member nations is required if UN resolutions, such as the sanctions presently under discussion, are to have effect. But they must be left in effect.

This being said, it is not enough for member nations of the UN, such as Canada, to operate under the current multinational military effort. Canada, as well as other countries involved in this military effort, must only take direction under the auspices of a co-operative United Nations force. Now is the time. We have the opportunity as members of the Security Council to further enhance the role of the United Nations.

The Prime Minister has taken the easy way out. He jumped on the bandwagon. I say Canada has never accepted a free ride because Canada has the global reputation of solving international problems through conciliation, patience, and thoughtful negotiations. Ours is a positive agenda, not a reactionary one. The Liberal Party believes that, apart from the Security Council resolutions, primacy must be given to the United Nations to negotiate an end to the crisis.

The Prime Minister attempts to justify his arbitrary actions by pointing to history. Canada has never been faint of heart, he says. Well, no one denies Canada's capacity to defend freedom. Canadian soldiers have paid the supreme sacrifice, but always in the knowledge that their government tried everything in its power to resolve the situation peacefully before sending them away from their homes, their families, and their country.

Canada has participated in many officially sanctioned United Nations peacekeeping forces. Perhaps the most memorable to Canadians was the participation of Canada in the United Nations Temporary Commission for Korea. In June, 1950, Parliament was still sitting and the Liberal government of the day took great pains to keep the House informed of developments, including the use of Canadian military forces. In fact, when the Canadian military was requested to participate in a UN force, that is, one with UN helmets, clothing, et cetera, the announcement was made here in Parliament. It was done with the full opportunity to discuss the issue. Parliament was subsequently recalled later that summer in August for an emergency session to deal specifically with events in Korea. The traditions in respect of Parliament were upheld and the view was that Canada would not fight for Korea, but for the United Nations and the principle of collective security.

I see by the clock, Mr. Speaker, I only have a minute left, so I would like to summarize.

Let us not forget that Canada could go to war. Our troops are already shoulder to shoulder with the Americans, as deep as you can get in the Persian Gulf. We are on the front-line. As what? Peacekeepers? Or order takers? God forbid the worst scenario comes true, we will have no alternative but to take our orders from George Bush.

Canada was not even a member of the Security Council when Canadian forces were sent to Korea under the UN flag. Now that Canada is a member of the Security Council, it has a special and valued opportunity to defend a multinational force. By jumping on the bandwagon called the multinational military force, Canada has lost that golden opportunity to be respected, to be counted on as the initiator of independent, thoughtful diplomacy. Failure to do so is nothing short of shameful.

• (2200)

**Hon. Alan Redway (Minister of State (Housing)):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words this evening with respect to the motion before the House, which reads:

> That this House, noting that the Government of Iraq has not complied with the United Nations Security Council resolutions concerning the invasion of Kuwait and the detention of third country nationals, supports the United Nations in its efforts to ensure compliance with Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today, outside the Parliament Buildings, there was a sign held by a number of Canadians which read, "Canada is for Peace not War". I think that that very well sums up my own personal feelings, the feelings of all of my colleagues on the government benches and I know, from the parts of the debate that I have heard in the House this evening, that it certainly sums up the feelings of the opposition members. I truly believe it sums up the feelings of all Canadians. Canada is indeed for peace and is certainly not for war.

This feeling has not burst forth in the last day or two, it is something that has been around for many, many years. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, as I do, the days of the early and middle 1980s in particular, when one of the principal concerns if not, perhaps, the principal concern of Canadians was the whole question of peace of disarmament. The desire for peace and disarmament heightened a fear that we would be engaged in a nuclear holocaust, a fear that there would be an escalation of the cold war, and concerns about nuclear missiles in Europe.

Those concerns led to the establishment of many groups and committees dedicated to peace and the cause of peace in Canada and around the world. I am sure that in every constituency in this country there are a number of these peace committees. Certainly in my own constituency, the East York Peace Committee has been established for many years and makes its points exceedingly well on this principle that Canada is for peace and Canada is not for war.

You will recall as well, Mr. Speaker, that during the 1980s there was a tremendous amount of focus in the schools, a lot of classes where the teachers focused on many, many occasions on this issue of peace and disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament. It parallels one of the phenomena that we have right at the moment where, in many of our schools, we have teachers focusing on the environment and environmental issues, as the hon. member for Davenport is well aware.

The issue of peace and not war is certainly not a new one but it really boils down, not really to the question of whether people are for peace or war because I think we would agree, unanimously, that we are all for peace but, as there was at that time, there is a legitimate difference of opinion on how peace can best be achieved. Of course in the 1980s, there were those who argued that peace could best be achieved by not only disarmament but unilateral disarmament. Perhaps by disarming ourselves

first, that would inspire others to disarm and lay down their arms as well. On the other hand, there were many who believed that the only way to achieve true lasting peace and disarmament at that time was through some form of negotiated, balanced and verifiable arrangements in order to reduce armaments and arrive at peace.

It was that difference of opinion that characterized the discussions that related to the peace issue during the 1980s. Both sides had the same objectives as far as I can see. What they did was disagree on the best way of achieving peace and disarmament.

There were a good many flash points or points that raised concerns on both sides of the House and at times there were different parties on both sides of the House making the points in different ways. Hon. members will recall the debates over cruise missile testing, something that from time to time still rises to the surface. There were debates over whether or not NATO should increase the number of nuclear missiles in Europe during that time and that generated very heated debates.

As well, those debates brought into question the very issue of NATO itself and whether we should be supporting NATO or withdrawing from it altogether. All of these issues are not really new ones and we have been living with them for a long time. Certainly in recent years they have been at the top of the agenda.

At the same time, fortunately, the cold war has now apparently come to an end in eastern Europe and the U.S.S.R. In Berlin itself the walls have come down. The Iron Curtain has been removed and now we have agreements on troop withdrawals from Germany, we have agreements on nuclear arms reduction, we have agreements on conventional arms reduction. Interestingly enough, the Soviet Union which for so many years was viewed as the enemy is now considered to be not the enemy but our friend.

There are again legitimate disagreements on what role, if any, NATO and what role, if any, Canada's part in NATO played in bringing about those events of the walls coming down and bringing about a situation where the Soviet Union is now our friend and not our enemy. There are many who feel quite strongly that NATO was a minimal part or perhaps no part at all. Personally, I believe that it played a very important part in the entire process. It played a part in halting potential aggression. It means that we stood firm and united with our allies and it allowed for those negotiated, balanced and verifiable arms reduction agreements to take place and to become reality. Hopefully we will see a time before too long when there will not be any weapons, conventional or nuclear in Europe or perhaps, hopefully, anywhere in the world.

By playing a role in that process, Canada was making a significant and a continuing contribution to our military defence force in Europe, which for that matter is still in Europe, through many years. Because we were playing that role, were involved and made a commitment, not just a commitment in words but a commitment in forces and troops, we had a voice in policy. We had a voice in influencing the disarmament positions of NATO and, for that matter, of the United States.

• (2210)

I would like to contrast that with what happened in New Zealand. New Zealand decided to opt for a position in which they banned United States military ships from the harbours of New Zealand on the basis that they might be carrying nuclear weapons. New Zealand took a stand on this issue.

In effect, New Zealand opted out of playing a role within the council of nations of the western world who were trying to bring about the peace and disarmament for which we all strive. In my view at least, New Zealand became irrelevant in that entire process.

The situation in the Persian Gulf as it now stands and the situation at that time have a good many parallels. Canadians want peace and not war. Again, they differ on the best way of achieving this. It is not just a debate that goes on in this House, it is a debate that rages probably in all of our constituencies. Each and every one of us has heard from constituents, perhaps not all the same way as I have, but I am sure opinions have been voiced on both sides of the issue, with a few shades in between.

I have heard from many who are most concerned about the fact that Canada is in the Persian Gulf at all. Those voices and concerns are voiced by people like Father Mahoney and Vi Thompson, who are prominent members of the East York Peace Committee. They are voiced by Gary Hayes as well. He is more concerned about the financial commitment that Canada has to

make. They are also voiced by people like Helen Petrowski, Norman Vale, and Vi McIntosh.

On the other hand, there are those who take exactly the opposite position. They feel very strongly that Canada should be in the gulf and that we should be doing all that we can to resist the aggression of Iraq against Kuwait. There are people such as Richard Kerfoot, Nancy Tittel and Mr. Tooke who have all been in touch with me. Their positions are quite legitimate and understandable.

There is another group. I referred to them during the debate in late September when the issue first came before the House. This group of Canadians are of the Muslim faith, particularly Canadians who come from the Middle East. They have a point of view to bring forward on this issue. Their concerns are somewhat different from the concerns of other Canadians. I believe very strongly that they should have a forum in which to voice those concerns.

They should have a forum somewhat similar to that which was put in place with the problems in China. It was one of a consultative committee of Canadians of Chinese origin who had an opportunity to exchange views with the government, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, in particular. They had an opportunity to make their feelings and those of others with similar feelings known. At the same time they heard first hand from the Secretary of State for External Affairs the views of the government, and had an opportunity to have those explained to them.

In September, I put forth the suggestion that we have such a consultative committee. We have been working with the Secretary of State for External Affairs and his staff to put that together. I am hopeful and optimistic that it will soon be reality, and we will have an opportunity for Canadians of the Muslim faith, particularly those from the Middle East, to have a voice in the whole process relating to this issue.

While there are many different views and concerns, all of them have been legitimate and understandable. As we know from what this House has debated before and is debating now, the government has taken a position very strongly in favour or peace. At the same time it has held the belief that peace can best be achieved not by pretending that there was no aggression on the part of Iraq against Kuwait but by opposing that aggression, and by doing it under the auspices of the United Nations, by working hard to ensure that there is United Nations endorsement for any actions that are taken with respect to the Persian Gulf.

You and I know, Mr. Speaker, that of the 11 resolutions of the United Nations Security Council to date on this issue, some nine of those have been co-sponsored by Canada. Canada has played a very significant role in trying to ensure that this entire process comes under the United Nations itself.

At the same time, the government feels, and I think a great many Canadians agree, that we have to back up our specific support. That is why, we have our ships in the Gulf, our squadron of CF-18s, and Canadian military personnel there as well. Canada has been trying to work through the system, just as we did in Europe with NATO, to try to influence the system, not toward war but toward peace; to make sure that there is no unilateral action on the part of anyone, the United States or anyone else; to make sure that nothing happens there without the authority and the full sanction of the United Nations. As in the case of NATO in the 1980s, we want to apply as much pressure as possible but always for the purpose of achieving peace, not war. That is what this motion is all about tonight. It is a motion to apply pressure. It is a motion to send a signal. I believe it is a motion in keeping with the kinds of action that were taken by NATO during the 1980s with respect to the Cold War, not in an effort to start a war but really to maintain peace and achieve disarmament.

There are some differences as well between the Persian Gulf situation today in the 1990s and Europe in the 1980s. One of them quite clearly is the fact that we are dealing now with the case of unprovoked aggression on the part of Iraq. Another is the fact that the Soviet Union and virtually all of the other countries are on our side as well.

Another difference is that this time it is not just a group of western nations through NATO but the United Nations that is taking this stand against aggression. It is acting, in my view at least, as a world policeman. Perhaps

it is a very modest step in the direction of some form of world government order.

The United Nations was founded with great hope and great expectations but has been rather impotent for a long period of time. If that is going to suddenly turn around, and if we are going to have some sort of world order, then we must start acting together. We will have to start working together and start striving to apply the rule of law right across the entire world.

Canadians may not be able to agree on the kind of action that should be taken to preserve peace but I truly believe that Canadians want peace, they do not want war, and that this motion is in keeping with those expectations.

• (2220)

**Mrs. Marleau:** Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much interest to the intervention of my colleague across the floor, and I would like to make a comment, first of all, on the United Nations.

I would like to remind the people of this august Chamber that the United Nations is not a god. It is a fallible group of people representing different nations who are every bit, as if not more, political than we are, and therefore are very much capable of being influenced by different sectors of the world.

I would venture to say that we as a country,—perhaps not as powerful a country as some—should play a very key role in influencing the resolutions that might be put forward. In other words, much as I appreciate the role of the United Nations and respect its decisions, I think we have a key role to play in the decisions that it is going to take.

That is not giving it a blank cheque and saying: "Whatever you do, we know we will be just fine". How do we know that? Why are we not standing up and saying: "If we endorse the resolution,"—which they have not passed yet—"we are, in essence, endorsing war". Do we, as a country, want war? I do not think we do.

We do not like what Saddam Hussein has done. I do not believe that this is the time to be passing a motion endorsing war. I do not believe the people of Canada believe that. I believe that we need more time for sanctions, and the hon. member is right, we must work together, but not by endorsing war, because the cost of war is very great.

I must ask: "What do we as Canadians have to gain from endorsing war at this time?" I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have absolutely nothing to gain right now by endorsing war. We have not given sanctions time to really take effect.

As a matter of fact, we are even now endangering the fate of the hostages that we have in that country. Let's give it a little bit of time. If we declare war tomorrow, it is not going to be over six months from now. We are going to have tremendous casualties.

I am a mother. I have children who are of age to fight in a war. I do not know that I want to say to my children and to the people in my constituency: "Go out because you are going to defend the country". Defend it against what? What have we as a country, as Canadians, to gain by endorsing a resolution at the UN or saying to the UN: "We want you to pass this resolution. Whatever resolution you take, we will endorse at this time".

What have we to gain as a country? What do our children have to gain from this kind of a resolution? I am asking this in all honesty, because I do not believe we have anything to gain. I do not know why Mr. Bush is so anxious to have a war in the gulf because there has been aggression by others. We have not seen the Americans rush in.

Is it because there is oil there? We have oil here. Why are we in such a rush? What do we have to gain? I keep asking. We have everything to lose, and absolutely nothing to gain.

**Mr. Redway:** Mr. Speaker, I do not think anyone would quarrel with the hon. member when she says that no one wants to see war.

In fact, the resolution before the House tonight certainly does not refer to war. I think I had better read it again for the hon. member so she will hear it. It reads as follows:

> That this House, noting that the Government of Iraq has not complied with the United Nations Security Council resolutions concerning the invasion of Kuwait and the detention of third country nationals, supports the United Nations in its efforts to ensure compliance with the Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions.

There is nothing in that at all that refers to war.

There is a resolution coming before the United Nations tomorrow. As you know, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in that that refers to war. I will read that for the hon. member as well, particularly paragraph 2, the action paragraph. I hope hon. members will try to keep order

on the other side so that I can complete my answer. The hon. member's question was a long one. I know she would love me to give a long answer as well. That is truly what I intend to do in keeping with her wishes.

Paragraph 2 of that UN resolution for tomorrow states: "authorizes member states to co-operate with the Government of Kuwait unless Iraq, on or before January 15, 1991, fully implements as set forth in paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions: To use all necessary means to uphold and implement the Security Council resolution 660".

That does not refer to war either, Mr. Speaker.

In addition, the Minister of National Defence in his comments indicated quite clearly that this government has given a mandate to our forces in the gulf that if there is to be a change in that mandate in any way, there will be a debate in this House specifically on any change in that mandate.

There is nothing in any of that that refers to war in any way. The hon. member also asked what we and our children had to gain from all this. I think it is quite clear that we and our children have an enormous amount to gain from standing firm with the United Nations to standing against aggression.

A few years ago the Second World War got off the track when people refused to stand up against aggression. Now, at long last, the world seems to be united, not just the United States, not just Canada, not just the Soviet Union, but countries around the world are united in standing against aggression.

If we can finally get the world to stand up against aggression, albeit once, then there will be a second time, a third time, and pretty soon we will have a rule of law applying right across the world where we will have a peace which is meaningful and permanent. We are going to have disarmament, all the sorts of things that the hon. member would wish for our country, and certainly I do. I know that the government shares those wishes as well.

**Mr. Ray Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** I congratulate the previous speaker for a balanced and inciteful description of what exists here.

On this side of the House there is a group of people who believe that two open-ended resolutions exist for the purposes of allowing the government the opportunity to make war.

We have no assurances over here. If the Prime Minister were to stand up and say we absolutely commit ourselves to not using the Canadian Armed Forces but are going to work to make sure that the economic sanctions, the blockade, the diplomatic initiatives and any other measures and pressures that can be conjured up, will be put on Iraq. If that is what we are dealing with, we could take some comfort in that. The Prime Minister's track record is honestly bad. The members have to admit that. This government's track record is so bad that the majority of Canadians are absolutely opposed to it.

I do not even know why we are here debating this. If the members who have spoken believe that the government is not going to use this as an opportunity to use the Canadian Armed Forces without the consent of Parliament, the motion would say that. That is what we would be dealing with. The government has left it open-ended because the opposition forced it to do so. There is very strong circumstantial evidence to assume that the government is going to follow Mr. Bush to war.

We should not be here debating an open-ended motion like this. I thank the member for his presentation. He certainly has defined it very clearly. We believe on the track record of that Prime Minister that we will go to war.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions and comments are now completed. Debate.

**Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say that I was pleased to be rising tonight, but I am not.

Just over two years ago I was elected in what was called the free trade election. During that election campaign I made it clear that that election was a lot more than about a trade deal. That election was about a closer cultural-military link with the United States. We are seeing now that that is happening. What I was saying during that election campaign has turned out to be prophetic. We are seeing our independence in developing our foreign policy withering away, and now it seems that our foreign policy is practically indistinguishable from that of the United States.

• (2230)

The government members in this debate tonight have been pointing at the support of the United Nations. It is very selective support for the United Nations. They would not bring back the House to talk about sending troops to the gulf in August. They did ask the United Nations what it thought at that point. Theirs was a slavish following of the U.S. line. So this high moral fibre that they are talking about now in support of the United Nations is very dubious, Mr. Speaker. The ebbs and flows of support for the UN from this government seem to go with political expediency.

I want to talk about sanctions. A number of members have pointed out that there has not been sufficient time for sanctions to take effect. We have seen in the South African experience how there have been sanctions for nearly 30 years, and it is only now that we are seeing change. I am not advocating that we wait 30 years, because in this instance there has been unprecedented unity of the international community in following up on sanctions. I think it would take months, not years, for sanctions to take their effect.

What is the rush? We have heard the high-minded arguments of the government members for proceeding with this tack of going to war. That is what we are talking about this evening in this House, going to war.

One of the government members talked about the morality in international behaviour. If that is so, where is the consistency? Where was this government and where were these members when we talked about the invasion of East Timor in Indonesia? What happened when China invaded Tibet? We did nothing. There was no response.

I think what we have to look at is the real agenda here. There are numerous examples beyond East Timor and Tibet.

The government is also saying that we condemn Saddam Hussein. We all condemn Saddam Hussein. But what we have seen with the kind of rhetoric in this House and in the United States is an attempt to personalize this issue in one man, to make him so evil. He is evil. I believe he is evil. But the attempt is to personalize this issue to one man so that we are capable of taking unthinkable action, of sending our young men and women into war, the kind of war that is beyond imagination.

I have a document that was provided me by Greenpeace, Mr. Speaker. It is four pages, dealing only with the U.S. capability in the Middle East, the nuclear capability: seven aircraft carriers, each with over 100 nuclear bombs on them; two battleships; eleven cruisers; three destroyers; then there are all the support ships that go along with them, and the submarines, all nuclear capable. That is only the United States capability. We do not know about France, we do not know about the Soviet Union, we do not know about Iraq. There are probably biological and chemical weapons there. This is what we are sending our young men and women into, Mr. Speaker.

I know that some of the Liberals were saying that I was getting exercised earlier on on this issue. You are damn right I am getting exercised. I think war is something to get exercised about, when we are talking about going to war.

When I came to this House I was here as a member of the New Democratic Party and someone who had worked for a long time for peace. This is not the way of achieving peace. We should be allowing time for sanctions to work.

That whole picture of Saddam Hussein as a madman, as an evil being, is of course true. I believe that is true, but we have to look beyond Saddam Hussein. One newspaper article that I have read recently gave an interesting statistic, and that is that 50 per cent of the population of Iraq is 14 years of age and under. That is who we would be going to war against.

As a mother of a child who is 14 and another who is 17, I am not willing to put my vote for that action. It is always women and children that are the first victims in any war. It is the civilians, especially in the kind of war that we have already seen Saddam Hussein quite capable of waging, using chemical weapons against his own people. We do not want that to happen. We do not want our young men and women injured. We do not want the children of Iraq injured, the innocent victims of war.

Why are we doing this? I think all of us know why we are doing it. It is because Kuwait and Iraq have vast quantities of oil.

As the associate critic on the environment for my party, responsible for the international aspects of the environment, this is another aspect: we have been working for the past 18 months in the environment committee on the whole issue of the changes to atmosphere, of global warming, and of carbon dioxide emis-

sions. Carbon dioxide emissions come from fossil fuels, come from oil. This is an opportunity to reduce our dependency on oil.

The government would have the public support to say no, we have to reduce our dependency on oil. But, no, the government has decided to take another tack. It has given away its independence on foreign policy. It is lock-step with the United States. It is leading us down a path, not only for our destruction, but for possible world destruction. I am not talking inflated rhetoric. We are playing a very dangerous game here.

In conclusion, there is no way that I will support this resolution, this government motion. I think the high-minded talk about supporting the UN is political expediency. They only do it when they figure that it is in lock-step with the United States. Let us be clear, my party and I are opposed to war in the gulf. We will be working diligently to make certain that the peace activists right across Canada contact their members of Parliament in every party of this House to make certain that they vote the correct way.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Marc Ferland (Portneuf):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague on her performance this evening. I note that she is a known pacifist and that she truly believes in what she says. But what I did not like about her speech was that she hinted that Canada, with regard to the Iraqi situation, has climbed onto the American band wagon. That is not true. If she has followed the debates during the last few weeks, if she has kept up with the reactions of all the presidents and heads of state including Mr. Gorbachev, Mr. Mitterrand and others, then she knows that UN members for the first time are unanimous in saying that it is wrong, that it is unacceptable for any country to invade another by the force of arms, to rape the women, to kill the children, to destroy. I believe this is taking place at this very moment and that we must act; we must show all the other nations that we can unanimously tell Mr. Hussein:

"If you do not leave Kuwait, if you do not respect the freedom of the Kuwaiti, if you do not stop killing them and torturing them, we shall unfortunately have no choice but to take action". And this is what all countries are saying, not just the United States. Mr. Gorbachev clearly said so not long ago.

The Chinese made the same statement recently when they said: "No, Mr. Hussein, we shall not use our right of veto to support you in this action. It is unacceptable; we are heading towards a new world order". This is what we hear from all national leaders except Mr. Hussein who says: "I have my own vision of things. Using brute force, I shall attack any country I choose. I shall make them say that their land is now my land and I shall do as I please in those countries".

• (2240)

I consider that unacceptable and everyone in this country, all the men and women of Canada, disagree with what Mr. Hussein is doing at this time.

[*English*]

**Ms. Hunter:** Mr. Speaker, I think that we all share mutual abhorrence of Saddam Hussein's actions. I do not think that there should be any doubt of that, and I would take extreme umbrage if that was what the member intended to say. Where we differ, though, is on how we are going to move him to change. Are we going to kill millions of women and children in a holocaust in the Persian Gulf, or are we going to allow economic sanctions time to work?

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, it has almost been driven out of my mind, the searing question that I had on the eloquent speech the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands has given.

I would like first of all to make this comment that in dealing with the issue that is before the House we have one item in background. We heard the other day that the government was making various cutbacks to public and social services, allegedly to pay for the war. It even has $17 million in preparation for actions beyond March 1991.

What does the hon. member think of the idea of cutbacks in public and social services to pay for war in the gulf?

**Ms. Hunter:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Victoria for his question. This is what I was speaking of in my initial comments.

The increased militarization of our country is what we are seeing here, and that was implicit with the trade deal. If you are going to have a closer economic relationship with a country, it is a given that you are going to have a

closer social policy and environmental connection. That is why we are seeing the increased budget items for the defence department. It is not just because of the Persian Gulf war; it is because of the increased militarization of our country.

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** Mr. Speaker, I would feel much better about this debate tonight if it were a little more honest and if we were debating in this House whether we should be sending our troops to war. That would be a much more honest debate than the one we are having here today.

The position being put forward by the government in its motion does not even suggest that it is planning to use force. The government's motion, which asks us to support Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions before the Security Council, does not even suggest that the resolution that will be before the Security Council tomorrow is part of this debate. But the resolution that is to be debated tomorrow is very specific because it:

> 2. Authorizes Member States cooperating with the Government of Kuwait, unless Iraq on or before January 1 (15), 1991 fully implements, as set forth in Paragraph one above, the foregoing resolutions, to use all necessary means to uphold and implement Security Council Resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security to the area;
>
> 3. Requests all States to provide appropriate support for the actions undertaken in pursuance of paragraph two of this resolution; and—.

It goes on. This provides a blank cheque to any country, Canada, the United States, or any other country to begin war in Kuwait. All other countries would be expected to support it. That is what we are debating today.

It goes on to make three other requests. If we pass this resolution, we are supporting the movement of troops, planes and ships into a war zone and into a war. To whom are we giving this support? To whatever country decides to go to war. The only country that has been talking about war in the last month is the United States. The decision to go to war will not be made by the Canadian government, but by some other government and from our understanding of Mr. Bush's comments, the United States government.

I think that the President of the United States has misread his people because there is a growing concern in the States that this is not the way to solve the problem. The sanctions seem to have been working but they have not been given a chance. As my colleague suggested, sanctions in South Africa took 20 to 30 years to work. I am not suggesting that there is a parallel here, but it does indicate that sanctions take time to work.

A declaration of war or an acceptance of this resolution gives someone authority to attack another nation, to attack another people. The products of war are death. The member from Surrey—White Rock—South Langley talked about the atrocities of the Iraqi. Violence begets violence. Should we kill thousands of Iraqi children by declaring this war? Do we punish Saddam Hussein by killing children and the civilians of Iraq?

There has to be a better way and the United Nations,until now , has been advocating that better way. It has advocated sanctions, isolation, and strong world opinion. We have come a long way on that track. We have acted together in the United Nations to keep the peace. Are we going to take a backward step now? Are we going to take a backward step because the President of the United States sees this as an opportunity to shore up his image in his own country? Again I think he has misread what his people believe because the U.S. people are not going to be supportive of this war.

What about the cost? The cost of keeping these troops in the Gulf in that area has been very high but it is small compared to the cost of going to war. As the critic for official development aid, I know that we can do a lot more for the people of this world by taking some of that money and spending it for aid in underdeveloped countries than spending it in war.

I am not alone in my concern.

• (2250)

In a letter from the Canadian Council of Churches to the Prime Minister, signed by my old friend, Dr. Stuart Brown, several points were made which I want to read into the record. A communique from the council states:

> A gulf war could have no beneficial results.

Quoting the letter, it continues:

> "The modern high-technology warfare for which the Gulf region has been prepared would result in mass destruction," with the loss of tens of thousands of lives and increased long-term instability in the Middle East.

It is more than just that. The communique goes to state:

> While Iraq's aggression against Kuwait is unacceptable, the most effective instrument against this aggression is economic sanctions. Sanctions must be accompanied by two fundamental assurances: that "the innocent people of Iraq and Kuwait will not simply be starved into submission" and that "there will be an openness to negotiate the terms of an Iraqi retreat." Canadian churches and churches in the region are committed to monitoring the effects of sanctions to ensure that the basic dietary and health needs of the people are met.

The letter commends the government for agreeing to debate this issue in Parliament. "This is not the time for ultimata; rather it is the time to search for non-military solutions, even if that means compromise and a less than ideal resolution. War will most certainly not produce an ideal solution".

The Council letter, signed by Dr. Stuart E. Brown, general secretary, was prepared by a joint working group of the CCC bodies: the Committee on International Affairs, the Middle East Working Group and Project Ploughshares. It was formally endorsed by the Anglican, United, Roman Catholic, Lutheran and Presbyterian churches.

Each member of the House, and each Canadian, who supports this resolution or the idea that we should go, should ask themselves if they would sacrifice their son or daughter for this war. Would they sacrifice their son or daughter if there was another way to save them? That is what they are asking other people to do.

**Mr. Patrick Boyer (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the member who spoke, given what he has said, if he and his party have ruled out any military option, or if they still envisage that that is a possibility at some stage?

**Mr. Hovdebo:** Mr. Speaker, the idea of war under any circumstances is abhorrent to me.

We understand that security sometimes is backed up by military force. The need to use it is usually because there is an intent to gain something by it. I do not believe there is anything to be gained by it here, and I do not think it is necessary.

My suggestion would be that only under extreme circumstances and possibly on attack would we suggest that it go, but it is something that we have not ruled out entirely.

**Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants):** Mr. Speaker, I must say that I have been involved in quite a few debates in the House.

I am not taking tremendous exception to the remarks of the last speaker but, quite frankly, I feel that this debate from its start has been one of the more sombre and serious debates, and has actually had a flow of information back and forth that sometimes is not the common denominator in debates. In particular, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs made a tremendous contribution. He did clarify perhaps one of the big things that we are debating.

To start with, there is no one who is supporting Saddam Hussein by standing and asking questions about a resolution that is very vague.

There is an honest interpretation as to the meaning of the resolution when it is tied in with what is going to be debated in New York tomorrow. As it stands now, Motion No. 24, which the hon. member for Etobicoke Lakeshore tried to clarify, is vague and can be open to the interpretation that opposition members and others have put on it. I tremendously resent it, as sombre as I can be tonight, because other remarks have been said outside the House which have been more inflammatory than any remarks that have been made in the House. When talking about potential conflict, we do not need inflammatory remarks to put the old gas on the fire. Fortunately, tonight, things have been sombre. I intend to try to maintain that dictum along with all members' contributions here today in large measure.

People outside the House say that if you dispute this or do not support that, then you are in some camp that we never want to be in, that is Saddam Hussein's. But they forget that there is a fellow called Sam Nunn. He is the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States. There is a fellow called Les Aspin, chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the United States. They have questioned where America is

going. It is their President, he being Republican and they being Democrat, whom they had do what the commander and chief of that country is entitled and is supposed to do. That is, to move quickly when Congress is not in session and/or stabilize bad situations. That is what George Bush did. That is why the Prime Minister of our country responded to the call and it is why other countries of the group of 26 of the coalition responded to the call to do what everyone wanted to be done, that is, to stabilize the position in the Middle East that everyone who is a student of history, let alone a student of the Middle East, knows is a most unstable area at the best of times.

You have friends one year that you feed fuel to and give them armaments. They are your best friends and then you do not believe what they say. They shoot a British journalist about a week or so before and everyone complains. They are still saying that an American delegation should go and meet Saddam Hussein.

I am going to quote the most interesting article that I wish everyone on the government side and everyone in the United Nations would have read. It appeared in a Sunday edition of *The New York Times* in September. It is the most appalling indictment of foreign policy when the ambassador of the United States, in talking to the President of Iraq, Saddam Hussein, eight days before the attack, asks her about what is your position on Kuwait. I have the quotes here and I know the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs is perhaps aware of it.

I am amazed that it has not been raised more in this country in the media. It was of so much import before the Americans adjourned for their mid-term congressional elections, that a subcommittee on middle eastern affairs was having hearings on how their Under-Secretary of State, Mr. Kelly, had given instructions to the poor American ambassador. She was just carrying out instructions from Washington. She said: "Oh, your problem with Kuwait is a dispute between Arab and Arab. You don't have to worry about the United States on that". That was eight days before Saddam Hussein made the attack across the border and took over Kuwait. He may not be going to do it anyway, but it is that type of fundamental flip-flop on something that is so important that disturbs many people.

I want to congratulate the member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception, an ex-military maritime commander, who made a tremendous contribution.

I will digress to the American side. You can raise legitimate questions, but do not let anyone raise a question that people, on raising the questions, no matter where they sit, are for Saddam Hussein and against peace. This is the worst type of demagoguery that you could ever see. To bring this into proper perspective, we have a debate on a vague resolution that disturbs me.

I wish the government, before tomorrow's vote, would amend its own resolution. The Liberal Party has moved an amendment to the motion that I can certainly support because it clarifies some of the legitimate vagueness in the present resolution. I will not go over the interpretation we give to all the resolutions confronting the United Nations which will be debated tomorrow. They can be amended tomorrow, as the member for South West Nova mentioned in a question to the minister or one of the government members. Who is to say that even the draft will be debated? Yet this blanket resolution will get us involved, potentially, with whatever they pass in New York tomorrow.

• (2300)

Just to reduce the argument to the absurd by using an extreme analogy, there are resolutions at the United Nations about Israel. Let us just save it tonight over coffee cups in New York as they try to hammer out things. There seems to be a crack in the coalition. Someone says, and it might be Gorbachev, having just had the Foreign Minister of Iraq in Moscow, and allegedly, Gorbachev was supposed to have given him a tongue lashing and said: "Get out, you have only a little time". Well, let us say the coalition is starting to get frayed at the edges, because it is a very tenuous coalition at the best of times.

Just to reduce this argument to the extreme, when you start to absorb the blanket resolutions of the United Nations, they could start to make a deal down there that comes on the United Nations Plaza tomorrow which will affect Israel. Some of those resolutions very definitely affect the whole Middle East. Of course, that is one of the troubling things with this whole debate, we are talking about oil—and we know it is oil—but we also know, and everyone knows, and I am glad the Secretary of State for External Affairs alluded to it in his remarks, that until we can resolve the question of Israel and the

Palestine refugees and the Gaza Strip, we will never get stability in the Middle East.

This brings me to a lighter thing that I throw out not in jest because of the lightness of the moment, but because of the pithy philosophy behind it, and that is my old friend Doonesbury, old Doonesbury the cartoonist. He comes up with a lot of interesting thoughts. Just last week, he had the cartoon that I think we all should remember as we try to hurry this thing along, all since August 2, four months down the road. There is the cartoon. The forces are coming in, Americans are getting off the helicopters—and no one accused me of being an anti-American. I am not anti-American at all, I married one, and am very happy to have married one, and am still married to her, so I am not anti-American. They are coming off the helicopter. There are the two camel drivers. One camel says to his fellow camel: "Boy, Ella, these fellows think they're pretty smart. They're going to settle this problem in four months, and we've been trying to settle it for 4,000 years".

Mr. Speaker, in talking about the Middle East, there is an awful lot of truth to that cartoon. So why, when everyone is for economic sanctions and some people raise questions about force. Even congressional leaders in the United States are now raising questions about force. The sad thing about this whole problem to me is that Canada will never have the forces, it never should have the forces of the United States. Thank God, we do not. But we did not exercise Pearsonian diplomacy this summer.

When Bush made the call and we responded initially with others it was to stabilize the situation, because Saudi Arabia was next. That was important, and we moved. Then there was the interval between the stability and preventing further invasion into Saudi Arabia. Saddam Hussein, according to what I read, would have controlled 40 per cent of the oil fields that feed the west. But we changed the mandate, which everyone responded to quickly to stabilize and prevent another invasion. No problem. Work things out.

The next item becomes removing Hussein from Kuwait. I do not know what the mandate is today. Yes, I have heard President Bush. I have heard the Prime Minister. Get out of Kuwait. Yes, aggression should not be rewarded. But does getting out of Kuwait mean terminating Saddam Hussein? Does it mean, as some members have said here earlier tonight in effect bombing Baghdad back to the cave, involving all the casualties that will make? Does that mean having a trusteeship go in and administer Iraq now that we have elevated President Assad of Syria? He and Saddam Hussein, I gather, are not the friendliest of souls.

It is unreal to even think about the potential of a war when we have so many feudal rivalries which have been there for a thousand years. They are flipping and flopping between one and the other, as some speakers have said the other night, just because some of the bad ones now happen to be on the good side—even though we know they are not very good.

How can President Bush justify going to Geneva and sitting down with President Assad of Syria, an acknowledged terrorist nation that puts bombs in international airplanes? Up until now we would not even talk to him, but because the end justifies the means in a Machiavellian way, we now get in bed with Assad, thinking that that is going to solve our problems in the Middle East, just having fallen out of bed with Saddam Hussein whom we were all for when he was fighting the hated Ayatollah of Iran.

We may start getting into that jigsaw puzzle, what with all the good intentions and serious things that have been said by all members about peace and the best way to try and resolve the problem in the Persian Gulf.

We just should not think of the geography of the world where time does not mean quite what it does in the more western world where we go by the clock. We have an eight-hour day and do not bow down and pray to Allah. We do not watch the old grass grow on the rock as is the oriental custom.

I have become involved emotionally with this problem because I watched the situation escalate. I was all for what President Bush did in getting people involved and Canada contributing. That was when I thought the UN would work things out. But the sadness to me! I have two sons, both fighting age and there is no way that I would want either of those sons to go to fight on the sand of a feudal kingdom where the democracy that we believe in has been put on suspension for 15 years.

If we, north of the 49th parallel, could have eased off on our unqualified and blind support after things had stabilized and said, "Hey, let us not get too many troops in there because obviously if we get 200,000, that may stabilize things. If we get half a million, then we are starting to set up a situation that we cannot pull back from". This has escalated the stakes beyond reason. That is the sadness I find and that is why I say we did not exercise Pearsonian diplomacy.

We are in the interval between stability and escalation because a President was caught in the mid-term election, for goodness sake. How much that has affected his decision, I do not know. But I certainly think it affected some of the things that Margaret Thatcher said when she was in Paris just 10 days ago. She talked about the brutal things going on in Iraq, things we all sort of knew. One wondered if she was saying this because of Iraq or whether it was because of her own particular political problems?

That may be very unfair, but I will tell you that that is what I thought when I saw her on television talking about Iraq in a most inflammatory way.

There was a time when putting half a million troops into Iraq, people would have said, "Hey, let us work this out and try to come up with something". Earlier I alluded to a *New York Times* story because we are on the precipice of a conflict.

Anyone who watched the the three-part PBS series on the Korean war will agree it was fantastic. It was on how you could miss communications and misjudge your enemy. The Americans soldiers were on the Yalu River in 1952 or 1953, thinking the war was over. It was one of the most interesting documentaries on PBS in a long while. The North Korean captain, the Chinese colonel, and the North Korean corporal, part of the 3,000 up in the hills, saw the Americans sitting on their tanks eating the American Thanksgiving dinner at the Yellow River because General McArthur thought the war was over. Here they had infiltrated the hills and from their cameras we could see this happening in this amazing documentary, just about two days before they came out of the hills. Of course, they chased the Americans and Canadians right back into Seoul. That was a misjudgment in communication in assessing the enemy. This is a misjudgment, too.

• (2310)

According to *The New York Times* of Sunday, September 23, 1990, it was the American Ambassador, April Glaspie, who on July 25, eight days before the invasion urged the Iraq leader, Saddam Hussein to settle his differences with Kuwait, but added:

> We have no opinion on the Arab-Arab conflicts, like your border disagreement with Kuwait.

This is according to an Iraqi document described as a transcript of their conversations. I am reading from *The New York Times*, Sunday edition. This is very authentic because this is what started a subcommittee hearing in the United States before they adjourned for their congressional elections.

I actually tried to phone Lee Hamilton, one of the better American congressman, a Democrat from Indiana, who was a chairman of that subcommittee, to find out the status of this subcommittee. Perhaps they thought it unpatriotic to explore it further, I do not know. Portions of the document, prepared in Arabic by the Iraqi government, was translated and broadcast by ABC News on September 11, and were the basis of accounts by *The Washington Post* and *The Guardian* of London. The article states:

> The State Department declined to confirm the accuracy of the document, but officials did not dispute Ms Glaspie's essential message.

Then it states:

> The administration was following what President Bush acknowledged last week was a flawed policy toward Iraq, a policy built on the premise that the best way to handle Mr. Hussein and moderate his behaviour was through improving relations with Baghdad. That assessment presumed that Iran and Iraq, both exhausted by their eight-year border war, would focus on domestic reconstruction, not foreign adventurism.
>
> As a result, the Bush Administration failed to calibrate its policy to take into account a string of belligerent statements and actions by Mr. Hussein in recent months, including the execution of a British journalist and a threat to use chemical weapons against Israel.

Listen to this, Mr. Speaker:

> "We were essentially operating without a policy," said a senior administration official. "The crisis came in a bit of a vacuum, at a time when everyone was focusing on German reunification."

This lady we have seen on PBS over the year because she speaks for the administration quite a bit:

> On July the 24, when Margaret D. Tutwiler, the States Department spokeswomen, was asked whether the United States had any commitment to defend Kuwait,she said"We do not have any defence

> treaties with Kuwait, and there are no special defense or security commitments to Kuwait."
>
> Asked whether the United States would help Kuwait if it were attacked, she replied, "We also remain strongly committed to supporting the individual and collective self-defense of our friends in the gulf with whom we have deep and longstanding ties," a statement that some Kuwaiti officials said privately was too weak.
>
> Two days before the invasion, John H. Kelly, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, essentially repeated the same message in Congressional testimony.

Lee Hamilton, at the hearing, chided Mr. Kelly for not taking a tougher stance against Iraq in his testimony before the invasion. The article goes on:

> You left the impression that it was the policy of the United States not to come to the defense of Kuwait," said Mr. Hamilton, an Indiana Democrat. "I asked you if there was a U.S. commitment to come to Kuwait's defense if it was attacked. Your response over and over again was we have no defense-treaty relationship with any gulf country."

I will not go any further because others wish to speak. Time is very essential in any types of conclusion. In conclusion, we had this type of flip-flop in policy when mixed signals were sent to the president by the ambassador for the United States. Fortunately, Bush did stabilize those mixed signals, but we may get ourselves involved in a world war. If there is any doubt about fighting, everyone in this House and everyone at the United Nations should read the book *The Bodyguard of Lies*. In it Churchill is quoted as saying: "In war truth is so precious it must be protected by a bodyguard of lies".

I commend this to everybody to read because this is the story of the deception, the deceit, and the spies, not just during the war but before the war when the German Commander in Chief, General Beck, of the German general staff was trying to get a message to London in 1938, saying: "Hey, London, we will get rid of this madman Hitler if you make sure you don't do certain things". This story illustrates in quote after quote and person after person how even within the general staff, the head of the intelligence department of the German army was always trying to get messages through.

If these two cultures that think alike could not get the message through to prevent a war, how can we be expected to hurry the type of communication that obviously is a problem between an Arabic situation and our western situation?

I conclude with what a Christian told me at a New Year's levee during the Iran hostage situation when poor old President Carter was trying to get the hostages out. I will never forget this. This was told by a member of our Armed Forces at the base that I have the honour to represent, CFB Greenwood. He is a Christian now. He had been a Muslim. He told me: "Mr. Nowlan, what really is the trouble with you westerners trying to deal with us people in the Middle East, you do not understand us because fundamentally the quickest way a Muslim can get to heaven is to kill an infidel and every Christian is an infidel. If you cannot get to heaven that way, the second quickest way to get to heaven is to be killed by an infidel".

With that type of so different thinking, to think that we are hurrying this thing along and not giving the time that most experts say is necessary for trade sanctions, I say we will regret it. This debate has been important. I only hope it gets to some people in New York before tomorrow.

**Mr. Ray Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** Mr. Speaker, it was an interesting, very worth-while and entertaining presentation.

There are two interesting things that I would like to ask the member about the speech. One, he is a long-standing Conservative and respected member of the Conservative Party and the government in this House who recently crossed the floor. In his statement tonight he opposes the motion. He pointed out the difficulties in the vagueness of that resolution and the fact that the opposition could interpret it the way they have tonight. The other thing is the consistency of the government side of the House where they are rock solid for this resolution and speak in support of it.

Would the hon. member venture to guess that the reason that they are on side is the government caucus is being forced into this position and the fact that the member has crossed the floor has given him the freedom to speak out against a very poor resolution presented to this House?

**Mr. Nowlan:** Categorically no, Mr. Speaker, I would not subscribe to that at all. Some day if the hon. member's party ever gets to be the government he will

understand that there are some different pressures, but he can still speak out, he can still speak within and then he can make up his mind. I think the debate here tonight typified that. Things were said by members on all sides that frankly were not strictly according to the dots on the *i*'s and the crosses on the *t*'s of the party lines.

I would like to see, frankly, more independence sometimes in the hon. member's party because his party is more monolithic than any party that I ever belonged to.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to hear the feast of reason and flow of soul from the hon. member. It is wonderful that, having switched sides, he is able to become unzipped as it were and spill out all these wonderful thoughts for the benefit of all members of this House and, of course, for the Canadian public. What I want to ask him and what I could not understand from listening as attentively as I did to his lengthy speech was whether or not he is going to support the Liberal amendment to this motion.

• (2320)

**Mr. Nowlan:** Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the member for Niagara, even when I was sitting on the other side of the House, although he used to confound me sometimes with his semantic arguments on procedural hurdles that had no sense, but you did not hear—

**Mr. Milliken:** I'm from Kingston.

**Mr. Nowlan:** Kingston, sorry. Well, you sometimes sound like Niagara on your procedural points of privilege. That is what I thought.

I am sorry the member did not hear me too clearly because I thought I did say at one time when I was trying to speak a little slower than I usually speak that I was going to support your amendment.

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston):** Mr. Speaker, just a quick question. The member has been in the House for a considerable period of time. Perhaps he can shed some light on the NDP amendment.

The NDP amendment says that this House opposes the use of force against Iraq until sanctions and other UN measures have had time to succeed. In effect what the NDP is saying is that they are endorsing the use of force, which seems to be contrary to NDP policy. Perhaps the member, with his experience, can advise the House whether this is an about-face on behalf of the NDP who seem to be supporting war with this particular amendment. Does he share my conclusions?

**Mr. Nowlan:** I will be even shorter on this one.

Just because I moved across the floor of the House to this perch that has a great view is no sign that I am going to start to interpret NDP amendments, subamendments, or even motions. I think they are quite capable of trying to interpret themselves.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Marc Ferland (Portneuf):** I have a short question, Mr. Speaker. I am aware of my colleague's experience and I would like him to tell me, based on his many years in the House—during his career, he has taken part in debates which were just as important as this one—in view of the circumstances and of the importance of the issue and considering that motion No. 24 which we are studying this evening is meant to support action to be taken by the United Nations, whether he would agree with me that the members of this House should all stand behind Canada's support of the United Nations.

[*English*]

**Mr. Nowlan:** This has been part of the debate, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate and know that the member has dutifully been here tonight and has had good questions. This is part of the debate. Obviously we all want to support the UN, but there is obviously a little different interpretation as how you most effectively support it, especially when you have a resolution that I think even my hon. friend would agree has some vagueness to it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions and comments are now terminated. Debate, the hon. member for Fredericton—York—Sunbury and the hon. member for Carleton—Charlotte will be the next two speakers with 10 minutes each.

**Mr. J. W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury):** Mr. Speaker, this is a debate which I think we all wish was not necessary. Certainly it is one I would have preferred to avoid, but I feel it is a personal political responsibility to take a stand on difficult issues like this, perhaps particularly so on difficult issues like this.

It is unthinkable that we have come to this tonight. I do not think many of us ever believed we would again have to come to grips with the real prospects of war. It is a little like a nightmare, unreal, unimaginable that we must seriously consider decisions that will bear potential for death and destruction, not only of Canadian men and women, but possibly of tens of thousands of human

beings on all sides, friends and foes, not just military personnel but innocent civilians, families, and children. It certainly is a horrible prospect.

My own instincts, as I believe would be the case with virtually every member in this House, would normally be to work for peace at almost any cost. Certainly I believe that we should do that. We should work for peace at almost any cost. Certainly I know that most of my constituents would have us avoid armed conflict except as a very last resort.

It is not difficult for me to identify with this issue in a very personal way. My wife and I have raised seven children and we have seven grandchildren. It is not inconceivable that war in the Persian Gulf might eventually impact directly on their lives. The world is a very small place today and distances are covered quickly by satellites, aircraft, intercontinental missiles, and, yes indeed, even by nuclear bombs.

It is very tempting, and it would be with great relief to set this subject aside, to leave it to other countries with larger stakes in the issues and with larger capabilities to deal with them. It would be far more satisfying to speak only for peace and never in contemplation of war.

That would not be responsible in the context of our membership in the United Nations. It would not be true to our commitments of interdependence with our allies, our neighbours and our friends. It would not be respectful of the faith in our mandates from our constituents, and I do not believe it would be Canada.

Rather, we have no alternative but to face up to the tragic irony that, although peace is the goal we all seek, history has taught us that sometimes if we want to ensure peace, we must even be prepared to go to war to attain it. This truly does seem to be one of those times in world history.

Not necessarily war, but a resolve for war if necessary to preserve the peace. I believe it is that resolve that will be our strength in preventing war at this time in the Persian Gulf.

I have always thanked my maker that I was born too young to fight in Europe or in Japan, but I do remember. Looking back those more than 50 years, I think we can now see with the perfect vision of hindsight that appeasement of dictators does not work to ensure peace.

Perhaps if Hitler had been confronted strongly and with determination in the late 1930s, the world might have been saved from the destruction of World War II, and many millions of lives might not have been lost.

Similarly, in 1990, I think the analogy does bear consideration that if the territorial ambition of Iraq, smaller than Germany but no less aggressive, and its dictator, Saddam Hussein, less powerful than Hitler but made from the same mould, and if their blatant aggression is not stopped in its tracks now, then who can tell where it may lead?

Our quest for peace and security cannot long tolerate the risks that that unanswered question contains. Will it stop at Kuwait? Will it be contained in the Middle East? Will it involve nuclear weapons? Can we really tolerate any of those questions at risk?

As compelling as those questions are, the burden of this debate does bear heavily upon us all. It was put in context for me today by an aggressive TV reporter on my way into the House when he asked: "Mr. Bird, are you really going to vote for young Canadians to come home in body bags from the Persian Gulf? Are you really going to obey orders from the U.S.A.?"

My quick answer seemed somehow inept and inadequate, almost as though these cynical and tortuous barbs were beyond my competence to answer. Yet, as I reflected upon these issues throughout the day, I believe I had them right at the start. I said to him: "I am not voting for death in the Persian Gulf, but rather I am voting for the best prospects of life and peace for this and future generations. I am not voting for the U.S.A. or any other foreign initiative, but rather for Canada to fulfil its responsibilities as a founding member of the United Nations designed so long ago as our best hope for preserving world peace".

Perhaps I could have even said more. For example, a little more than two weeks ago, we observed Remembrance Day in Canada. We paid tribute to hundreds of thousands of Canadians who fought for this country in two World Wars and in Korea, a great many of whom gave their lives in pursuit of freedom and peace.

It has long been part of our commitment on Remembrance Day to make the commitment that their sacrifices shall not have been in vain. We have not only a responsibility today to present and future generations, but also an obligation to the memory of our forebears: our fathers, brothers and uncles that we shall do what it takes to preserve peace in the world and indeed, yes, in many cases to our sisters, our aunts and our mothers.

It is a tragic statement, but to keep this commitment we must contemplate today the prospect of war again. That is a position I feel sure that those past generations, and indeed future generations, will understand and respect.

• (2330 )

Our first challenge is to demonstrate our resolve and our diplomatic skills to mount deterrent influence that will pre-empt the prospects of conflict. The economic blockade against Iraq is a powerful weapon. It must be used with ever-increasing discipline and intensity.

In the final analysis, however, we must make it terribly obvious that we are prepared to join the United Nations in whatever fight it takes to turn Iraq out of Kuwait and to stop its aggression completely. It is to be hoped, indeed it is to be prayed, that such a demonstration of economic sanctions and political will be sufficient to achieve the purposes of peace. Otherwise the cause of peace may demand the action of war and ultimately, with very heavy hearts yet resolute spirits, we may be called upon and we must be prepared to help fight it.

The entire area of the Middle East is now a flash point for world conflict. There are many volatile forces at work, none of which can be totally predictable, except that their impact will have profound consequences around the globe. Never, since its inception, has the United Nations represented such potential for world action toward peace, and never before has its mission led so closely to war.

Perhaps, to use a Churchillian phrase, this may become the United Nations' finest hour, when the consensus and strength of nations united for peace can demonstrate conclusively that they are capable of preserving it, even by force, if necessary to do so. There can be no compromise of the principles of respect for sovereignty of other nations and defence against aggression over the weak by the strong.

Let us hope and pray that in demonstrating its commitment to those principles, in the face of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, the United Nations will also be delivering an unmistakable message of resolve that will help bring resolution to other Middle East conflicts as well. Ultimately, the fires of war must be banked in all corners of the world, particularly in the Middle East. Preserving peace in the Persian Gulf may prove to be the prelude to permanent peace elsewhere throughout that troubled region, and indeed throughout the world.

**Mr. Greg Thompson (Carleton—Charlotte):** Mr. Speaker, we have heard from both sides tonight differing versions of what is going on in the world and what is going on in the Persian Gulf. I think we have to respect both sides. If Canadian people who are watching tonight can filter this debate to its lowest common denominator, I guess they will come up with the understanding that we are trying to say tonight is that we do want peace. Everyone in this House wants peace.

I can criticize the New Democrats for their position. I can criticize the Liberals for their position, and maybe some of our own Progressive Conservatives. However, if one were to cut through all the rhetoric and political posturing on both sides of the House, I think one would find that the common denominator is peace, to maintain peace in the Middle East.

If the Canadian people have had a chance to hear our Associate Minister of National Defence and our Minister of National Defence who is in the House at this very moment, they will come to the opinion that that is what they want. There is absolutely no question about it.

When we compare what is going on in the Persian Gulf at this very moment to what has gone on in Vietnam and in Europe during World War II under the dictates of Adolf Hitler, I do not think it is a fair comparison. I think some members draw those comparisons simply out of fear, because we do not want those types of things to happen. If we measure what has happened in this so-called civilized world of ours in the last hundred years, in fact within the last 20th century starting with World War II and going through, there is no question at all that war is the most inhumane of all activities that human beings engage in. We do not want it. Millions of lives have been lost forever. Young generations of Canadians did not have an opportunity to grow up and

experience the great country that we do have. It was the same for Allied Forces in European countries and the United States of America.

We can go through all of the wars that we have been engaged in as a peacekeeping nation. None of us will question the fact that Canada is a peacekeeping nation, yet at some particular point we have had to put our men, our women, our children, our country on the line. Other nations have done the same thing in defence of certain principles. We have paid the price, not as much as other countries but we have certainly paid the price: hundreds of thousands of Canadians, millions of Europeans, countless millions of Russians. War has devastated the world in terms of human tragedy. None of us want to see that.

That is exactly what we are attempting to do in the Middle East. We have the support of just about every civilized nation in the world in what we are attempting to do as a nation: maintain the peace. We do not want to see the kind of devastation brought about by war, but we do not avoid war by backing down and allowing an aggressive nation to take advantage of a less aggressive nation or a smaller nation. I think we are being true hypocrites if we allow that to happen. We cannot allow that to happen.

I do not think we can allow the story to be distorted. I believe to a degree that is happening. We are simply attempting to maintain the peace. I do not pretend to have all the answers to what is going on in the Persian Gulf. I simply do not. There are many experts in this House who go far beyond my abilities in this area, but as a Canadian I probably have more at risk in this matter than virtually everyone in this House. Why is this? It is because my son will be engaged in that conflict. It is something I do not want to see happen. It is as simple as that. I do not.

If we could avoid it, we would do everything in our power to avoid it, but it is something that we cannot. It is reality staring me in the face, staring our nation in the face. We cannot avoid it. My wife at this very moment is in West Germany to visit our son before he is deployed to the Middle East, to the Persian Gulf. Why? Because, in reality, it could be the last time that my wife and my youngest son will see Greg Junior. It is as simple as that. That is the reality of the tragedy of war. We do not want it to happen. Hopefully I will be allowed to go over for a couple of days to see my son.

That is the human tragedy of war. There are parents and individuals in this very House whose sons and daughters or grandchildren are over there. Not one of us wants to see it come to the final act of man taking man, human life taking human life. We do not want that to happen.

That is why as a Canadian I can stand here very proudly and look over what we have done as a nation since World War I and certainly since World War II to maintain the peace. I believe in all sincerity that peace is exactly what our Prime Minister wants to achieve, that peace is exactly what our defence minister wants to maintain.

• (2340)

We are not an aggressive nation. We never have been and we never will be. We are a civilized nation that wants to bring about a civilized solution to that mighty problem, but we do not solve a problem by backing away from it. We have the support of almost every civilized nation in the universe, communist nations included or what is left of those communist nations.

That is a strange paradox when we think about it. Could we stand in this House a year ago and say that? No, we could not, but I believe our Secretary of State for External Affairs, our Prime Minister, and our Minister of National Defence have worked very strongly to bring about this sort of unification of spirit in this situation. They have worked very hard. Canada's credibility is certainly on the line. A lot of human emotions are on the line, mine included.

Going back to my opening, none of us want to see the ultimate, which is war. We do not want to see the ultimate inhumanity. Our NDP friends and our Liberal friends do not want to see it. We have taken a position which I believe history will prove right. When we look back a year, two years, five years or ten years from now, I think we could all honourably say that we did the right thing and that we were there for the right reasons: to prevent death, to prevent inhumanity, and to preserve peace.

**Mrs. Pauline Browes (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State of Canada and Minister of State (Multiculturalism and Citizenship)):** Mr. Speaker, I was moved by what the member said about his own son who

will be in the Persian Gulf. I want to say a few words about paying the price.

This afternoon the Canadian parliamentary group, some 40 members of Parliament, met with representatives of Baltic peoples, Canadians of Baltic heritage. We talked about paying the price and freedom being snatched from the Baltic States some 50 years ago. It reminded me, as we were sitting in the West Block discussing something that happened 50 years ago, of how we might be able to right the situation. Here we are in the House tonight talking about freedom having been snatched from the people of Kuwait by the Iraqis, and the price that has to be paid by Canadians who are there, the hostages who are there. We were most pleased today that five of those hostages will be released.

What is happening is not just about that region itself. It is about the goals of our foreign policies that it is built upon. It is the foundation, goals which are peaceful and prosperous, goals which permit Canada to live in freedom. The Baltic people have not been able to live in freedom. Now the people of Kuwait cannot live in freedom. As the member has said, a price has been paid. We cannot let ourselves remain silent. We cannot fool ourselves into believing that we are isolated from events of this magnitude.

I would just like to say to the hon. member that his commitment is strong. His resolute is strong as his own family member is involved in this. I would also like to say that recently the constituents of Scarborough Centre promptly responded to a questionnaire supporting the government's position that Canada should play a role in the Persian Gulf, a role which has been fully consistent with the United Nations to date, including the enforcement of economic sanctions.

**Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to take part in this debate. I have sat here throughout the evening listening to many great speakers, and I want to state that I support, in principle, the Canadian government's actions in condemning the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq, by joining late with the United Nations and countries around the world to say that this type of activity cannot be allowed to go unchallenged, and that Canada would do the right thing, as it did, and participate in the naval blockade of Iraq.

From the moment Iraqi tanks rolled into Kuwait in August, there has been world-wide agreement that they must leave. The only question was how to make this happen. Some world leaders wanted immediate military action, regardless of whether the international community supported such a move. They believed that this would punish the Iraqi aggressor and ensure that Saddam Hussein would never again threaten the region.

Fortunately, other world leaders campaigned to stop such a move, recognizing that military action would shatter the international consequences in the United Nations. Other leaders promoted a more credible alternative. Since the objective behind the United States, Canada, and the other countries could be said to be the protection of Saudi Arabia from Iraqi attack, and the allies should not attack at all, but rather, declare the measures to be a success. The economic embargo of Iraq could be maintained as punishment. In time, these people argued, Iraq could sue for peace and abandon this occupied territory.

The third most widely appealing option was to combine UN-mandated economic sanctions with the potential for military action under UN agreement. In this option, every diplomatic effort would be exhausted before resorting to force. This is exactly what is happening now.

The Canadian people, through their elected representatives in Parliament, must be given the opportunity to be kept informed and to offer their opinion on the relevant issues. As I studied this motion, I realized that once again the government is trying to get authorization to branch out on its own and act without consulting Parliament. I specifically refer to the end of the motion which reads "subsequent resolutions". This makes me uneasy, as it leaves so many avenues open. The Liberal amendment would prevent the government from once again taking action without consulting Parliament.

If the House agrees to the Liberal amendment, then, and only then, will I support the motion. Without this amendment, we would be allowing the government to take action on behalf of Canadians without consulting their elected representatives. We would be writing a blank cheque to the government.

If there is one clear message that should come out of this debate tonight and tomorrow, it is this. Canada must be an advocate of patience. It must use its influence on the United Nations Security Council. It must argue for a

diplomatic solution. There must be a clear understanding, agreed to by all of us, that sanctions must be given a chance and a peaceful solution should result, certainly not one of war.

Throughout two world wars and the Korean War, Canada was recognized as one of the greatest fighting nations on the face of this earth. After this, we have become a peacekeeping nation, a reputation earned to a great degree, by the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson. Lately, Canada has always filled the role as peacekeeper. That is exactly how we want to continue to be known. A peaceful solution must come of this.

I am in no way trying to minimize the fact that the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq must not be tolerated and that there is support for Canadian action to date in participating in the international effort to make sanctions work. We must all keep in mind that if war breaks out, there is no way of telling how many casualties there will be and how many of our men and women will lose their lives.

• (2350)

We all agree, I believe, that Saddam Hussein is a madman. He is a man who must be stopped. Maybe the only way to stop him will be by force. However, if this is true, this must be debated fully in this Parliament. This is why I stand here tonight and say that, if we are to support this motion, it must be amended so that any resolution undertaken by the Security Council tomorrow must be debated in the House of Commons before Canada participates.

Christmas is fast approaching and this House will be recessing. But, if we must debate it, whether it be on December 25, December 31, or on January 1, we must debate it before further Canadian action would be taken.

Saddam Hussein is a serious threat to international peace, and the Charter of the United Nations which forbids acts of aggression must be supported. The security of other states in the region must be secured. I cannot stress enough how important it is that we settle this crisis with peace rather than with war.

On Tuesday last, the Leader of the Opposition questioned the Prime Minister stating that:

> Speaking to an American Senate committee this morning, former American Defence Secretary James Schlesinger said that so far, economic sanctions against Iraq have produced the expected results, but might have to be maintained for a whole year if they are to have a decisive impact. His opinion is shared by a good many international affairs experts.

The Leader asked the Prime Minister if he shares the views of these experts and, if not, why not.

In response, the Prime Minister did not bother to provide full information on the effectiveness of the sanctions. This can only lead one to believe that perhaps the Prime Minister is reluctant to let us in on the facts about sanctions, because there is evidence that they are working.

Since the Second World War, no country has been disciplined so strongly and so completely because of its aggression. With such tight sanctions, it is difficult to imagine how Iraq could possibly be better off for having invaded Kuwait. Therefore, I feel that the sanctions should be given a longer period of time, perhaps six months, or perhaps a year. The precise length of time of the sanctions I am not here to debate tonight.

What I am prepared to say is that if sanctions do not achieve their objective, which is the complete withdrawal from Kuwait of Iraqi forces and the assurance that Saddam Hussein does not plan further aggression against neighbouring states, then war will be an option. It cannot be ruled out. If it should become the most viable option for the fulfilment of international objectives, then Canada will support military action at that time.

In any scenario, the government must not be able to take such steps as it did this summer without consulting the people of Canada through Parliament. Therefore, unless this amendment is adopted, I cannot support the government's action.

**Mrs. Coline Campbell (South West Nova):** Mr. Speaker, I, too, have listened carefully today to my colleagues on all sides of the House. I have to say that I think all Canadians have the idea that peace is the most important thing for any country to live by. However, I do feel that there are a few elements in this debate that have been whitewashed and perhaps have to be reviewed.

My colleague mentioned the use of sanctions and the length of time, and I agree totally with everything that has been said. I agree with the last speaker for the government as to the need to find peace.

I think Canadians should realize that the importance of this debate tonight has been to show Canadians that once again we have a government that is proceeding faster than we should be proceeding.

One of the saddest things I have heard was one of our three members who are in Iraq on the radio tonight saying that our government, our country had not done enough to free the hostages over there. I think this is what we have forgotten in this process today.

We have not asked ourselves if we have done enough, before asking for a resolution based on something that may pass in the future, or tomorrow, at the United Nations?

I will deal with that because I asked the Minister of Defence a question specifically about it. I do not think we have tried hard enough as a country who has had a role for peacekeeping that has been well accepted throughout the world to help the remaining hostages in Iraq and Kuwait. We have not tried either in the sense of using the United Nations properly. We have resolutions of the United Nations and we have all the economic sanctions, including the sea and air transport in and out of Iraq. We have not given them time to be effective, in my view.

Furthermore, we have no reporting mechanism to anyone about the effect of the economic sanctions. We just have to accept the information coming from one source or another. There is no UN statement coming out as to the effect. I know that the chairmanship of the United Nations today is in the hands of the United States and that that chairmanship changes to another country at the end of this month. I also know that a chairman of any committee controls the work program of that committee.

I do not want to get into the reasons why we are perhaps on the verge of exercising more force in the Persian Gulf. There will be another day to argue whether they are valid reasons for Canadians, or whether it is business interests like some have implied here tonight.

It may be big business interests in the Middle East that are forcing us into this. We did not go to war or even take this type of precaution in the crisis with Lebanon or in Central America. The draft resolution that is before the UN this week would change the mandate of our forces when they went over initially, which was to enforce economic sanctions. It was not to try and restore peace, as it says in the draft resolution.

We are asked here tonight by this government to pass a motion that supposes something in the future. Our amendment says that we do not mind passing a motion supporting all that the UN has done until today, but not a motion in the House that may or may not have a future resolution. Economic sanctions may start to work tomorrow. Why are we prejudging what the Security Council may or may not do tomorrow by passing a resolution in this House, by pre-empting a process that I think all of us have had a lot of respect for, and that is the United Nations. I do not think there has been any effort on behalf of the Secretary of State for External Affairs or our officials at the UN to try and find what the reporting mechanism is going to be for the member states who are taking part in forcing the economic sanctions in the gulf. There is no mechanism. Furthermore, there is no mechanism within the draft resolution tomorrow that would have a reporting of the necessary force or the necessary means to keep peace in the Persian Gulf.

**An hon. member:** It is committee 661, that Canada co-chaired.

**Mrs. Campbell (South West Nova):** Resolution 661, you mean.

**An hon. member:** The committee that created that resolution.

**Mrs. Campbell (South West Nova):** You are talking about the military committee and I have not heard them report anywhere. I have not seen them report once. Perhaps the parliamentary secretary will produce the reports of the committee.

• (0000)

However, I can say that we are rushing into an element that has all the hardships of losing a very secure role that we have played up until now, and the role that we have played up until tonight in the gulf. We are being asked to change that and are being asked by this government to pass a motion that will sanction its future moves, probably without having to come back to Parliament. If we sanction the motion tonight or tomorrow, and it will not be because the opposition is voting with it, we are sanctioning future resolutions. It gives the appearance that Parliament has debated and passed something that we have not had an opportunity to debate.

The vagueness of the government's motion, in its efforts to assure compliance with the Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions—and the offensive part is "subsequent resolutions", because it is vague as to what is subsequent resolutions—would be clearly defined if today's date was put in. In the future, we could come back to this House and debate any future resolutions that may be passed by the United Nations. But no, this government wants to pre-empt the Security Council and give the government *carte blanche* to change the role in the Persian Gulf without coming back to Parliament if the United Nations goes ahead.

In the summer, we saw troops leave Halifax without a resolution as to why they were going to the Persian Gulf. It was not until they were in Gibraltar, I think, that they got the—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret the hon. member's time has expired.

**Mr. Peter L. McCreath (South Shore):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to join in this debate this evening. I particularly congratulate the government for bringing this debate forward in response, I might say, to requests put forward by various members of the opposition in the last few days and, indeed, because it is the proper thing to do.

It is appropriate that the Parliament of Canada should come together and discuss events as serious as those which have taken place in the Persian Gulf and the implication of the possibility that, for the first time in 37 years, Canadians have been drawn into hostile action.

But the debate we are engaged in today is not about war, it is about peace. The actions of the United Nations are about peace and about how best to bring forward peace. If we want to talk about war, quite frankly, war began on August 2 for the people of Kuwait and, by implication, war began on August 2 for the people of the world, the people who believe that the arbitrary actions of a medieval dictator like Saddam Hussein should not be tolerated in the world.

The events we have seen in the last year or so have been extraordinary and we thought the world was coming together for the first time. Now we are faced with this situation that brings us back down to earth and reminds us that, no matter how civilized the peoples of the world become, there will always be those who cannot play by the rules of civilized people. That is what the debate is about today.

What we have seen take place in the last three months is an extraordinary coming together of the peoples of the world, united through the vehicle of the United Nations, an institution whose credibility, quite frankly in recent years has been brought into question. What we have seen in the last three months is the renewal of the credibility of the United Nations.

I welcome the debate that is taking place this evening. There is something I regret, other than what has gone on with Mr. Saddam Hussein and his supporters who have made necessary the actions of the nations that have come together at the United Nations and, indeed, have made necessary this debate in Parliament today.

There is a second thing that I regret. I must say that honestly I regret the message might go out across the world, to Canadian forces in the gulf, that Canadians do not stand united on this issue, that Canadians do not speak with one voice on this issue, and that is something regrettable.

I do not know and I certainly do not wish to attribute motivation to my hon. friends opposite with respect to what is going on here in this discussion and, indeed, this debate tonight.

**Mr. Milliken:** Just agree to the amendment.

**Mr. McCreath:** I read the amendments of the hon. members opposite, both from the Liberal Party and the NDP. Those amendments are saying that Canada tomorrow is not prepared to stand with the United Nations. That is what they are saying. They are saying: "Let's wait. Let's debate. Let's not take a strong stand. Let's not tell this man that the world is not prepared to tolerate his actions". That is what they are saying on the other side. They are proposing that we show exactly what the leader of Iraq is looking to see from the western world. He is looking to see the cracks. He is looking to see those who would break ranks. He is looking to see the weakness and that is precisely what we must not show him.

I cannot help but wonder what would have been said in this country. Canadians are not used to war. It has been 37 years since our troops faced hostile action. What would have been said in 1950? What would Prime Minister St. Laurent have said about the opposition in Parliament that day when the United Nations said: "We have to stand together". If the Parliament of Canada had

had to debate, if the people on the other side had said at that time: "We will not stand with the government because whatever this government does we are against". What would the Right Hon. Mackenzie King have said in 1939 if the opposition of the day had stood against the government of that time? I cannot help but think to myself that Neville Chamberlain would have been very much at home in the Liberal Party of Canada today. And what message is being sent out by that action?

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, there are two messages that the Parliament of this country must send out. One message should be sent to Mr. Saddam Hussein and that is that Canada stands with the world, that Canada is not prepared to tolerate countries invading its neighbours.

I listened earlier to my hon. friends from the NDP saying: "We must give sanctions time to work". Sanctions have not worked for 30 years in South Africa, but we must wait and let sanctions work. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I do not care what the NDP thinks, sanctions are not good enough for the people of Kuwait.

I heard talk about children being killed in the war. Nobody wants to see children killed, nobody wants to see men or women killed. But tell it to the people of Kuwait. That is who the NDP should be talking to.

The message that we must send first and foremost is that Canada stands with the world.

Second, we must send a message to our troops, to our men and women who are in the gulf. Seventy per cent of those people live in Nova Scotia, my province. I know some of the people who are over there, former friends and colleagues in the navy. We must send a message to them that Canada stands united behind them, that Canada appreciates the courage that they are showing by being there.

We heard earlier a very eloquent speech from an hon. colleague from Carleton—Charlotte. He talked about his personal involvement with his son being over there. Well, there are a lot of people in Nova Scotia who have husbands or wives, or sons or daughters over there. We think about those people and what message are my friends opposite sending to them? I am saying we have to send them a message that Canada appreciates the courage that they are showing. We appreciate these men and women being there. They joined the armed forces. They knew the implications. Canadians are not used to war. We can play on that if we wish, as I think some members of this House have chosen to do by saying somebody might get killed in a war. Yes, Mr. Speaker, somebody might get killed in a war, but with a strong united front, there will be no war and that, surely, is our objective.

I listened earlier to my hon. friend from Bonavista—Trinity—Conception, a very distinguished member of this House and a retired admiral. I could not help but wonder what reaction his friends, his former colleagues in the navy, would have to hearing him and his party stand there equivocating over where we are, saying we cannot take a chance. The implication of their position is very simple: "If the shootin' starts, don't shoot back, we've got to have a debate in Parliament over it". Nonsense! We must give our government a mandate to govern. That is what parliamentary government is all about. So, Mr. Speaker, I do feel strongly about this. I served ten years in the navy myself. I know what it is like to go to sea. I know what it is like to be in danger. I was never in a situation where people were going to be shooting at me. But the bottom line is that is where our people are. We should not laugh about it as my friends opposite are because it is a serious situation.

• (0010)

We have to send a message to the world. We have to send a message to Canadian men and women abroad and that message is that Canada stands with the world, and with our Canadian men and women in the Armed Forces. The Government of Canada, with or without the opposition, will do what is right by the Canadian Armed Forces and, indeed, will do the people of Canada proud in taking the actions that will make it not necessary to have a war and that we will have peace in our time.

**Mr. Stan Wilbee (Delta):** Mr. Speaker, that is certainly a very difficult act to follow. I do appreciate the member's words and I do concur with him 100 per cent.

I would like to express my support tonight for the resolution we are discussing and point out some of Canada's responsibilities in this particular crisis. We have a long history as peacekeepers and we do have the

responsibility today to help restore the peace in the Persian Gulf.

As a member of the United Nations Security Council, we have the responsibility to uphold the charter of the United Nations and all of its resolutions. Ultimately, as the Government of Canada, we have the responsibility to explain to Canadians the role we intend to play in this particular crisis.

The background of this whole situation is well known to all of us. We are aware of the details of how on August 2 Iraq invaded Kuwait. This unprovoked, brutal and most monstrous act of aggression shocked the whole world and triggered one of the most serious international crises of recent times. It was a flagrant violation of international law and has been condemned by the whole international community. Despite the United Nations resolutions creating an international trade embargo and sanctions, Mr. Hussein has seen not fit to back down. Many foreigners, including 45 Canadians, are still being held hostage in Iraq. The threat of future violence toward Saudi Arabia and any other of the gulf states is still a real possibility.

While the sanctions have perhaps produced some changes in the position of Iraq, the Americans and others tell us that it will be perhaps a year before they take effect. I think we need to recognize what the delay while waiting for the sanctions to take a full effect would have. I believe that as we consider the build-up and development of nuclear arms by Iraq and stockpiling of chemical weapons, we realize the threat to all of the peaceful countries in the Middle East.

Mr. Hussein has been described as crazy, but I do not believe he is. I believe he is very shrewd and calculating, and as we have already seen, a very unpredictable person. His recent attempts to lead the whole Arab world against Israel are a very dangerous ploy and will lead to further destabilization in the Middle East.

The motion before us this evening is to support the United Nations resolution which demands that Iraq comply fully with resolution 660 and all subsequent resolutions. This resolution provides Iraq with one final opportunity to remove all of its troops from Kuwait and release the foreign hostages. If this is not done, the resolution authorizes member states to use all necessary means to bring an end to this crises. While this does not necessarily mean the immediate use of troops, it does allow those in charge of the UN forces to use force if necessary.

In supporting this motion, we would be supporting the use of force which many feel would be inconsistent with our responsibilities to our traditional peacekeeping role.

We have to ask ourselves this evening what it really means to be peacekeepers. I believe that peacekeeping is an integral part of not only preserving the peace, but sometimes restoring it when it has been disturbed, such as has happened in the Middle East.

As Canadians, we can be justifiably proud of our role as peacekeepers. In March of this year we had the privilege to visit Cyprus where we visited the Canadian troops, who have an excellent role and an excellent reputation as peacekeepers.

We are familiar with the role that Canadians played in the Suez crisis in the 1950s. It was our country under the then Secretary of State for External Affairs, Lester Pearson, who pioneered the United Nations Emergency Force, for which he won the Nobel Peace Prize.

Canada is the only member of the United Nations to have participated in all of the major peacekeeping operations. Our record spans four decades and include operations both within and without the UN auspices. Considering this history, we cannot abandon our role and responsibility as peacekeepers.

A very significant statement was made by our Prime Minister when he said: "Our traditional peacekeeping role neither excludes nor excuses us from the call to resist aggression".

The United Nations Charter does not provide a definition of peacekeeping either. However, peacekeeping reflects one of the first purposes of the UN announced in its preamble to the Charter when it says: "The establishment of conditions under which justice and respect for obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained".

Peacekeeping goes hand in hand with peacemaking. To quote the Secretary General: "As regards international peace and security, the United Nations Charter sets out a process which in its first stage is based on the

renunciation of force in international relations and on the peaceful settlement of disputes".

If these principles are rejected, the Charter provides for a collective enforcement by the world community through the Security Council. Such actions range from various forms of embargoes to the use of military forces by the Security Council.

While I believe that we must use every diplomatic tool that we have, one of the best diplomacy tools that we have is to back up our diplomacy with a legitimate threat of force. If approved, the United Nations resolution will strengthen our diplomatic message and convey to Mr. Hussein that disregard for international law cannot, nor will not, be tolerated. Iraq must understand the conviction and the determination of the international community.

A second responsibility we must uphold is our responsibility as a member of the Security Council of the United Nations. As a member of the Security Council, we are responsible for maintaining international peace and security in accordance with the purposes and principles of the UN.

In the event of a threat to peace or an act of aggression, we are to make recommendations as to what action should be taken. We are doing that in this case.

This can include, under the provisions of the Charter, chapter 7, the enforcement action by UN member states, including the use of armed forces or other collective measures for dealing with threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, or acts of aggression.

Canada has played an integral role in the creation of the United Nations and has been actively involved since the beginning. When we were elected to the Security Council two years ago, we won on the first ballot with 80 per cent of the member states voting for us.

We should be very proud as a country to be held in such high esteem throughout the world. How can we let those countries down that voted us to the Security Council when we are faced with such a difficult situation?

When Canada was first elected, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the seriousness of our commitment, said that our role would be to react to issues as they arise, depending on the issue, its timing, its connection to other issues and the crucial question of what is finally possible. He said the question of what is finally possible does not, unfortunately, always conform to what is desirable.

To quote from the speech of our Secretary of State for External Affairs to the United Nations Association, he said: "We will face the choice of working and voting for imperfect compromises that have some chance of success as opposed to speaking and voting for resolutions that sound great, but cannot be applied. This government has no illusions that some of our positions in the Security Council will from time to time displease segments of the Canadian public". This is one of those times. We agree that not everybody is going to agree with what we are doing. However, this is no excuse to shrink from our responsibility to the world community.

• (0020)

Some have accused the government of saying: "How high?" to the United States command of "Jump". This is an insult, as was mentioned earlier tonight, not only to Canada, but to France, the United Kingdom and many other countries that are involved in the Middle East. As the nation with the greatest resources, I believe it is natural that the United States should be the leader in this particular engagement.

This brings me to the last and final responsibility, and that is our responsibility as a government to keep Canadians informed of our position and the role we intend to play. I am glad that we have had this debate tonight to present Canada's position on the proposed UN resolution. I encourage the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Prime Minister to continue to allow Parliament to play an important part in these decisions.

I support the motion and I hope that our decisions are made in Canada for Canadians.

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, the hour grows late, and I mean much more than the hour on the clock across from me. Just a year ago the world rejoiced as the walls came tumbling down and peace and democracy seemed to be sweeping huge parts of the world, where for decades the suppression of human potential and human freedom had been the norm. The cold war was ending and for the first time in 50 years we were seeing the possibility of turning the world's resources from instruments of death and destruction to feeding the hungry of the world, nurturing her children and reversing the devastating damage we do

every day to the bounty of the earth and to the very ability of our planet to sustain life.

Now we find ourselves on the brink of war. We find Canada turning its back on the role for which we have become one of the most respected nations of the world, the role of peacemaker and peacekeeper. That role, despite what we have heard from the government side tonight, has not been a role of wimpish submission to aggression or to the violation of human rights. It has been one of going courageously into dangerous situations, acting with restraint but with the clear objective that our forces were there to prevent the outbreak of hostilities, of violence, of killing and that our diplomatic efforts in other places were sustaining and supporting their efforts to prevent war.

Now instead we have adopted a warmongering, sabre-rattling stance. We hear our Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and the Minister of National Defence saying: "We will do what needs to be done with or without the United Nations".

It is important to understand what is before us tonight. The only purpose of the motion before us is to supersede a motion that was adopted by this House just a month ago, a motion that says we abhor the aggression against Kuwait, we support the United Nations resolutions calling for sanctions and we commit the Government of Canada reporting back to the Canadian people through their elected Parliament if further action is to be taken in the Middle East.

The government now wants to supersede that. It wants a wide open door to take whatever action it deems appropriate, without the responsibility to report to Parliament and to account to Canadians for its actions.

It is also important to understand what the motion is that will be dealt with by the Security Council tomorrow and that the government wants to support on behalf of the people of Canada. For a week now we have been subjected to suggestions and statements about what this motion is. I question whether many members on the other side have read the motion.

We have heard that this is a necessary step so that the United Nations can act with force. That is not what the motion says. The motion authorizes member states, not the United Nations, but any one of those member states, to take all necessary means to uphold and implement Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions, that is to have Iraq withdraw from Kuwait. Any one of those member states, with whatever weapons are at their disposal, with or without the rest of the United Nations members, is authorized by this motion to act.

Furthermore, those same member states are authorized to use all necessary means to restore international peace and security in the area. That goes far beyond Kuwait and Iraq. That can touch any one of a number of volatile situations in the Middle East. I ask the members opposite to think of all the countries in the United Nations, many of which are countries in the Middle East, and ask whether we really want, as a country, to give UN sanction to any one of those states in taking the action they think is necessary to "restore international peace and security in this area".

We are all aware of the numerous difficult and volatile situations that exist in that part of the world. Why does the Prime Minister want this *carte blanche*, not for the United Nations, but for the member states of the United Nations? What justification has he provided this House? Just as the government refused to come before Parliament and justify why we were putting Canadian men and women into a potential war zone in the first place, he has now refused to tell us what sanctions have accomplished, what they could accomplish by Christmas Day, what they could accomplish by January 15, and how long we would need sanctions to work. Frankly, how he can ask us on the basis of no justification as to what is happening with the sanctions to get this kind of open door to any further action without the specific information coming before this Parliament, I do not understand.

The Prime Minister says "trust me" but what reason have we to trust. He wraps himself in the United Nations flag, but it was not on the basis of the UN resolution that we committed troops to the Persian Gulf. We did that two weeks before the United Nations passed any resolution. It was not on the basis of any United Nations resolution that we moved our troops from outside the gulf to inside the gulf. It was not on the basis of any United Nations resolution, it was on the basis of a statement by the U.S. air force chief of staff that the

U.S. was prepared to unleash a massive bombing attack against Baghdad that we committed our CF-18s.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has said this motion is not a threat. Of course it is a threat. I question whether those who are making those threats, rattling those sabres, even understand the enemy well enough to know what effect this threat will have. We have assumed an air of superiority that discounts the values that guide the Arab nations and guide Iraq. We are not prepared to deal with them because we do not give them any credibility.

Horrible crimes have been committed against our own humanity when we fail to give value to each and every life on this planet. Hitler was able to perpetrate the Holocaust based on the belief that Jews were not quite human. Atrocities happened in Vietnam based on the views that people with yellow skin and slanted eyes were not quite human. Violence against women and children continues because we are able to convince ourselves that they are not quite human.

The UN was formed with the determination to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. Surely we have progressed in our evolution as human beings beyond where we believe that only brute force is the way to resolve disputes. We should make no mistake in this volatile situation that a war puts at risk nothing less than the survival of the world.

I do not believe for one moment in appeasement or acquiescence or acceding to the aggression of a Saddam Hussein. Killing is not the only way to be tough. Sometimes it takes more toughness, more courage and more strength to last out a peaceful resolution of aggression.

I would like to see Canada taking much more of a leadership role in this issue than we have done. We look to the United Nations and welcome its concerted action, yet every day we continue to biologically and chemically destroy our world. The Minister of the Environment tells us that he won't take any action on that destruction of our world until two years from now when we might have an international agreement.

• (0030)

The appalling contradiction in our words and actions is diminishing Canada's reputation internationally and I call upon the government to either accept the amendment to this motion or to withdraw it and to let stand the motion of October 19 that we support the UN in sanctions; we will continue those sanctions until the aggression is undone and we will do nothing further until we come back to this Parliament and speak to the people of Canada.

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, we cannot and will not vote for this motion because it leaves far too many questions unanswered. The motion asks our Parliament to endorse not just one, but many Security Council resolutions, as spelled out in the motion before us, including resolutions whose wording we do not know because they have not been finalized nor passed. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State to External Affairs, in his intervention, revealed the weakness of this aspect of the resolution some five hours ago.

Second, we will not support it because the effect of sanctions which we all subscribe to and support is still unknown and has just begun to be felt.

Third, we will not support it because the environmental consequences both in human and ecological terms are frightening.

I would like to put on record in that respect a few paragraphs from a speech given by the King of Jordan, His Majesty King Hussein I, some three weeks ago in Geneva on the occasion of the Second World Conference on Climate Warming. He said:

> A war in the Gulf would not only result in devastating human death and injury, tremendous economic loss, and prolonged political confrontation between Orient and Occident. It could also lead to an environmental catastrophe the likes of which the world has not experienced since the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant—A war in the Gulf could result in the use of chemical and biological weapons, and widespread destruction to oil fields and oil storage depots.
>
> The preliminary calculations of our scientists indicate that if half Kuwait's oil reserves (or about 50 billion barrels) were to go up in flames during a war, the environmental impact would be swift, severe and devastating. Emissions of carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide and sulphur dioxide would surpass internationally accepted safety standards by factors of hundreds, and, without factoring in wind effects, would blacken the skies over a radius of at least 750 kilometres from Kuwait—that is, all of Kuwait, Iraq, Bahrain, Qatar, the Emirates and the waters of the Gulf, and most of Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria and Iran.
>
> Other than poisonous emissions of carbon monoxide and sulphur dioxide, the emission of carbon dioxide will increase by at least a factor of 100 over the current total global emission of 5.5 billion tons a year. Lingering in the atmosphere for around 100 years, this massive CO2 emission would promote the greenhouse effect, and contribute to

global warming, climatic changes, lower global food production, and human and animal health deterioration.

The environmental and human toll of such a scenario would be beyond our wildest fears. If oil production facilities suffered long-term damage, which is likely in the event of war, the catastrophe we warn of would be compounded by the devastating impact of the loss of oil imports for economies and peoples around the world.

Because of time limitations I will not go beyond these major quotations from that speech.

• (0035)

It seems to me that the premise that we ought to adopt as a civilized society with the record that Canada has would be that it is in the Persian Gulf an illusion to believe that peace can be attained through an act of war.

I am referring, in particular, to an editorial in *The Globe and Mail* today which is pursuing this perverse logic, trying to convince its readership that we can pursue peace through an act of war in the Persian Gulf.

Second, the United Nations is an instrument of peace. It should not be involved in offensive actions.

Third, Canada should pursue a policy of voting against any possible offensive action in the gulf, not subscribe to potential ones and ask the Parliament of Canada to subscribe to commit itself to subsequent resolutions, the wording of which we do not know. The draft which is in our possession and to which colleagues of mine have made reference earlier was produced on Monday of this week and has already been put on record on several occasions. It would give a green light and a blank cheque to the use of all necessary means to uphold and implement Security Council resolution 660 and all subsequent relevant resolutions.

I am sure the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs would not, in all honesty, expect Parliament to submit itself to resolutions that have not yet been drafted, agreed upon, and passed by virtue of this draft that is in our possession as of Monday of this week from the Canadian mission in New York.

**Mr. Boyer:** Certainly not.

**Mr. Caccia:** I am glad to hear that the parliamentary secretary concurs with that.

It seems to us that major features of Canadian policies have to be formulated as they have been by the distinguished Leader of the Senate group in the other place, who said on November 20 that Canada's policy should consist of major features:

First, Canada should work principally through the United Nations and not bilaterally—

Second, while safeguarding humanitarian action, medical supplies and food supplies, Canada should favour putting the maximum amount of pressure on Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait, short of offensive action.

Third, an early report should be obtained—

We have complained about all afternoon and evening:

—from the Security Council sanctions committee to be made public and discussed in the Canadian Parliament.

Fourth, Canada should make it clear that it will not consider offensive military action in the Gulf—

Fifth, Canadian land forces should not be sent to the Gulf area—

Sixth, Canada should initiate rounds of consultation with the countries concerned to find ways of de-escalating the conflict.

Finally, the Canadian government should not initiate or participate in offensive action without bringing the issue before both Houses of Parliament.

What we are witnessing, instead, is an erratic course of action of this government, not a well thought out policy that is implemented according to some very clearly set premises and principles.

There is agreement in this House it seems to me at the end of this debate on two points. First, we all agree that the action on the part of Iraq invading in Kuwait ought to be rejected, has been rejected, and must continue to be rejected and condemned. Second, there is no one in the House who would disagree that we fully support the use of sanctions. But beyond that we part ways.

We as Liberals are convinced that the solution to the Persian Gulf crisis must be found through dialogue and negotiations, not through armed conflict. The UN's role in this issue will not be ultimately successful and the world body prestige enhanced if it is not actively involved in the peace process.

Why is Canada not discussing ideas for a peacekeeping force, for instance? It has not been pursued in the Security Council by Canada, consistent with the tradition and experience that we have in this respect. How about

the UN led strategy for curbing the global arms threat to avoid a repetition of the situation?

• (0040)

We believe that Canadians are looking for answers to creative questions and not to initiatives that we are being asked to pursue by way of commitments which would inevitably lead to Canada being involved in aggressive initiatives in the gulf area.

In his intervention this afternoon the Secretary of State for External Affairs failed to prove his case. It was his responsibility to convince this House that there was urgency and an absolute necessity for Parliament to endorse this resolution. Instead he engaged in an elaboration of an historical nature as to what has happened so far and urged Parliament to follow the lead without, however, giving us the reasons for doing so.

Mr. Speaker, I see you signalling. I appreciate the opportunity for this intervention at this late hour.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The next two speakers who will have 10 minutes each will be the hon. member for Prince Albert—Churchill River and the hon member for North Island—Powell River. That will take us to around one o'clock, and I know that there are still two or three speakers.

I can, by unanimous consent, not see the clock or I am at your disposal as to whatever you would like me to do. There are three extra speakers, the member for Parkdale—High Park, the member for Beaver River, and the member for Fraser Valley West.

**An hon. member:** And the member for Winnipeg North.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** It is a little more than that. Do I have unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** No.

**Mr. Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if there might be unanimous consent, if there was a clear indication that there would be an absolute limit and no questions and answers, to a brief 10 minutes for each of the remaining four speakers?

**Mr. Boyer:** There is more than four.

**Mr. Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** It would be a shame to limit a debate of this importance at this hour. Haste and brief remarks would facilitate in moving it along.

**Mr. Flis:** I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am a little disappointed to hear from the parliamentary secretary that he did not give unanimous consent. Usually he is a very reasonable colleague and does agree to such a request. It would be a shame on such an important topic to see the clock. We could go half an hour.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Mr. McKnight:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Making a decision at this time of night when we have explained to all colleagues who have an interest in this matter that the debate would conclude at 1 p.m. and now making exceptions to what has been established does not seem fair to the colleagues who would have wished to speak and because of notification of 10-minute speeches and the closure at one o'clock are not here to take part in the extension. I find that unfair to the colleagues who are not here at this time.

**Mr. Wenman:** I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I can understand that the government wants the debate concluded and would not want to think that it was opening the debate through the night or this kind of thing. However if we agree, by unanimous consent, to limit it just to those on your list, the debate does come to an early conclusion and in fact rewards the patience of those of us who have sat here and waited so long to speak, because it was one of the most important issues we can face, an issue of life and death.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Again I have to ask for unanimous consent.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** There is not unanimous consent. The hon. member for Prince Albert—Churchill River. You will have to split that eight minutes apiece between yourself and your colleague.

**Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to be here to participate in this debate, even though the hour is late. As the previous interchange has indicated that my time will be quite

limited, I would like to deal with some of the highlights of what I had planned to say.

We have heard many words of high principle and abstract thoughts about the nature of the United Nations, the international community, international law, and so on.

• (0045)

We are also talking about a very stark reality, a reality that is very clear, for example, to the 18-year-old in the Co-op service station that I went into on the weekend. He asked whether, in fact, he would be subject to a draft as a foreseeable consequence of the actions of the government and the United Nations in the Middle East, something that he felt personally to be a fear for him.

The fears that this young man expressed are indicative of the thoughts going through the minds of many young people in the country. We too often ignore that it is those people facing the direct reality, and not those of us who sit in the House.

At the other end, there are people probably not many blocks from here, and people in the Pentagon who are perhaps at this very moment, if they work this late, planning meticulously what would happen under various scenarios. How many people would die, how they would die, and when they would die. These things are well planned in advance and, if the people of Canada had that kind of information laid before them by the government, rather than lofty rhetoric and appeals to emotion, it might well cast a much different light on the question we are debating. That is the reality of what we are talking about tonight.

I certainly stand with my party and, in fact, the whole opposition in opposing the resolution put forward by the government. I do so for several reasons and many of those have been expressed very well by other speakers tonight. Basically, we cannot issue a blank cheque for what will happen after January 15. With all due respect, I do not think we can issue our own government a blank cheque for what will happen after January 15. I do not think, given the wording of the UN resolution which allows any member of the international community to take action, we cannot allow a blank cheque there either. It has been clear as these things evolved through the summer—the Oka dispute and our first excursion into the gulf—that, in fact, the government is prepared to move well ahead of the authority it has from Parliament and to move well ahead of the rationale which it might be offering.

This whole scenario and the resolution before us indicate that what we might have been doing up to now might well have been a fraud, in that it implies that we never were serious about sanctions, that the UN body was never serious about sanctions, that the U.S. was never serious about sanctions, and that the objective was always to invade and engage in a military conflict. Surely, all our experience with sanctions—and there has been considerable experience with sanctions internationally—has indicated that sanctions would not work this fast. It is silly to say that the possibilities of sanctions have been exhausted or would be exhausted by January 15. That clearly is not within the realm of imagination, especially when we are being asked again to accept a blank cheque when there has been no evidence before us that the sanctions are not working.

This was underlined when we heard the member from Surrey say: "What if it takes a year for sanctions to work?" Well, what if it takes a year for sanctions to work? Surely, a year of sanctions is a much preferable scenario than a blood-bath involving our own young men and women in the Middle East. Spending a year to make sure that sanctions work and engaging in other forms of international pressure are surely preferable to engaging in a blood-bath in the Middle East.

I was disturbed in this debate by the questioning of the motives of people who perhaps do not support this resolution and the implication that perhaps those who oppose the government's resolution, somehow or other, are condoning the actions of Saddam Hussein, are in favour of the expansionism, and of the flouting international law. I would like to ask the government, does it feel that the motives of people like the Christian Peacemaker Teams, a group from the Church of the Brethren, the Brethren in Christ, the Mennonite Church and the General Conference Mennonite Church, the delegation that departed last weekend, should be questioned. I might add that I might well have been a member of that delegation if Federal Express had not sent my passport to Winnipeg instead of Washington.

• (0050)

This delegation has been in Iraq for some days. Their objective was to meet with Iraqi families, to visit non-religious institutions such as hospitals, schools and other projects to communicate concerns for a just peace with the political leaders in Baghdad and so on.

I received a fax today from that delegation. Some of the things they say are interesting. It says: "Shortages are beginning. Sugar, milk, medical supplies, petrol additives, water purification chemicals are all in short supply". It says: "Everyone is growing in apprehension and conviction about the crisis". It says further: "In other meetings senior Iraqis underlined their desire to negotiate and said that they await a 'hint' of interest from the U.S.". All of these are indications to me that the sanctions are working, that the effects are being felt. Surely it is very much premature at this point to say that sanctions are not working.

We also have heard an appeal to principle, the principles of international law. It strikes me as ironic. My first experience at the United Nations came when I was making an intervention on behalf of East Timor at the same time as the initial debates were occurring in the Security Council regarding the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait at the beginning of August. It was an interesting juxtaposition, where on the one hand the world community was solidly condemning the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq, while at the same time totally ignoring the invasion of East Timor by Indonesia 15 years ago. The international community has been silent on that question ever since.

It struck me that it must be a matter of who ends up with the oil. In the case of Iraq obviously the bad guys ended up with the oil and in the case of East Timor the good guys ended up with the oil. That seems to be very much what these high flown principles come down to when they are examined closely.

In conclusion, I would like to urge the government to not let us go down the slippery slope that we are on, to not let ourselves get sucked into a situation that we cannot get out of, to not engage in a kind of demonization that allows us no options. Canada has been a leader in the search for peace internationally. We are not showing leadership now. Let us show leadership again. As a former cultural hero of a particular generation said: "Let's give the sanctions a chance, let's give peace a chance".

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member for Fraser Valley West on a point of order.

**Mr. Wenman:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the government to reconsider the request for unanimous consent in order that they avoid the appearance of unfortunate coincidence in that I am the only government member not being allowed to speak, especially since I have informed the government that I cannot support their motion at this time. I would ask for their concurrence to be heard.

**Mr. Boyer:** Mr. Speaker, the problem with this is that as the evening dwindled on, members have relied on the unanimous consent of the House earlier to go to 1 a.m. and then left. There were a number of MPs who wanted to speak. I said they would not be able to and they went home. Recently we had the same thing and after that, 10 to 15 minutes ago other MPs left. I am trying to be fair on this and certainly not prevent anybody speaking no matter what point—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** There is not unanimous consent. The hon. member for North Island—Powell River.

**Mr. Ray Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** Mr. Speaker, I think that is certainly regrettable. It is regrettable that the government has seen fit to do this. We have heard the arguments on why and they can be judged by the public. Mr. Speaker, I think in a few moments we will have finished this. What I would like to do is basically communicate to this House the feeling of my constituents. After all, we all represent a large number of people in this House of Commons, where the issues are aired and they are decided.

• (0055)

The people I represent do support the United Nations and they support it vigorously. They believe that the United Nations and its collective security approach is the only way to go. The allegations that that is not true, that I do not support it, my colleagues do not, and the people I represent do not is false.

They do not support Saddam Hussein. They do not support the invasion of Kuwait. They are not weak on this. They are absolutely firm. So am I as are my colleagues.

They do not believe, however, that the Canadian Armed Forces should be used to attack Iraq. The reason they do not believe that is that at the present time there is no one shooting inside Kuwait, or Iraq is not shooting at its neighbours at this point. The situation has stopped.

We believe that this government and the United States in the United Nations will convince their United Nations colleagues to use force to attack when nobody is actually shooting at this point for whatever reason, and we believe that is absolutely wrong. A million people will die, most of them women and children, but certainly members of the Canadian Armed Forces will die, and they could die in large numbers if the conflict takes on the complexion of the Iran–Iraq war. Americans will die in large numbers, as will members of the armed forces of every other nation. We will kill probably a million Iraqis as well, women and children, the elderly. It will be an absolute blood–bath.

That is what we have before us tonight. My constituents do not believe that that should happen, in spite of the polls that appear, in spite of what the government might believe.

The other thing they do not believe is the Prime Minister of Canada. Part of the dilemma of this country on the unity issue and on so many other issues is that the Prime Minister of Canada has lost the confidence of the nation. He is not viewed as a strong leader in whom the confidence of the citizenry exists.

What they fear the most and what I fear the most is that this open–ended resolution has been constructed by intelligent people to leave room for the government to act unilaterally. We have heard backbenchers stand in this House, even cabinet ministers, and say: "Oh, no, we would never do anything like that".

They have in fact done that before. I would point to the GATT agreement on the west coast in which the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, now the Minister of Indian Affairs, stood up and said: "We will never let this thing come to pass. It would be catastrophic for the people on the west coast". The Prime Minister said: "Sorry. We are going to let it happen because our friends, the Americans, want that to happen".

We believe that will happen with this situation. When the Americans go, they are going to say to the Prime Minister of this country that he is going with them and that is the reason why we have an open–ended resolution. That is why the United Nations has an open–ended resolution.

The people I represent recognize in this Prime Minister an individual who will leave himself an out to use the Armed Forces, to not call back Parliament and to basically support the Americans who are the primary initiators of this action to leap into a blood–bath in the Middle East. This will be absolutely catastrophic.

I intend to go from this House because I do not believe that the other side of the House is acting in a responsible and honest fashion and I am going to urge citizens in every community to get out to demonstrate and to actively fight this government in its decision to lead us close and into a war in the Persian Gulf.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** It being one o'clock, pursuant to order made earlier, this sitting of the debate is now deemed adjourned and the House stands adjourned until eleven o'clock a.m. this day, pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 1 a.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Thursday, November 29, 1990**

The House met at 11 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

[*English*]

## NATIONAL HOCKEY LEAGUE

### FUTURE EXPANSION

**Mr. Terry Clifford (London—Middlesex):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose a resolution in the House that has been discussed by all sides of the House, seconded by the hon. member for Stormont—Dundas:

> Whereas the game of hockey is part of the Canadian identity and mindful of the fact that the National Hockey League is considering expansion;
>
> And whereas this House is of the opinion that any future expansion of the NHL would benefit from the inclusion of Canadian teams;
>
> Therefore, that this House supports the efforts of Ottawa and Hamilton in their bids to obtain National Hockey League franchises.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it agreed?

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, we have no problem with the content of the motion. Because we were unable to get agreement with the other two parties that our leader would be allowed 20 minutes to speak on this very important issue, which will be dealt with this morning, we said that we would not put any other procedures up this morning. We agreed with the content. Now we have a government backbencher getting up on a procedural motion after an agreement that we would not do so. It does not make sense.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** If there is no consent, we will go to Routine Proceedings.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

## PETITIONS

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 83 petitions.

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Mr. Speaker, I have more petitions from Canadians in the metropolitan Toronto area arguing that at the present time the Government of Canada has seen fit to apply a zero rate of tax to magazines, books and newspapers. It now proposes to include them in the GST. Their argument is that there has been no such tax since Confederation.

The petitioners are lobbying this House and this government, first of all, to get rid of the GST, and failing that, no GST be imposed on printed material.

### GASOLINE ADDITIVES

**Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add these petitions containing 335 names to the 4,000 persons who have signed petitions asking the government to ban the use of MMT in gasoline. Methylcyclopentadienyl manganese tricarbonyl is what is meant by MMT. MM-3, a form of manganese, comes from the exhaust of cars. It is an insidious neuro-toxic substance taken in through the human respiratory system.

When the Department of Transport conducts their emission tests on Canadian automobiles, they do not use gasoline that contains MMT because the cars do not pass the test using this additive which has been banned in the United States since 1978.

These petitioners are calling upon the government to ban this insidious substance which attacks the brain cells of younger people whose immune systems are not fully developed.

• (1110 )

VIA RAIL

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present two petitions to the House. One is from some of the residents of the riding of Kingston and the Islands who signed a petition opposed to the government cutbacks in public transportation and specifically cutbacks in the VIA Rail network in Canada.

I am sure the petitioners would be upset at the number of cuts that we have had in this area already. There is apprehension, given the run-down of VIA Rail that the government is engineering, there may be more. The petitioners call upon Parliament to reinstate, not cancel in whole or in part, any rail passenger service in Canada. Some of the signatures were before the cuts and some after the cuts.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** The second petition is from residents of the city of Toronto. These Canadians are opposed to the goods and services tax in so far as the tax applies on books and the printed word. They support, of course, the amendment put forward by the Liberal senators in the other place supporting the cut of this vicious tax on books and the printed word and urging the Parliament of Canada to oppose the goods and services tax, specifically that portion of the tax that applies to books.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I rise once again, day after day, month after month to bring to this government's attention the thousands of petitions that have been presented to this House with respect to the unfortunate tax this government has decided to put on intellectual property, on books, and on magazines.

I ask this government to stop being so stubborn and to reconsider the tax on reading materials. The government is now well aware that the province of Quebec does not intend to tax intellectual property and reading materials. I would suggest that the government take a good lesson from the province of Quebec and the millions of Canadians who agree with it.

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for recognizing me under the provisions of Standing Order 36 in order to place a petition on the table with regard to the goods and services tax.

A number of the petitioners come from the great province of British Columbia. They wish to register their complaint that the Government of Canada should not proceed with the goods and services tax as it will be a very prohibitive and negative factor in terms of the goods and services that they will have to purchase.

Mr. Speaker, I also have a petition signed by individuals from the province of Alberta, which I am sure is dear to your heart, and they too, like previous petitioners, are opposed to the goods and services tax. They call upon the Government of Canada to move forthwith and withdraw the goods and services tax.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member is very welcome.

**Mr. Joe Fontana (London East):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I stand before this House to present a petition on behalf of people from Toronto, London, and even those people from the riding of the Minister of Finance, asking this government to reaffirm the historic principles embodied in the tax-free status of the printed word on books, newspapers and magazines by retaining the zero rate, instead of imposing the GST on learning materials.

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, it is my honour, duty and privilege to present to this House, under Standing Order 36, a petition certified correct by the clerk of petitions.

This petition comes from the riding of the hon. member for Haldimand—Norfolk. Many of the petitioners are residents of Brantford, Mill Grove, Simcoe, Waterford and Princeton. These petitioners strongly oppose the goods and services tax, an unprecedented tax grab from the pockets of Canadians that will hit them not only with higher taxes, higher inflation, higher interest rates and higher unemployment. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, taxing books, the Bible, university learning material in the year of literacy?

This petition says no to the goods and services tax and asks that the members in the other place, do all in their power to prevent it from passing.

FOOD PACKAGING AND LABELLING

**Mrs. Pauline Browes (Scarborough Centre):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present this petition, on behalf of a number of my constituents in Scarborough.

They are concerned about the food packaging and the labelling of food packaging, as that relates to allergic reactions. The Allergy Information Association has done a great deal of work on this. The petitioners are calling upon Parliament to enact legislation, amending the food and drug regulations, in order to require manufacturers to list on pre-packaged foods, in place of the general classifications, the specific food ingredients and additives and, as well, to require restaurateurs and food retailers to provide, on demand, to customers a list of all food ingredients and additives in prepared foods.

* * *

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, Question No. 349 will be answered today.

[*Text*]

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD COMMISSIONERS' SALARIES, EXPENSES, BONUSES, ETC.

Question No. 349—**Mr. Ferguson:**

For the years 1989 and 1990, what were the (a) salaries (b) expenses (c) bonuses (d) any other remuneration, of the Commissioners of the Canadian Wheat Board?

**Hon. Charles James Mayer (Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister of State (Grains and Oilseeds)):** a) Effective April 1, 1989, the salary range for the Chief Commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board is $109,700—$133,300. The salary range for the other four Commissioners is $102,600—$120,000.

b) The total of expenses for all five Commissioners: 1989-90—$285,233.45; April 1, 1990 to September 26, 1990—$132,381.23.

c) The Commissioners' bonuses are based on performance and are confidential.

d) None.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The question as enumerated by the hon. parliamentary secretary, has been answered.

**Mr. Cooper:** I ask, Mr. Speaker, that all remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** It being 11.18 o'clock, pursuant to order made Wednesday, November 28, 1990, it is my duty to interrupt Routine Proceedings and call Government Business No. 24.

---

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

## INVASION OF KUWAIT

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS

The House resumed from Wednesday, November 28, the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):

That this House, noting that the Government of Iraq has not complied with the United Nations Security Council resolutions concerning the invasion of Kuwait and the detention of third country nationals, supports the United Nations in its efforts to ensure compliance with Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions.

And on the amendment of Mr. Gray (Windsor West):

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "its" and substituting the following:

"current efforts to ensure compliance with Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions adopted as of 28 November 1990, and that this support shall not be interpreted as approval of the use of Canadian Forces for offensive action without further consultation with and approval by this House."

And on the amendment of Mr. Brewin:

That the motion be amended by adding the following words:

"and further, that this House oppose use of force against Iraq until sanctions and other United Nations measures have had time to

succeed and urges the government to seek amendments to the currently proposed Security Council resolution to that effect."

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the Security Council of the United Nations will vote on a resolution authorizing member states, co-operating with the Government of Kuwait, and I quote from the resolution: "to use all necessary means to uphold and implement Security Council resolution 660, and all subsequent relevant resolutions, and to restore peace and security in the area".

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada will vote, this afternoon, in favour of this resolution of the Security Council because Canadians believe profoundly in the United Nations; Canadians support the rule of international law; and, Canadians understand the need for collective security. Now is the time to vote.

In endorsing this resolution, Canada will join the international community in sending President Hussein a clear message that the time has come to take the United Nations directive seriously. The international community will also be giving him, and this I believe is an important consideration, a very clear signal of a "pause of goodwill", during which time he is encouraged and, indeed, invited to release the hostages and to withdraw his forces from Kuwait.

As President Gorbachev of the Soviet Union stated yesterday: "The fate of Iraq is now in the hands of (President Hussein) and time is expiring". Peace is jeopardized, not by the resolution being discussed at the Security Council of the United Nations this afternoon, but by the actions taken by Iraq during the last four months. Peace would be fatally undermined if nations like Canada failed to take appropriate measures and the United Nations was weakened and diminished.

• (1120 )

Although Kuwait is distinct from Canada, geographically, Canadian interests are directly engaged in the conflict there.

The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait is a blatant contravention of the system of international law that Canadians among many others have painstakingly helped to create since the Second World War. In fact, no country has a greater interest than Canada in the promotion, the defence and the respect of the rule of law.

The objective of that law, in part, is to ensure the security of smaller countries in face of larger neighbours, and to provide the means to settle disputes peacefully.

The invasion of Kuwait puts the concept of collective security, as provided for in the United Nations Charter, to a decisive test. Article 1 of the Charter reads, in part, as follows:

The Purposes of the United Nations are to maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace—

Those words were incorporated right into the Charter of the United Nations.

Today's UN resolution is not just the culmination of diplomatic activity over the past four months. It is also in some important ways the realization of diplomatic aspirations held by many since the founding of the international organization.

With the end of the Cold War, the international community has the opportunity at last to transform the potential of the United Nations into performance. The visionaries who created the United Nations were idealists, but they were not dreamers.

They were determined: "to make certain," as Mr. Pearson wrote in 1945, "that never again should an aggressor be permitted to strike down one nation after another before the peace-loving nations of the world organize and take concerted action against it".

Let me repeat what Mr. Pearson wrote: "never again should an aggressor be permitted to strike down one nation after another before the peace-loving nations of the world organize and take concerted action against it".

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Mulroney:** What Mr. Pearson wrote was true in 1945, and it is no less valid in 1990. He understood—indeed those who brought the United Nations together understood—that the United Nations could only be effective if everyone recognized and accepted that security was indivisible. During the 40 years of the Cold War, the world allowed itself—sometimes in dramatic ways—to forget that important lesson. We have had to send young sailors, soldiers, airmen and women into active service in the Persian Gulf. I know that all members of

the House will join with me today in saluting again the courage and the dedication of these brave young Canadians.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Mulroney:** The United Nations was prevented by the Cold War from responding to other acts of aggression over the years. But that situation has now changed, in very dramatic and remarkable ways. Witness the extraordinary co-operation between the Soviet Union and the United States in this and other important areas around the world, to witness the progressive and the dynamic attitude of President Gorbachev and contrast that in similarly explosive situations in the past with the attitudes of his predecessors.

This is a unique time in international affairs. Because of that, the situation has now changed. With the end of the Cold War, the United Nations has the opportunity again to act collectively in the defence of the security of its members. The United Nations is acting with prudence and care and it is precisely because of its moderation that the United Nations today deserves Canada's support.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Mulroney:** What is at stake, Mr. Speaker, is not just the future of Kuwait but also, in many important ways, the future of the United Nations. We know what happened to the League of Nations when it stood by as Mussolini invaded Ethiopia. It was reduced to impotence and to scorn. Men and women around the world who believed in liberty and freedom paid an enormous price as the effectiveness of the League disintegrated.

This cannot and must not be allowed to happen to the increasing and effective moral authority that the United Nations is now bringing in a dozen different ways to questions around the world. This cannot happen. What happened to the League cannot and must not ever be allowed to happen to the United Nations.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mulroney:** Mr. Speaker, the lessons of the past must be learned.

Any weakening of the UN, would engender an escalation of military spending for self-defence around the world and a proliferation of ever more dangerous and destructive arms—in short, the creation of a much more dangerous world.

And we know that Iraq, which is already working on weapons of mass destruction and on the means of delivering them over long distances, would become even more uncontrollable.

Canadian interests in Kuwait and the region go beyond the present and potential military dangers and the preservation of the principle of collective security.

The inalienable human rights of millions of people have been, and are still being, callously overridden by Iraq and countless atrocities have been committed against innocent people.

And the economic impacts of the Gulf crisis have been serious on the people of the energy-poor, heavily indebted countries of the third world and on the reconstruction of the newly liberated countries of Eastern Europe which need additional assistance from countries like Canada and other industrialized countries, assistance that is necessarily fragmented as a result of the entirely unusual circumstances in the Gulf.

So Canadian interests are very much engaged in this issue. Nor is the challenge to those interests and to our basic human values ever likely to be more clear or the need to join in a collective response more compelling. In its contempt for international opinion. the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait is one of the most brazen acts of aggression of our age.

Iraq has inflicted death and destruction on its small neighbour, plundered that country, detained foreigners, including Canadians, against their will and given guest workers, many penniless, the choice of braving the desert in August or starving to death.

Since he first used force to occupy Kuwait in August, he has threatened to invade Saudi Arabia, to attack Israel with chemical and biological weapons, to sponsor terrorism against those who resist his aggression and to destroy the oil fields of the Arabian Peninsula.

And this from a man who started a war with another of his neighbours, Iran, that lasted eight years and cost close to a million lives—almost an entire generation wiped out as a result of an act of aggression. This from a

man who used poison gas in that war, including against his own citizens.

• (1130)

[*English*]

What is at stake in the Gulf are the foundations of peace and the norm of civilization. The international community must prevail. It is giving diplomacy every chance to work as it must.

As a member of the United Nations Security Council, Canada has worked hard to help draft and pass a series of principled step-by-step resolutions designed to persuade Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait.

We have helped the United Nations design and implement economic sanctions against Iraq that are the most stringent ever adopted. We have ourselves respected those sanctions scrupulously. Indeed, I think that I indicated earlier to the House that the first implication of the international application of sanctions occurred at the Port of Vancouver where Canada immediately interrupted a possible shipment that would have violated even inadvertently the first orders that emanated from the Security Council.

We have dispatched three warships and a squadron of CF-18 fighter aircraft and approximately 1,700 personnel to resist Iraqi aggression and to enforce the United Nations sanctions.

In the many discussions I have had with President Bush on this subject, I have consistently counselled both restraint in securing Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait and the need to work at all times within the authority of the United Nations Charter.

Indeed, the *New York Times* reported in August—I believe on its front page—an important disagreement that took place in respect of an interpretation of article 51 where Canada, through our distinguished ambassador, Yves Fortier, led the fight in the Security Council to insist that the suggestion by the United States that any concept of unilateral action at that point in time must be resisted and that the solidarity that this had engendered at the United Nations must be respected.

I believe that that action taken by the Government of Canada on the instructions of the Secretary of State for External Affairs to Ambassador Fortier resulted in the solidarity we know today. It was consistent with the finest traditions of Canadian diplomacy.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Mulroney:** That has been my consistent message as well in discussions with President Gorbachev, former Prime Minister Thatcher, President Mitterrand, Prime Minister Andreotti, Chancellor Kohl and other leaders.

It was also the message conveyed by Mr. Clark in the past few days in his most recent discussions with President Mubarak of Egypt, President Ozal of Turkey, King Hussein of Jordan and Prime Minister Shamir of Israel.

The entire Canadian policy in this regard, Mr. Speaker, has been designed with a peaceful solution in mind: support for the United Nations, implementation of sanctions in Canada itself, increased consultations with world leaders exploring all conceivable avenues toward a peaceful solution, deployment of military support to seek to enforce United Nations sanctions and unrelenting diplomatic efforts to secure the release of all Canadians being illegally held in Iraq.

In our discussions with world leaders, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Minister of National Defence, and I have found a remarkable consensus that the best solution to the crisis in the Gulf is indeed the one that Canada has articulated consistently at the United Nations, namely, a peaceful one.

However, we have also found that a very strong consensus exists to the effect that if peaceful means do not work, recourse would have to be added to other necessary means. While the UN sanctions are undoubtedly being felt by the Iraqi and Kuwaiti people, we have found no widespread confidence that they are sufficient to bring about the desired result: namely, to persuade President Hussein to withdraw his forces from Kuwait.

The situation Canada faces is clear. I can tell you that Canada will stand with the overwhelming majority of the world community, including all of our partners in the Security Council, in giving Saddam Hussein an opportunity to reflect carefully on the consequences of his action and a reasonable timetable to withdraw from Kuwait, but withdraw from Kuwait he must.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Mulroney:** President Hussein, I very much regret to say, appears to be quite prepared to see his people endure hardship indefinitely so he can hang on to Kuwait. We see no contradiction between continuing to apply pressure through economic sanctions, the action of the United Nations, in other words, giving diplomacy a chance and giving President Hussein a period of time to withdraw from Kuwait.

[*Translation*]

While the Security Council was passing repeated resolutions ordering Iraq to abandon its conquest of Kuwait, President Hussein formally annexed that country, plundered its wealth, brutalized its people, and tried to erase its very identity.

His response to the world community's repeated urgent demands that he withdraw his forces from Kuwait was to send another 250,000 soldiers to that unfortunate country. And to try to protect himself from harm he has detained thousands of foreigners and, cynically, has used many as human shields at strategic locations. Meanwhile, the suffering of the Kuwait people continues!

And the risk persists of an accidental launch of full-scale war in the most volatile region in the world, with consequences that could engulf everyone.

President Hussein is a man of limited acquaintance with the world outside his own borders. From the beginning he appears to have underestimated what the international reaction would be to his attack on Kuwait.

It seems to take a pretty clear and fothright message Mr. Speaker, to persuade him that times have changed, that the will of the world community will not be thwarted and that he will, one way or another, have to leave Kuwait.

[*English*]

Short of the use of force itself, today's UN Security Council resolution is the strongest possible message the international community can send to him.

Members of this House understand at least as well as anyone that we Canadians are a peaceful people.

In Canada, our national day is a time for picnics and family, not for displays of military might. But we Canadians have also learned the lessons of history. We know that not everyone shares our respect for international law and for the norms of civilized international behaviour.

As Mr. Pearson pointed out so eloquently: "We have also learned the consequences of appeasement".

We know that if Iraq profits from its aggression, the whole idea of collective security will be fatally undermined and the world will become a much more dangerous place. This cannot be allowed to happen.

The object of the exercise at the United Nations today is peace. Although opposition parties have expressed some concerns, some of which I can understand, I hope all members of the House will support the United Nations resolution today in the interests of international solidarity and in the face of a serious threat to world peace.

• (1140)

*The Toronto Star* pointed out in its lead editorial this morning, and I quote:

> For Canada to vote against such a resolution would be to send the wrong signal to Saddam at a critical stage of this psychological warfare.
>
> It would also break faith with an unprecedented consensus that has emerged on this issue between east and west, Arabs and non-Arabs.

I think *The Star* has made two very important points. The UN's quite unprecedented achievements need now to be sustained by a solid indication of international support. What gives rise to war, Mr. Speaker, is the collapse of international order, and the collapse of international order comes about when member states allow international law to be violated and the United Nations to be ignored. The integrity of the United Nations and its charter is now at stake, and that integrity must be preserved.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Mulroney:** We hope for the sake of all concerned that President Hussein heeds the United Nations message and withdraws peacefully. That is Canada's policy. That is Canada's objective at the Security Council today, and that has been the objective of our policy from the very beginning.

We strongly urge President Hussein to do so in the interests of his own people, his own nation, and those of world peace. The choice is entirely his to make. We genuinely hope he reflects carefully and that he chooses wisely.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great honour to follow the Prime Minister in this debate. I agree with many of the things that the Prime Minister said in this House. I agree, for example, with what he said about the invasion of Kuwait being a blatant contravention of international law. We on this side of the House agree very strongly with this.

The Prime Minister opened his remarks by saying we must have a collective security and now is the time to vote. Mr. Speaker, what is it we are voting for? Are we voting for the resolution which will be voted upon in the United Nations this afternoon, or are we coming back to this House to vote on the resolution on the floor of this House? I remind the Prime Minister that first and foremost we must vote on the resolution before us in this House. If the Prime Minister would like to send a very strong message to the United Nations to show that we all, in the Canadian tradition, support what the United Nations is doing, his party should have no difficulty supporting the Liberal amendment.

The Prime Minister was not here yesterday. I will just remind him what the Liberal amendment is. It is adding to the end of the government motion, after the word "its" substituting the following:

> "current efforts to ensure compliance with Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions adopted as of 28 November 1990, and that this support shall not be interpreted as approval of the use of Canadian Forces for offensive action without further consultation with and approval by this House."

This is something which the Prime Minister promised us before. Now he is backing away from his promise. As the resolution reads, government representatives are interpreting it differently.

I was here until one o'clock this morning hearing the speeches. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs said on the floor of this House that subsequent resolutions means only resolutions passed to this point. I went to the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* and looked up the meaning of subsequent. The meaning of subsequent is "of later time or date". In other words, the resolution would read:

> That this House, noting that the Government of Iraq has not complied with the United Nations Security Council resolutions concerning the invasion of Kuwait and the detention of third country nationals, supports the United Nations in its efforts to ensure compliance with Security Council resolution 660—

To that point we agree. It would continue:

> —and subsequent resolutions.

In other words, the UN can pass resolutions next month or during the summer when this House is not sitting. We know that this Prime Minister will not recall Parliament when we ask the Prime Minister to do it, as we did in the Oka crisis and as we did in the Gulf crisis. We asked day in and day out and Canadians asked: "Please recall Parliament and let us debate it first". The Prime Minister did not recall Parliament. That is why we cannot support such a resolution, because we on this side of the House and Canadians cannot trust this Prime Minister or his government.

"Subsequent resolutions", his own Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs said, meant only previous resolutions. This morning the Prime Minister said that that includes the motion that will be voted on today. Yesterday there was a different interpretation. Are we to trust this government when this government wants us to vote on this?

If the government wants to send a strong message to the United Nations, let it support our amendment. Then it will send a strong message. There is time to negotiate approval and support for that amendment.

What we heard today is a sabre rattling, gun toting, grenade throwing, Rambo Prime Minister. He talks about collective security, and the only way he sees collective security is with arms. What about using diplomacy? What about giving sanctions more time to work?

The Prime Minister himself said there are signs that sanctions are working. Why do we not give those sanctions more time? How long did it take for the sanctions to take effect in South Africa and in other parts of the world? Here the government is putting a time line.

The resolution at the United Nations has a time line. I believe it is January 15. What happens when that time line is up? What happens then? Is it war? If it is war, what kind of war? Nuclear? Chemical warfare? Is this what the government wants Canadians to get into?

The Prime Minister correctly said that when Iran and Iraq went to war a million lives were lost. What a tragedy: one million lives between two countries. How many lives are going to be sacrificed when over 20 countries get involved in war, with chemical warfare and the potential of nuclear warfare? Is that what the Prime Minister wants to commit Canadians to?

The Prime Minister said that the United Nations is acting with prudence and care and deserves our support. Yes, it deserves our support to allow sanctions more time to work. It deserves our support to allow for diplomacy. This party congratulates our ambassador, Yves Fortier. He is an excellent ambassador who knows how to negotiate with other countries through diplomacy, but let us give him more time to do this. Let us not put a time line on it.

What if the diplomacy works in, let us say, February, March or at the end of 1991? Are we limited to this January 15 time line and we go to war? What we heard from the Prime Minister today is a little scary.

• (1150)

This is probably one of the most important debates this House will face for a very long time. In fact, the implications of this debate will stay long after we are gone. We are not debating a simple motion to support or oppose sanctioned military aggression in the Gulf, as the Prime Minister tried to convince us. What we are debating is the future of thousands and potentially millions of people around the world. We are debating the end of the cold war in the context of the new international order. We are debating whether peaceful persuasion and the dollar spent in that persuasion is preferable to offensive military action that far surpasses anything that anyone in this House can conceive.

The purpose of the motion we are debating today is to give our government the go-ahead to vote in favour of a Security Council motion that carries with it an ultimatum. In other words, there will be no more room for negotiation. The die will have been cast, and there will be no turning back. I think it is important to all of us in this House to understand what happens to the role of the Security Council once this motion is passed.

The motion, to begin with, was put forward by the United States. We know that. We do not need a lesson in the motives of the American president. Yes, Mr. Bush wants Hussein out, and he wants him out now, and we agree with that.

The Middle East is and has been since 1940 of critical interest to the United States. The State Department in the 1940s described the Middle East as being a stupendous source of strategic power and one of the greatest material prizes in world history. Eisenhower himself referred to it as the most strategically important area in the world. But, let there be no misunderstanding: my party also condemns the action of Hussein and calls on him to withdraw Iraqi troops from Kuwait immediately.

The sanctions that are currently in place are strictly a United Nations operation under the supervision of the United Nations 661 committee. Douglas Scott, President of the Markland group, and other disarmament spokesmen confirm that a military action as put forth in this motion and as supported by the Prime Minister, would have no UN supervision.

In fact, the United States has made it very clear that it would not allow a committee such as the one that supervised the sanctions to operate. What this means is that essentially the war would be fought by the U.S. and its allies, with no direction from the UN. It means that the responsibility of dealing with Iraq would be turned over to a group of countries beyond UN control.

If one were to look at how the 661 committee works, one would appreciate the degree of control the committee exerts. Responsible for the supervision of humanitarian supplies of food stuffs and medicine, the committee also directs the way in which aircraft and ships are inspected on the way into the Gulf. It monitors very closely legislation and regulations enacted by member countries in complying with the sanctions. Countries with inadequate legislation or regulations are required to respond directly to this committee.

The UN charter, however, does allow for supervision of military action by a military staff committee. Just as recent as last week, I understand, the Soviet Union was hesitant in supporting the resolution unless there was such a committee. This shows that there is a will to pursue courses of action other than by military force.

Unfortunately, the United States has shown, on more than one occasion, that it is able to circumvent quite deliberately any action that it does not consider conducive to U.S. self-interest. This will for peaceful alternatives is further exemplified by at least two working

papers that I have, which I can table, that were circulated at the United Nations. From what I understand, neither paper was found worthy of discussion because the United States took exception to them. Yet, both these papers called for dealing with the issue within a peaceful framework that would compliment the sanctions and allow for discussion and movement that could lead, with the right type of encouragement, to a peaceful resolution through diplomacy as the Prime Minister said.

I want to draw to the attention of the House the specific reasons that my colleagues on this side of the House oppose the motion put forth by the government. The Liberal Party has stated on many occasions that it supports all the resolutions that have been put forth to date at the Security Council.

However we cannot support under any circumstances a blank cheque to the government, as is the case in this motion, and I have already mentioned the controversial interpretation by government representatives themselves.

We also cannot support a deadline such as is indicated in the draft resolution to be debated at the United Nations this afternoon. Our party does not want a time line put into that resolution. If that time line were removed, then we certainly would consider it.

We believe that we have not given peace a chance to work. I would like to remind this House that we are not the only ones who feel this way. We are in the company of former U.S. advisers, Schlesinger and Brzezinski, who was here at the Soviet Union conference for three days. We are in the company of the United Nations Association of Canada. We are in the company of 65 per cent of Canadians who believe that the sanctions need more time. But, does this Prime Minister listen to Canadians? Oh, no.

We are also in the company of several Security Council members who are not quite decided on their decision on the vote. From what I understand, an affirmative vote is necessary by 10 of the 15 members and so far four countries are opposed and five others are wavering.

I urge this government to reflect on our country's influence on members of the Security Council. Over the last few days I had my office speak to various people at the UN. We have been told quite explicitly that Canada does not seem to appreciate how crucial our vote will be on the motion; that were we to abstain it would encourage other member countries to vote according to their will, versus voting under pressure from the United States.

The Security Council is not some independent body that exists somewhere in space making decisions. It is made up of individual countries. I truly believe that we would have a consensus at the United Nations, albeit a different one from that which was envisioned. It would not be a move that was unsupportive of the UN, because a majority of members would be in agreement.

These are not only my words. I have had calls from my constituents. I had a call from a daughter whose father is a hostage in Kuwait. His wife and daughter are my constituents. The hostage had to be smuggled into a hospital to have an operation because he had a tumour on his stomach. This is when it hits home. I had calls from other constituents who have asked me to pass on these words, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Prime Minister: "Stop your sabre rattling".

After listening to my constituents on this issue, I would suggest to the government that we take a step back, that we put down our sabres and swords, that we shed this paranoid mentality that is not in keeping with our own, and that we begin by promoting within a peaceful framework action that we would support upon the withdrawal of Iraq forces.

We should begin by talking about timetables for the withdrawal of the multinational forces; about support in setting up a democratic government in Kuwait, because there is not one now; about the convening of an international peace conference, which the Secretary of State for External Affairs has been promoting, to resolve the Palestinian issue.

If all diplomatic initiatives fail and if the longer time for sanctions to work fails, then and only then would we really have credibility in supporting the military option. We have not explored all diplomatic channels. We have not given sanctions time to work. We are not being fair to the Canadians who voted us into this House to go the military option right now.

I will close with these words. The Prime Minister said that the late Lester B. Pearson would be rolling over in his grave if he heard what I said. I ask the Prime Minister if Lester B. Pearson was standing in his place, what option would he choose? Would he recommend the diplomatic channel and the sanction channel, or would he support the sabre-rattling approach of our Prime Minister?

• (1200 )

The answer is very clear. The late Lester B. Pearson is with us, smiling. At least some Canadians have not forgotten what he stood for and what the United Nations is standing for; that is, to resolve issues peacefully, without war.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the motion before us, which is asking this House to support the United Nations in its efforts to ensure compliance with Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions.

I remind the House that we are not here to debate whether the aggression of Saddam Hussein is unacceptable. It is unacceptable. We are not here to debate whether the actions that have been taken either in the past or in the present by Saddam Hussein are insupportable nationally and internationally. They are insupportable.

We are not here to debate whether economic sanctions is a route that we should go. This House has already passed that resolution. This party has already supported that resolution.

We are here and are asked to support a resolution which is basically a blank cheque for war. We are asked to support any resolution, not specific resolutions. It has been decades since Canada has been at war. Instead, we have paid the role of peacekeeper, of mediator, of a bridge between east and west, north and south.

While our record has not always been perfect, our commitment to the principles of dialogue, negotiation and peaceful solutions has served us well in the international community.

The government's motion represents a sharp and historic move away from the traditional role of peacekeeper. It represents a move to military solutions and to participation in war.

My party takes a back seat to no one in our condemnation of Saddam Hussein. My party is not willing to discard the principles which have served this country so well. Canada must look at peaceful options and solutions to a crisis in the Gulf.

Canadians, as the Prime Minister himself has said, are a peaceful people. We cannot and must not move hastily into a war. Therefore my party cannot support the government's motion. I want to cite two major reasons for this. First, by supporting the draft UN resolution, I draw your attention to the words "use all necessary means".

We would be signalling, by supporting this motion, support for the use of military force as a means to resolve the conflict by an artificial deadline, a deadline which I remind the Prime Minister his own Secretary of State for External Affairs said he had some great difficulty with.

This is not the time for Canadians to go against their conscience. It is the time for Canadians to stand up for peace.

My party believes that such an option as proposed by this motion is premature. We are saying, give sanctions a chance. Give diplomacy a chance. Patience and common sense are crucial at this time.

Second, any Canadian participation in the use of military force would not, given the wording of the government's motion, require the involvement and consent of this Parliament. Once again, it would allow closed door, back room, old style decision making. We were asked to give consent to anything that was passed behind these doors, without the Canadians being included in this debate and fully aware of all of the ramifications of the actions which would be taken.

[*Translation*]

This would be a logical extension of the government's actions last summer, when the Prime Minister, with total disregard for public opinion and the democratic process, decided to send troops to the Persian Gulf without consulting Parliament.

**Mrs. Gibeau:** Read the papers!

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Only last week, our troops participated in military exercises that went well beyond their mandate as defined by Parliament and well beyond the parameters of the UN resolutions endorsed by this Parliament.

[*English*]

My party believes that Canadians must be consulted. They must be given all of the information and much greater discussion must take place in this House. It must agree on any change in our status in the Persian Gulf.

The government is asking for a blank cheque and we are saying no. We reject this motion. We reject it because it is misguided and because it is wrong.

Let us look at the options with which we are confronted.

[*Translation*]

The invasion of Kuwait by Saddam Hussein on August 2 and the occupation of that country constitute a flagrant violation of international law. Such action is unacceptable and shocking to all people who believe in freedom.

This contempt for human rights is not an isolated incident. Saddam Hussein does not have a good record on human rights. In fact, he has one of the worst. He even used chemical weapons against his own people. I am sure everyone in this House will agree that Iraq must withdraw from Kuwait.

[*English*]

We have no difference, therefore, on the final goal. The question and the point on which our approaches differ is what is the best response to Hussein's actions? What is the best, most rational and least costly route to achieve our goals? Is it economic sanctions and international isolation, or is it war?

The government suggests that economic sanctions are not working but it gives us no evidence to support that argument. We, on the contrary, have reason to believe that sanctions are working. Several witnesses appearing before the Standing Committee on International Affairs have argued that sanctions are effective. German hostages just released from Iraq tell us that the effects of sanctions are beginning to show. An American admiral has argued that the embargo is working. A former director of the CIA says he believes that the embargo will work.

I remind the House that Iraq relies on imports for over 80 per cent of its basic materials. It is dependent on the sale of oil for 95 per cent of its export earnings. Sanctions are supported world-wide. Iraq is totally isolated. They are feeling the effects now. Given four, six or eight months, those effects may well be impossible to bear for Saddam Hussein.

How can the government say that sanctions will not work. They can work. What is needed is patience, strength and resolve. We must give sanctions a chance.

[*Translation*]

I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, that the position of the Secretary of State for External Affairs on the use of sanctions is highly inconsistent. When he talked about South Africa, the Secretary of State was very much in favour of sanctions. He said they were effective. He argued that we had to be patient. He was sure that if we were prepared to wait, the sanctions would produce results.

So I have a question for the Prime Minister: Why South Africa and not Iraq?

[*English*]

Sanctions and international pressure forced South Africa out of Namibia. The United Nations played a peaceful and meaningful role in restoring independence to that country. Let that example guide us in our new post-cold war era of international relations.

• (1210)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the government argued that we must resort to force because it is the only language Saddam Hussein understands. However, we cannot be absolutely sure that Saddam Hussein is impervious to other arguments if we do not keep conciliation and peace on the agenda. We must be absolutely sure.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, we must look at the implications of war. We must consider them directly and head on. Let there be no mistake. The cost of war would be high. Hundreds of thousands of lives may be lost, many of them civilian, and it is clear that Canadian men and women, including those hostages still in Iraq, would be among the casualties. We are talking about another generation of young people, of lives full of promise and potential, ended.

There is a good reason why the rapidly growing anti-war movement in the United States is being led by Vietnam veterans. They know the reality. They have

been there. They are saying: "Don't do it again". It is time to listen to them.

No one believes that a war would be short, that a war would be contained just between Iraq and Kuwait. There is a real chance of a war in the Middle East escalating into a conflict which encompasses the entire Middle East. The horrors of chemical weapons, of nuclear weapons, and the use of those in that region is not outside the realm of possibility.

A war in the Gulf will destroy lives, will devastate nations. We must do everything we can to avoid it.

Yesterday the Secretary of State for External Affairs said in the House that if the New Democratic Party wanted to wait months for sanctions to work that that is our decision. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is our decision.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** It is one that we counsel this government to follow because by waiting months we may prevent a war that lasts for years and we may prevent pain that lasts a lifetime.

[*Translation*]

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that voting against this motion does not in any way mean we reject the resolutions adopted by the UN so far. What we reject is the resolution drafted by the United States. I may add, Mr. Speaker, that an increasing number of Americans is against this motion.

[*English*]

What we are saying, Mr. Speaker, to the Canadian government, to the Prime Minister, is that he must go to the United Nations, to the Security Council and ask them to hold the course on sanctions, to let sanctions work and to commit again that Canada will do its fair share to ensure that those economic sanctions are implemented.

Mr. Speaker, the government will surely say that Canada must be tough and we must be strong. I agree. But to be tough sometimes means trying to bring others around to your view than just giving in to theirs.

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, to be strong means to be patient and to show resolve. To be strong means searching until exhaustion for peaceful solutions. To be strong means seeking dialogue when others seek destruction.

Our amendment to the government's motion underlines the view that the Canadian government must speak for Canadians by demonstrating a strong commitment to peace. In every decision it makes in this crisis it must consult the people of Canada or it will not be supported by the people of Canada.

It has been said that the road to war is a wide one and the path to peace is often narrow and difficult to find. Let us offer the world some hope. Let Canada be a voice of calm. Let Canada be a voice of reason. Let Canada be a voice for peace.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. Ethel Blondin (Western Arctic):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment. With regard to the issue of war, when it comes down to the reconciliation of some rather major decisions that have to be made, it is never easy, there is never a right answer and no one in his or her right mind goes against the idea of peace. Having said that, on October 23 a motion was put to this House:

> That this House condemn the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq and, encouraged by the unprecedented international consensus demanding the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait and the full restoration of the legitimate government of Kuwait, affirm unequivocally its support for Canada's actions in the Security Council—

Having embodied here the condemnation of Iraq for the invasion of Kuwait, I would like to know why the New Democratic Party did not support the condemnation of Iraq by voting for this particular motion on October 23, 1990.

I would like the Leader of the New Democratic Party to give us her reconciliation on this whole motion. Indeed, it was a difficult one even for our party. We put forward a motion and by changing some of the wording, we accepted it because the discussion of any kind of peace initiative or any kind of discussion about war is a very serious and difficult one for any party. I ask the hon. member to please respond.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Western Arctic for her comments. As a member from the north, I share the north with the hon. member for Western Arctic, and I think we have some understanding about the threats of living very close to a superpower, as we do in the north. I believe the member for Western Arctic pointed that out in her own comments.

I appreciate her comments, in terms of the motion that she refers to. We have always been unequivocal in condemning the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq. Once again, the government brought forth motions to this House that were opened-ended and that allowed for going beyond the specifics. That is what this government wants again with this motion before us today. One would not even buy a house without knowing what is in it, but this government wants to agree to any kind of resolution, no matter what it is, no matter what is proposed, if it is in the United Nations.

I would have thought a party which prides itself on business would want to make sure that it was being full and open with this House and with the Canadian public about what it is asking the public to agree to and what it is asking this House of Commons to agree to. We do not need open-ended resolutions; we need this government to stand up in front of the public of Canada, to be accountable for its actions, and to tell us what evidence it has that economic sanctions are not working because it has never once in this House been able to tell anyone what evidence it has that economic sanctions are not working.

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest and with care to the comments of the Leader of the New Democratic Party. This is indeed a difficult debate for all parliamentarians. It is a difficult debate for Canadians and people all over the world who love peace, strive for peace, and want to see a world where we do not have madmen like Saddam Hussein who take over countries, trample on people's sovereign rights, their human rights, maim, kill, and have no respect for international law. It is a very complex issue and I know that the resolution that is before us today, the one from the government, obviously is too open-ended. It is flawed, but that is typical of the type of resolutions that this government always puts forward on serious matters .The government did the same thing on the resolution about sending troops over to the Persian Gulf. It cannot seem to get it right.

• (1220)

I want to ask the Leader of the New Democratic Party, what is the position of her party. I have looked at the proposed amendment that has been put forward. It talks about allowing sanctions to work. Under what circumstances and what conditions would her party be able to support other efforts, other than sanctions? I am talking about the possible use of force. Does she foresee any circumstances where the possible use of force would be something that should be considered and would be supported by her party?

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Mr. Speaker, clearly we do not know what is going to happen in the future. The first step we have to take is to make sure that we have done everything. I think that the Liberal Party is in agreement, that we cannot accept an open-ended resolution until we have shown that everything else has been done before we take an offensive action. I think we should be clear here that what is being discussed in the Middle East is not a defensive action by the United States, Canada and other countries, but an offensive action which can lead to disastrous consequences.

Therefore, we are saying very clearly that we need to allow time for economic sanctions to work. It is not just the New Democratic Party that has said this. Gwynne Dyer, when he gave his testimony before the international affairs committee, other experts, other military analysts have said that it takes six months to a year before we can really see whether the economic sanctions are working. We must do that. We must give those sanctions a chance.

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** Mr. Speaker, I think the member is right in the sense that the sanctions are the way to go, in the sense that time must be given to see that sanctions work. What we are facing in real terms is whether or not it is appropriate to send a message ultimately to somebody who has committed an act of aggression, a country that has committed an act of aggression against another country, that we are not prepared to wait forever.

The passage of a UN resolution that provides power to an international force does not mean that the power gets executed in the next two minutes, or the next five minutes, or the next five days, or even the next five months. However, there is a message in it.

Surely, the New Democratic Party agrees with the message that in no way, at no time, can the country of Iraq be rewarded for having committed the act of aggression. Surely, we as a world community with all of our experience that tracks back to the League of Nations and the United Nations have to say that we prefer a world community for the future, for our children and our grandchildren, where the world operates together under

United Nations sanction and we as a world community prefer to say to any country we will not tolerate aggression and if pushed to the wall, we are willing to back up our resolutions with whatever force has to be there. We cannot simply deal in world terms with rhetoric.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I do not know whether there was a question but if the hon. member for Yukon would like to rebut.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Mr. Speaker, if economic sanctions were not a strong message, why did this government propose them? Economic sanctions are a strong message. This government and our own party have been proposing for years that economic sanctions in South Africa are a strong message.

Economic sanctions are a strong message.

We do not support aggression, but we believe we have to take all steps before we do anything else. I remind the hon. member that this resolution would give agreement to any resolution that might be made, without specifying what would be in that resolution. That is unacceptable.

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that remain, I am pleased to have an opportunity to enter into this debate.

All of us recently experienced the Remembrance Day ceremonies. I know, as I have been a member in this House now for a little over 10 years, the Remembrance Day ceremonies are always a special time of tribute to our veterans, to those Canadians who did serve to protect our country and our interests, and to those who gave up their lives in that last war.

The first unique thing about this ceremony this year as I was attending those Remembrance Day services is that it was conducted by a young woman who was the minister but who was also a member of Canada's reserves.

In that audience were several other young people who were members of the reserves of the Canadian Armed Forces. What was unique about this particular service was that these young people, even though we were there remembering past wars and victims, I was there with young people who may well be called upon by their country to serve in an action that all of us were looking at each night on our television screens.

What intrigued me was to hear the attitude of these young people, the concerns for their families and country, and about the implications of what may well happen in that part of the world. It did add, I thought, a very unique dimension and a very touching dimension to those services this last Remembrance Day.

The other comment that I want to mention is that I have always enjoyed reading novels of a historical nature. One of the things that seems to come to mind when we look at history is, of course, that perspective of hindsight that somehow takes war and glamourizes it. It somehow separates it from us in a certain way. We look at the spectacular and successful actions—all of the events that go on in a war—but we are left with a sense of distance.

Yet, today we find ourselves in a very unique position in that with the television communications, particularly, and with our print media, what can happen so many miles away from us can have an instantaneous impact on our nation.

Somebody living in the community of Peace River will feel a very significant effect.

**Miss Grey:** Mr. Speaker, just on a brief point of order, I feel that for those of us in the House here—in fact, Canadians across the country watching this—it looks like a replay of the Grey Cup and watching the CFL time killers in action.

As this House knows, there were a number of members who wished to speak on this motion last night. Mr. Speaker, you well know. You were in the chair. However, when unanimous consent was sought just before one o'clock to ignore the clock and allow the last speakers to finish, the hon. Minister of National Defence denied unanimous consent.

I suspect that Canadians do not appreciate that either.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** It being 12.30 p.m., pursuant to Order made Wednesday, November 28, 1990, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the motion now before the House.

• (1230 )

The question is on the amendment of Mr. Gray (Windsor West). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** All those in favour of the amendment 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.

The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 314*)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Althouse | Angus |
| Assad | Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) |
| Baker | Bélair |
| Bellemare | Benjamin |
| Berger | Black |
| Blackburn (Brant) | Blondin |
| Boudria | Breaugh |
| Brewin | Butland |
| Caccia | Campbell (South West Nova) |
| Catterall | Clancy |
| Copps | Duhamel |
| Ferguson | Finestone |
| Fisher | Flis |
| Fontana | Foster |
| Fulton | Funk |
| Gaffney | Gagliano |
| Gardiner | Gauthier |
| Gray (Windsor West) | Grey (Beaver River) |
| Guarnieri | Harb |
| Harvard | Harvey (Edmonton East) |
| Heap | Hovdebo |
| Hunter | Karpoff |
| Karygiannis | Keyes |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) | Kindy |
| Kristiansen | Langan (Mission—Coquitlam) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | Laporte |
| LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) | Lee |
| MacDonald (Dartmouth) | MacWilliam |
| Marleau | Martin (LaSalle—Émard) |
| McCurdy | McLaughlin |
| Mifflin | Milliken |
| Murphy | Nault |
| Nowlan | Nunziata |
| Parent | Parker |
| Peterson | Pickard |
| Proud | Rideout |
| Rodriguez | Samson |
| Skelly (North Island—Powell River) | Speller |
| Stewart | Stupich |
| Taylor | Tobin |
| Waddell | Walker |
| Whittaker | Young (Beaches —Woodbine)—84 |

NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Attewell | Beatty |
| Bertrand | Bird |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blenkarn |
| Bosley | Bouchard (Roberval) |
| Bourgault | Boyer |
| Brightwell | Browes |
| Cadieux | Campbell (Vancouver Centre) |
| Cardiff | Casey |
| Chadwick | Clark (Brandon—Souris) |
| Clifford | Cole |
| Collins | Cook |
| Cooper | Corbeil |
| Côté | Crosby (Halifax West) |
| Danis | Della Noce |
| Desjardins | Dick |
| Dobbie | Domm |
| Dorin | Duceppe |
| Duplessis | Fee |
| Feltham | Ferland |
| Fontaine | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gibeau |
| Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Greene |
| Guilbault | Gustafson |
| Hawkes | Hockin |
| Horner | Hudon |
| Hughes | Jacques |
| James | Jelinek |
| Jourdenais | Koury |
| Landry | Langlois |
| Lapierre | Larrivée |
| Lewis | Loiselle |
| Lopez | MacDonald (Rosedale) |
| MacDougall (Timiskaming) | Malone |
| Marin | Masse |
| Mazankowski | McCreath |
| McDougall (St. Paul's) | McKnight |
| McLean | Monteith |
| Moore | Mulroney |
| Nicholson | Oberle |
| O'Kurley | Paproski |
| Plourde | Porter |
| Redway | Reimer |
| Richardson | Robitaille |
| Rocheleau | Scott (Victoria—Haliburton) |
| Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) | Shields |
| Siddon | Sobeski |
| Sparrow | Tardif |
| Têtreault | Thompson |
| Thorkelson | Tremblay (Québec-Est) |
| Van de Walle | Vankoughnet |
| Venne | Vézina |
| Vien | Vincent |
| White | Wilbee |
| Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) | Winegard |
| Worthy—111 | |

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the amendment lost.

• (1300)

The next question is on the amendment of Mr. Brewin. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I just wanted to inquire as to whether the House would be favourably disposed to applying the same vote, in other words the vote of the previous motion, to this motion in an effort to assist everyone. It is a suggestion which I offer to members of Parliament.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, I heard a no from the other side. I was not sure whether or not the member simply wanted to change their vote or whether he wanted all of us to go through the process of voting again. That could make a difference. I think there was at least one member on our side who came in late and would want to be recorded through subsequent votes. There may be two or three tag-ends to pick up, if that is agreeable.

**Mr. Speaker:** The House has heard the suggestion of the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell. Is there agreement?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Mr. Nowlan:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to facilitate, knowing that we do take a lot of time to vote when in effect the numbers perhaps do not change too much. Since we are getting to a very changed House, we will have to be a little more careful.

If it is only two or three members who are affected, I certainly think it might facilitate the vote to have the agreement that was called upon. Then some members could go on and register their vote another way.

**Mr. Speaker:** The House has heard what seems to be a reasonable suggestion by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley—Hants. Is there agreement?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** There does not seem to be unanimous consent.

The House divided on the amendment of Mr. Brewin, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 315*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Assad
Baker
Bellemare
Berger
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Brewin
Caccia
Catterall
Copps
Ferguson
Flis
Foster
Funk
Gagliano
Gauthier
Guarnieri
Harvard
Heap
Hunter
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
Laporte
Lee
MacWilliam
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McLaughlin
Nault
Parent
Peterson
Samson
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Stewart
Taylor
Waddell
Whittaker

Angus
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bélair
Benjamin
Black
Blondin
Breaugh
Butland
Campbell (South West Nova)
Clancy
Duhamel
Fisher
Fontana
Fulton
Gaffney
Gardiner
Gray (Windsor West)
Harb
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Keyes
Kristiansen
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacDonald (Dartmouth)
Marleau
McCurdy
Murphy
Nunziata
Parker
Rodriguez
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Speller
Stupich
Tobin
Walker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—76

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Attewell
Bertrand
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Bosley
Bourgault
Brightwell
Cadieux
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Crosby (Halifax West)
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Duceppe
Fee
Ferland
Fretz

Andre
Beatty
Bird
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Browes
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Casey
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cook
Côté
Danis
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Duplessis
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen

Gibeau
Greene
Guilbault
Hawkes
Horner
Hughes
James
Jourdenais
Landry
Lapierre
Lewis
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Marin
Mazankowski
McDermid
McKnight
Monteith
Mulroney
Nowlan
O'Kurley
Plourde
Redway
Richardson
Rocheleau
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Sparrow
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Van de Walle
Venne
Vien
White
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Worthy—113

Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Gustafson
Hockin
Hudon
Jacques
Jelinek
Koury
Langlois
Larrivée
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Masse
McCreath
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Moore
Nicholson
Oberle
Paproski
Porter
Reimer
Robitaille
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Shields
Sobeski
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilbee
Winegard

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the amendment lost.

• (1310 )

The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**Mr. Speaker:** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Calgary West, on a point of order.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, rather than suggest that we apply the vote from the previous vote, I was going to suggest that we apply it in reverse. There might be a predisposition to apply the vote from the previous motion in reverse.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Calgary West has made a suggestion to the House. Is there agreement?

**Some hon. members:** No.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 316*)

YEAS

Members

Anderson
Attewell
Bertrand
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Bosley
Bourgault
Brightwell
Cadieux
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Crosby (Halifax West)
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Duceppe
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Gustafson
Hockin
Hudon
Jacques
Jelinek
Koury
Langlois
Larrivée
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Masse
McCreath
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Moore
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plourde
Redway
Richardson
Rocheleau
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Sparrow
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Van de Walle
Venne
Vien
White
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Worthy—111

Andre
Beatty
Bird
Blenkarn
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Browes
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Casey
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cook
Côté
Danis
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Duplessis
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Guilbault
Hawkes
Horner
Hughes
James
Jourdenais
Landry
Lapierre
Lewis
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Marin
Mazankowski
McDermid
McKnight
Monteith
Mulroney
Oberle
Paproski
Porter
Reimer
Robitaille
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Shields
Sobeski
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilbee
Winegard

## NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Althouse | Angus |
| Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) | Baker |
| Bélair | Bellemare |
| Benjamin | Berger |
| Black | Blackburn (Brant) |
| Blondin | Boudria |
| Breaugh | Brewin |
| Butland | Caccia |
| Campbell (South West Nova) | Catterall |
| Clancy | Copps |
| Duhamel | Ferguson |
| Fisher | Flis |
| Fontana | Foster |
| Fulton | Funk |
| Gaffney | Gagliano |
| Gardiner | Gauthier |
| Gray (Windsor West) | Grey (Beaver River) |
| Guarnieri | Harb |
| Harvard | Harvey (Edmonton East) |
| Heap | Hovdebo |
| Hunter | Karpoff |
| Karygiannis | Keyes |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) | Kindy |
| Kristiansen | Langan (Mission—Coquitlam) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | Laporte |
| LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) | Lee |
| MacDonald (Dartmouth) | MacWilliam |
| Marleau | Martin (LaSalle—Émard) |
| McCurdy | McLaughlin |
| Milliken | Murphy |
| Nault | Nowlan |
| Nunziata | Parent |
| Parker | Peterson |
| Pickard | Proud |
| Rideout | Rodriguez |
| Samson | Skelly (North Island—Powell River) |
| Skelly (Comox—Alberni) | Speller |
| Stewart | Stupich |
| Taylor | Tobin |
| Waddell | Walker |
| Whittaker | Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—82 |

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

Pursuant to Order made Wednesday, November 28, 1990, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock p.m.

The House took recess at 1.21 p.m.

---

## AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

# STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*English*]

## CANADA POST

**Mrs. Coline Campbell (South West Nova):** Mr. Speaker, our mail presently goes to the Persian Gulf via a depot in Halifax. In order to send mail to that depot, Canadian people have to pay the cost of the mail.



I have spoken to the Minister of National Defence and written to the minister in charge of the Post Office to see if during the Christmas season parcels, care packages, presents, letters and cards could not be sent free of charge to the depot in Halifax.

This is one way for Canada to say "Thank you" to the men and women who serve in the Gulf and who are there through our government's policies, perhaps not by choice, and in very dangerous times.

I call on the minister in charge of Canada Post to ask Canada Post to stop putting profits before service in this particular area and allow the mail in Canada to go free of charge to Halifax and on to the Gulf during the next month. In fact, it should go free all the time to our men and women who are serving in the Gulf.

* * *

## NORTHERN TELECOM CANADA LIMITED

**Mr. Harry Chadwick (Bramalea—Gore—Malton):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise in the House today to inform my colleagues of the outstanding achievement of a company which employs many people in my constituency.

On October 31, 1990 one of the largest employers in my riding, Northern Telecom Canada Limited of Bramalea, Ontario was honoured with a Gold 1990 Canada Award for Business Excellence in the category of outstanding quality.

I can say without reservation that Northern Telecom is an impressive operation, conscious of producing an outstanding product, while maintaining an excellent working environment for its employees. With this winning combination, I am confident that Northern Telecom Canada Limited will continue to be successful and will remain a respected member of the community of Bramalea. Again, congratulations Northern Telecom.

* * *

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. David Walker (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, on Monday in this House the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources was asked about the future of the core area initiative in Winnipeg. He replied that he would do what was best for Winnipeg.

We found out subsequently that best means eliminating the core area initiative, cutting back on projects in the inner city and leaving the 100,000 people who live there in need of federal moneys but without any support.

It is hard to believe that now, at the last moment, he has finally discovered that he does not like North Portage, that he does not like the Forks, he does not like the core, but somehow up until this time he could not find a way of speaking about it.

The minister said that he needs a public evaluation before he continues. If he needs a public evaluation, he should have thought about it months ago because people in Winnipeg have been asking for the renewal for many weeks now. Instead, the minister should commit himself in Winnipeg to the renewal of the core and to a commitment to improve the conditions of Winnipeg's inner city.

* * *

## HEALTH

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the government an editorial which appeared yesterday in the Winnipeg *Free Press*. The editorial correctly points out the need for the federal government to maintain national health care standards. The editorial also points out that for the last 10 years Liberal and Tory governments have gradually reduced the federal share of funding for Canada's health care system.

The reduction started when the Liberal's new leader was Minister of Finance. He started the erosion of our health care system and the Conservatives were only too eager to follow his lead.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of the vision of Tommy Douglas that Canada has one of the best health care systems anywhere. I find it disgraceful that the federal Conservatives and Liberals still yearn for an American style system. It is obvious that Canada's health care system is not safe under either the Conservatives or the Liberals.

* * *

## CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

**Mrs. Edna Anderson (Simcoe Centre):** Mr. Speaker, Canada's veterans are supporting our armed forces in the Gulf in a very heart-warming way. In particular, I am talking about members of the Alberta command of the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans in Canada.

Recently Command President Mr. Cecil Burke handed over a cheque for $120,000 to the Base Commander, Canadian Forces Base, Edmonton. The money will be used to buy televisions, video-cassette recorders and satellite dish antennae for the enjoyment of our forces personnel in the Gulf.

Mr. Burke said: "Most of us have an idea of what they are going through over there". I congratulate members of Canada's oldest veterans organization for rallying round those whose turn it is now to wear the uniform of Canada in a far-away land.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## TRIBUTE TO JEAN-FRANÇOIS BOUCHARD

**Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec-Est):** Mr. Speaker, allow me to pay tribute to an eight-year-old boy called Jean-François Bouchard. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Jean-Paul Bouchard of my riding. The reason for this tribute is the following. On October 28, Jean-François took part in a Halloween skating event. Everyone had a great time until Jean-François fell and had most of one finger cut off. The strength, courage and, let us say the word, bravery displayed by this young boy were impressive. This is why I wanted to draw special attention to it.

Mr. Speaker, small children have a way of teaching us adults singular lessons of logic and positive thinking. This young boy has quite a future ahead of him. I am sure of that.

* * *

## TAX REFORM

**Mr. Gabriel Desjardins (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, the tax reform implemented in 1988 is having positive results. The 1988 tax statistics indicate that low-income Canadians do benefit from the reform. That same year, the average after tax income rose by 8.6 per cent. The number of Canadians over age 65 who do not pay any tax has increased by more than 40 per cent and now stands at 290,000.

The income tax reform has made the system more progressive and more equitable. The sales tax reform is an additional stage in that process. High-income Canadians will be paying a larger share of their income

through the sales tax, whereas families with an income of $30,000 or less will be better off than they are now.

All things considered, the tax reform combined with other important measures taken by the government to boost the Canadian economy will make the tax system more equitable, improve competitiveness and create more jobs.

* * *

[*English*]

## SOCIALIST AWARDS

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt):** Mr. Speaker, fellow Canadians, it is time once again for the weekly socialist awards of excellence. This week's nominees all hail from that hotbed of socialism, Ontario, where 30 per cent of the people voted NDP and got a lousy government.

The nominees are NDP MPP Tony Silipo who after being elected to the legislature was found guilty by the Law Society for misconduct in his handling of forged documents; MPP Tony Rizzo who admitted that he was involved in receiving free work from a contractor whose applications Mr. Rizzo always voted in favour of, as well as his union-busting tactics; Bob White, erstwhile head of the CAW, whose support of the NDP with union funds—many of whom I might add vote Liberal—is on par with the big Tory corporate donors, will stop at nothing to fulfil his own personal political goals.

The envelope please. The winner is Bob White who, in a great display of looking out for the little guy, has accepted his pay-off as a director of that bastion of the working class, the Toronto Skydome.

* * *

## THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Rod Laporte (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre):** Mr. Speaker, the environment is everyone's concern but it is of special concern to our next generation.

Grade six students at Westmount School in Moose Jaw have written to advise me that they have studied the effects of acid rain. One student writes: "We have discovered that acid rain causes fish, plants and animals to die, lakes to be ruined and animal reproduction difficulties".

Another writes: "It is very important to stop acid rain because Canadian lakes are very sensitive to acid rain and we share 25 per cent of the world's fresh water supply".

The government should heed the pleas of these students. They are speaking on behalf of students right across the country. The government should ensure that a national acid rain program which places a cap on emissions and sets national standards will be included in the upcoming Green Plan.

Certainly the fact that the three western provinces and the two territories are not now included in any plan leaves over one-half of Canada's environment unprotected.

I say well done to the students at Westmount School. Let us all hope that the government is listening.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

**M. Ken Hughes (Macleod):** Next week, Mr. Speaker, Canada will play an important role in the GATT negotiations in Brussels. It was Prime Minister Mulroney who, at the outset of this critical round four years ago, insisted that agriculture be put on the negotiation agenda. Last year the industrialized nations paid out something like $250 billion in farm subsidies, yet a good many agricultural producers throughout the world are still hard-pressed, except perhaps in Europe where the EEC is thwarting progress. The international agricultural trade system does not work, and that spells disaster for some Canadian farmers. We and our agricultural producers simply cannot accept a failure next week, and certainly not the status quo.

* * *

• (1410 )

[*English*]

## JUSTICE

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice visited Winnipeg last weekend and commented on the David Milgaard case.

Milgaard has spent more than 20 years in prison for murder, but there is serious doubt that he committed the crime. For many months we have pressed the justice minister to make a decision in the case. On Winnipeg television she said: "In the third week in September I was advised the file was ready for me but that they," being department officials, "had received communication from Milgaard's counsel that he wished to make more argument".

Where does the justice minister get this stuff? She is dead wrong. Milgaard's counsel, David Asper, said in the same broadcast: "We completed our submission during the summer". By the way, that was confirmed in a September 10 letter from Asper to the Department of Justice.

The minister had better get a grip on her department. Someone is feeding her a line. It puts justice under a cloud and makes her look like a fool.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## SEXIST PUBLICITY

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert):** In his movie entitled "Jesus of Montréal", Mr. Speaker, Denys Arcand offers a satire of the advertising industry and the way this industry exploits the physical attributes of women to sell their wares. Unfortunately, as any other good satire, Denys Arcand's is a fairly accurate reflection of the truth.

Mr. Speaker, who among us has not noticed the degrading representation of women by our major advertising agencies and their customers? Is it necessary to use a woman's body to sell beer or chewing gum? All advertising agencies are well aware that by trying to sell their wares that way, they are selling sex. I suggest this is an unhealthy if not dangerous attitude to cultivate in a society where violence against women is definitely on the rise.

* * *

[*English*]

## PENSION PLANS

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, six years ago the government amended the Canada and Quebec pension plans to bring them into line with the equality provisions in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The government imposed equality at the same time on all private sector pension plans it regulates, yet it has failed to eliminate inequities and injustices in the pension plans for its own employees.

Survivors of Public Service pensions still get only a 50 per cent pension, compared to the 60 per cent the government imposes on other funds. Part-time employees are left out of the pension plan, contributing further to the poverty of women.

The government is withholding from Public Service employees changes that are their right under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

It is holding these changes in reserve to sugar coat the bitter bill it plans to deliver when it deindexes the pensions Public Service employees have paid for over many years.

When will the government treat its own employees with the same pension equality it imposes on all other employers?

* * *

[*Translation*]

## CENTRAL MORTAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION

**Mr. Fernand Jourdenais (La Prairie):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my most heartfelt appreciation and gratitude to the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and its responsible minister, Hon. Allan Redway, for the financial support my constituents of La Prairie, on the south shore of Montreal, have received from the corporation which, through its grants, has made it possible since my election in 1984 to build approximately 200 low-rental housing units for senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of an agreement on social housing, reached in 1986 by the Quebec government and the Government of Canada I will have the honour to officially open on December 1 the *Manoir de Brossard*, a complex of 61 low-rental housing units for senior citizens.

This opening is the concrete result of the joint efforts of the CMHC, the Quebec Housing Corporation, the Brossard Municipal Housing Bureau and myself to provide our senior citizens with decent housing.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the CMHC and my minister for their tremendous contributions.

* * *

[*English*]

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, just last week this government fed Canadians the line that it needed money to pay for its action in the Gulf. Yet every Canadian knows that its greatest overspending costs were due to its bad judgment in estimating the costs of its high interest rate policies and bringing in the GST, all policies for which Canadian taxpayers have to pay.

Now after cutting funding for programs for people, Finance Minister Michael Wilson is so insensitive that he spent $250,000 of Canadian taxpayers' money to peddle government propaganda to the business community. The minister's video titled, "Where Do Your Taxpayer Dollars Go?", should really have been called "Tax Lies and Videotape".

* * *

## MINING

**Mr. John A. MacDougall (Timiskaming):** Mr. Speaker, in the current environmental debate, there is one major stakeholder whose efforts to apply the principles of sustainable development often go unnoticed.

Industry is concerned about sustainable development and the environmental challenge before us. In particular today, I wish to commend the Canadian mining industry.

It is a little known fact that Canadians are leading the way in sustainable mining. Under the leadership of the Mining Association of Canada, our mining sector has produced for itself a Guide for Environmental Practice.

Canadian mining companies are committed to sound environmental practices at home and abroad. The mining sector is committed to responsible product stewardship. The mining community is very aware of environmental problems and is eager to participate in vital debate begun with the work of the Brundtland report.

As a major stakeholder, a provider of wealth for our country, the Canadian mining sector has a valuable contribution to make for environmentally sustainable economic development.

---

# ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

## PERSIAN GULF

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister and is about Canada's involvement in the crisis in the Persian Gulf. On Monday, the Minister for International Trade, speaking on behalf of the government about the sanctions against Iraq said in this House:

> —the Secretary of State for External Affairs is quite prepared to make available to the House, or to the Standing Committee on External Affairs, the full information on how effective the sanctions policy appears to be.

Yesterday, when speaking in this House, the Secretary of State for External Affairs gave no such information and no such evidence. All he did was say, in effect, that the sanctions were not working and today in the House the Prime Minister said the same thing.

Will the Prime Minister give us the evidence promised by the Minister for International Trade that the sanctions are not working? This evidence is important because it affects how Canadians look at the risk some Canadians are under in the Persian Gulf. Why will the Prime Minister not give us the evidence promised on behalf of this government? Why will he not give us that evidence today?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, first let me just correct a misstatement by my hon. friend in regard to my statement this morning in the House. What I said was: "While the UN sanctions are undoubtedly being felt by the Iraqi and Kuwaiti people, we have found no wide-spread confidence that they are sufficient to bring about the desired result to namely persuade President Hussein to withdraw his forces from Kuwait". I think that is an important distinction that my hon. friend would want to bear in mind.

As to any information that the Secretary of State for External Affairs would have available regarding the results of the sanction policy, I am sure that, immediately

upon his return from New York, he would be happy to provide this to my hon. friend.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the time to provide that evidence was during the debate which has just concluded. Canadians will want to know why the government did not have enough confidence in its own policy to provide that evidence before now. Canadians need that evidence before the vote is taken in the United Nations on the resolution in question.

Yesterday, the immediate past chairman of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral William Crowe, said in testimony before a United States Senate committee, when speaking about the sanctions against Iraq and how they are working: "I counsel patience, war is not neat, it is not tidy, it is a mess". That is what Admiral Crowe said.

Is it possible that the reason the government has not given us the evidence it claims it has about how the sanctions are working is because it knows all the evidence is of the kind provided by Admiral Crowe, that the sanctions are working and they need more time to work and the time has not yet arrived, nor is it near, for offensive action? Is that not the fact?

• (1420)

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, it really is quite a shameful suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition, to say nothing of the fact that I find passing strange the manner in which some days the Liberal Party loves the Americans and most days, they do not. When they find an American who says something with which they agree, they are actively quoting him.

The issue before the House is the issue we addressed this morning, support for the United Nations.

**Mr. Harvard:** We support the United Nations.

**Mr. Mulroney:** My friend says "We support the United Nations". The United Nations has passed 10 resolutions requesting that they withdraw from Kuwait. This will be the eleventh resolution for which the United Nations is seeking support.

Mr. Pearson said in 1945: "Never again should an aggressor be permitted to strike down one nation after another before the peace loving nations of the world organize and take concerted action against it." The United Nations is seeking the support of peace-loving nations to take concerted action against it, and Canada is going to provide that support.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, today the Prime Minister says that he is a great supporter of the United Nations, and so is his government. These words are strange in light of the fact that a few days ago the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs said that they were ready to get involved in offensive action against Iraq unilaterally whether the UN approved it or not. Those are not the words of somebody who puts his primary faith in the United Nations.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Conservative Senator Gérald Beaudoin, the constitutional expert, said that the government would not have to call back Parliament if it were to decide in favour of armed intervention against Iraq. Mr. Speaker, this statement contradicts a government motion adopted by this House on October 23.

I therefore want to ask the Prime Minister: Will he repudiate today the statements made by Senator Beaudoin and will he announce his intention to respect his commitment to call back Parliament before Canadian troops are involved in a military offensive in the Persian Gulf?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I did not read the senator's statement, but my hon. friend can hardly expect me to start commenting on all the statements being made in the Senate, because we would be here for quite some time. As for the second part of his question, the Secretary of State for External Affairs and myself have, on various occasions, dealt with this point satisfactorily. However, the Leader of the Opposition—inadvertently, I expect—misquoted what I said. In fact, he said, suggesting that he was quoting me verbatim:

[*English*]

—"the Prime Minister said that we are ready to get involved to get in an offensive action against Iraq unilaterally whether the United Nations approved or not". I never made any such statement.

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister and concerns the government's non-tabling of requested sanctions documentation.

The Prime Minister's answers to the hon. House leader's questions a few moments ago are ringing in my ears. They echo almost exactly the answer we got to the same question in this House on Monday of this week when the Minister for International Trade responded: "I am quite sure that the Secretary of State for External Affairs is quite prepared to make available to the House the full information on the effect of sanctions policies". Canadians accept an embargo against Iraq, but not an embargo against providing Canadians vital information concerning sanctions. We requested information. We did not get it.

Why has the government refused to provide this vital information concerning sanctions against Iraq?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the government is not refusing to provide information. I have already indicated to my hon. friend that when the question was asked, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who is responsible for this, was in Jordan meeting with King Hussein and in Israel meeting with Prime Minister Shamir. He then flew back, spoke at a meeting here in Ottawa, spoke in the House, and is now speaking before the Security Council at the United Nations.

I indicated to my hon. friend that when the information is made available to me, presumably immediately upon my right hon. friend's return, we will be happy to provide my hon. friend with all of the information that we have.

The issue before the House yesterday, today and tomorrow in respect of Iraq is going to be whether this party, this government and this House supports the United Nations in what it is seeking to do. We will provide full support, as we will provide my hon. friend with all of the information available to us.

We seek peace in the region, but peace in the region will come through firm and unwavering support for the resolutions of the UN Security Council.

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is also to the Prime Minister. Canada has supported and this party has supported the imposition of UN sanctions against Iraq as an effective method of forcing Iraq out of Kuwait. Other nations, such as Colombia, have proposed other peace-making solutions to the Middle East crisis to the UN Security Council. What evidence can the government give us today that Canada has pursued other peaceful resolutions to the Middle East crisis prior to supporting the UN resolution before the Security Council today?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I can tell my hon. friend that in co-operation with a number of other nations, Canada has been working privately, and I hope with some effect, to assist in what we hope will be a peaceful resolution of this very important matter. This has been done at the United Nations directly with the Secretary General. It has been done through a number of our important alliances and in other initiatives around the world. We hope that will contribute in a beneficial way.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, today a resolution was passed in this House, not supported by this party, which basically gave blanket support to any resolution that the United Nations might pass, because it is not clear what will be contained in subsequent UN resolutions. It simply says the Security Council resolution and all subsequent relevant resolutions, but no specifics.

Given the fact that there are no specifics attached to what resolutions this government has just supported, if the United States were to decide to invade Iraq after January 15, which is the deadline given in the UN resolution, does this government resolution mean today that the Prime Minister has given George Bush his approval and that he can have Canadian support for an attack of Iraq after January 15?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend seriously would not want me to answer that kind of canard. I wonder why she devised the hypothetical question with Mr. Bush in mind. Perhaps she missed the statement by Soviet President Gorbachev this week who delivered an ultimatum to Iraq warning it to withdraw from Kuwait or face the worst consequences. Gorbachev is reported to have told the Iraqi Foreign Minister, Mr. Aziz: "If Iraq really wanted a settlement in the entire region and is interested in avoiding the worst, it must now openly pull out of Kuwait and release hostages".

• (1430)

President Gorbachev concluded: "The President of Iraq must weigh everything once more. The fate of Iraq is in the hands of its leaders, and time is expiring."

President Gorbachev is expressing a pretty universally held sentiment, with the possible exception of a few people in the NDP.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, I ask the Prime Minister then: What did we vote on this morning?

What does he mean by the kind of sanctions that will be effective January 15? I ask the Prime Minister again: In this UN resolution, what is his understanding of exactly what will occur after January 15 if Saddam Hussein has not withdrawn from Kuwait by that time?

**Mr. Speaker:** The Chair is in some difficulty. That is a very hypothetical question. Within the rules, it is out of order.

I would ask the hon. member to perhaps rephrase her question.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Mr. Speaker, we were asked to vote this morning on a resolution that said in effect that we would support any resolution, not specified, that the United Nations would pass.

What does the Prime Minister anticipate those other resolutions would be?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the motion refers to the resolution that is being debated at the United Nations today. That is the position.

That is why President Gorbachev indicated publicly in Paris that it was imperative that the United Nations receive unanimous support, if at all possible, for the resolution that was going to be voted today, because he did not want the United Nations to go the route of the League of Nations, which disintegrated and was unable to provide the strong international leadership that the world needs.

The United Nations asked for Canada's support in the defence of universal rights. That was granted today by the Government of Canada, and I hope eventually by members of my hon. friend's party.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is well aware of what the UN resolution says and, I assume, what his own resolution says.

It asks this House to give a blank cheque to vote for any resolution that the UN might give.

I have a question on another very serious subject related to the issue in the Middle East.

[*Translation*]

Everyone is this country is delighted that seven Canadian hostages were able to leave Iraq, but we are concerned about the fate of the remaining hostages. I want to ask the Prime Minister to tell the House what his government intends to do to ensure that the remaining Canadian hostages will also be able to go home.

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, in my comments this morning I pointed out that one of the cornerstones of the government's foreign policy in this area was freeing the hostages. The government has embarked on a series of initiatives and is working very hard to help the hostages and their families.

It is also important to point out that President Gorbachev asked Foreign Minister Aziz in Moscow about 48 hours ago to proceed immediately. He asked Iraq to proceed immediately with the release of all hostages held in Iraq.

* * *

## GREAT WHALE PROJECT

**Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard):** My question is directed to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, the Government of Quebec approved a federal-provincial agreement on impact studies for the Great Whale project. The Quebec environment minister said very clearly that the agreement did not include infrastructures. On October 18, in reply to a question here in the House, the federal environment minister said, and I quote: "With my Quebec counterpart we are having a discussion of the terms of reference which will cover the infrastructures". This is my question: Who is telling the truth?

[*English*]

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to make it very clear to this House that there is in fact no agreement between the Government of Quebec and the

Government of Canada on this issue. There is a response by the Government of Quebec to a proposal made by the Government of Canada on November 20.

I think it is perfectly reasonable, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member would not ask us to respond to that counter-proposal until the Minister of the Environment, who is meeting in Victoria with his provincial counterparts, meeting by the way to discuss very important issues, including consulting with them on the green plan, has an opportunity to examine the document and to respond at the appropriate time.

Because he asked a question before, I want to assure him, as the Minister of the Environment has done on numerous occasions, that there will be an environmental assessment of both the infrastructure and the project itself and that this environmental assessment will be a public process.

**Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard):** What a tangled web we weave. I have a document dated July 6 which sets out the principles of an agreement reached between the two Ministers of the Environment. That agreement specifically excludes the infrastructures. The agreement is in French:

[*Translation*]

"Quebec and Canada have agreed to submit the Great Whale complex to an environmental assessment. For the purposes of this joint assessment, the complex excludes access infrastructures."

[*English*]

Does the government deny that the agreement sent from Quebec last night contains the exclusion that I have just cited? Does the government deny that the agreement was arrived at by the federal Minister of the Environment at the end of June? Does the government deny that that clause is in complete contradiction of the principles that the minister has stated? Does the government deny that the minister's public statements are simply not borne out by his private action?

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, who I believe is a member of the legal profession, must surely understand that there is a very major distinction between the word "agreement" which he chooses to use—and I may say he probably does so for his own political advantage—and the question of a proposal. There have been a series of proposals and counter-proposals back and forth between the two governments. What we have today is a response by the Government of Quebec to the latest proposal which we put on the table on November 20. We will be responding at the appropriate time.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## CITIZEN'S FORUM ON CANADA'S FUTURE

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister and concerns the Spicer commission. It seems the Prime Minister does not intend to fill the seat left vacant by Mrs. Thérèse Paquet-Sévigny, thus diminishing the contribution of women and francophones to the future of this country.

Mr. Speaker, we are sorry to hear the Prime Minister did not appoint someone else, and that I want to ask him whether he is prepared to acknowledge that the Commission is merely a smoke-screen and that he has failed miserably in his task to keep this country together and united.

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that my hon. friend, who usually shows a special interest in important questions concerning national unity, should make such a suggestion.

First of all, regarding the claim that I had decided not to proceed with a new appointment, I simply want to say to my hon. friend that I am having consultations on the membership of the commission. We have suffered a slight setback. Why? Because an exceptional woman, who was posted at the United Nations, agreed to sit on the Commission and subsequently was told that her acceptance might have an impact on administrative decisions at the UN. In the circumstances, she had to withdraw. There is nothing dishonourable about that. There is no negative reflection, either on her or the government. The seats on the commission will be filled, and I am sure the Spicer commission will continue its work and will end up gathering tremendous support for Canada.

• (1440 )

[*English*]

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, the Spicer commission, from what reports we get from the press, has no work mandate. It has no work plan. Its members are part time. The Prime Minister tells us he is hesitating to name an additional or additional members to that commission.

Given the importance of this commission to the future of this country, is the Prime Minister prepared today to tell this House that he will name a replacement for the person that left the commission, Madam Paquet-Sévigny? Will he show us today by his efforts that he will do everything to make a success of this commission and appoint people to the commission who will be full time and will work in the interests of Canadians and the future of the country?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know why my hon. friend has such little faith in the capacity of these people to do very good job for Canada. I fail to understand as well why he is so negative in regard to the manner in which the commission has begun its work.

It took some four months before the composition of Quebec's Bélanger-Campeau commission was completed. Indeed, the assembly had to be reconvened to provide for the admission of additional members.

Why would my hon. friend be alarmed at the fact that one member of the Spicer Commission had to resign for reasons that I have explained and conclude therefrom that it will not be effective?

I tell my hon. friend that the Spicer commission will make an effective and I believe durable contribution to the well-being of Canada.

* * *

## THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister.

Yesterday Canada's environment took a serious back-room beating from Premier Bourassa and the Quebec Liberals. Their unilateral decision to proceed with the $600 million infrastructure of the Great Whale project is both a threat and an insult.

Since this is part of the largest industrial project ever conceived in the history of North America, will the Prime Minister demonstrate that he believes what he said about the environment when he spoke before the United Nations and assure this House that there will be no federal permits or authorization given on the infrastructure until the entire project has been given a full public environmental assessment and review? Yes or no?

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, as I explained just a moment ago to my hon. friend opposite, the Government of Quebec has made a proposal to the Government of Canada which will certainly be considered by the Minister of the Environment, as the hon. member would wish, on his return from these very important meetings in Victoria.

With respect specifically to the question of infrastructure and the question of environmental assessments, I think there are two or three questions which have been asked by the Canadian public and I think they should be answered.

One of these questions is: Will there be a full environmental assessment in which the federal government will participate on both the question of the infrastructure and the question of the project? And the answer to that is yes.

The second question which I think has been asked is whether or not the federal government will issue any permits to those areas which fall into its jurisdiction with respect to the infrastructure until the EARP process has been applied. And the answer to that question is no.

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** My supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is again for the Prime Minister.

The Great Whale project has been on the drawing boards since the 1970s. There have been years of opportunity to evaluate Quebec Hydro's secret environmental impact studies publicly.

Would the Prime Minister confirm the simple fact that there has been a political deal, a roll of the dice deal, made between his office, himself and Premier Bourassa to cover up the truly horrific impacts of this project which stands to be an ecological Auschwitz?

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I am not so certain that question is worthy of an answer, but the answer is a simple no.

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue.

Since the Government of Quebec has now taken the lead and cancelled its value added tax on books, and since the Minister of National Revenue indicated as recently as yesterday that he would cancel this goods and services tax on books in all probability after it becomes law, if it does come into law, will he today take Quebec's excellent lead and will he, in International Literacy Year, cancel the goods and services tax on all books and learning materials now?

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should get his facts straight before putting a question of that nature.

Yesterday I made several comments to the Canadian Tax Foundation. When asked about the Quebec situation on books, I said: "We can't start fiddling around with the legislation. It would send out a confusing message. In other words, there will be no changes in the legislation before it is passed".

I went on to say what the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance had said in the past, that once the legislation is implemented we will monitor its effects on the economy, on society, and on specific sectors, and could possibly in future make adjustments. But there will be no adjustments prior to January 1, and the tax will be implemented.

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, we will let Canadians decide who has his facts straight.

[*Translation*]

My supplementay is directed to the Prime Minister. Taxing books and other learning materials amounts to encouraging illiteracy. The 5 to 7 million illiterate Canadians who cost in excess of $10 billion a year to the treasury are often among our poorest fellow citizens. What does the Prime Minister intend to do to help these people learn to read and get them out of this vicious circle of poverty?

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, this government is aware of the importance of cultural industries and cultural sectors as a whole, whether related to publishing, cinema, sound recording or theatre. In most sectors the government has established programs to enable the cultural community to progress to the benefit of all Canadians, and we are pursuing our efforts, Mr. Speaker, including in the publishing field.

* * *

[*English*]

## HEALTH

**Mr. David Berger (Saint-Henri—Westmount):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

The minister has said that he had to cut health care research to reduce the deficit. Canadians do not accept that. The minister will never convince Canadians that he had no option.

Would the Minister of National Health and Welfare explain to Canadians why he chose—and this is the point—to single out health care research for such harsh treatment?

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the harsh treatment that is referred to by the hon. member. Since this government came to office, displacing the old Liberal government and its record on research in Canada, NHRDP has increased by some 55 per cent, some $10 million.

In his own province of Quebec, since the Liberals were thrown out, NHRDP grants went from $4.769 million to $7.696 million in the first 11 months of this year.

That is a record on research which speaks for itself. The hon. member can talk about research. This government has funded it.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. David Berger (Saint-Henri—Westmount):** That is not the question, Mr. Speaker. We never said he cut 100 per cent of the program. Indeed the minister himself confirmed that he did cut this program. So I am asking him today why he chose to cut the health care research program, and will he agree to re-instate the full budget for that research program?

[*English*]

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, let me be a bit more specific even about the hon. member's riding. He will be aware of the fact that on October 17, I wrote to the hon. member to inform him that so far this year $2.9 million had been put into his own constituency by NHRDP.

• (1450)

We can contrast this government's record in his constituency with his vote on Bill C-22, where the position of the Liberal Party was to block research in dealing with the whole area of medicine. Its record has been one of disgrace.

I believe that at any fair comparison between the record of the Liberals on medical research and the record of this government, it will show that while they talk about it they talk a good fight, but they oppose it when it comes to voting.

* * *

## PERSIAN GULF

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

I just want to take him back to the answer he gave to a question by my leader. As I heard him and as I think the House heard him, he said that the government's view of the motion which was passed this morning was that, in terms of subsequent resolutions to today, the only UN resolution that was covered was the resolution which will be coming before the Security Council today. That is what he said. That was ably assisted, I may say, by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Will the Prime Minister therefore agree that the government has no House approval for the commitment of Canadian forces to any offensive action against Iraq?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the answer that I gave to the Leader of the NDP is the policy of the government in regard to the question that was raised by her.

With regard to the broader question, which was the subject of debate this morning, I refer my hon. friend to a statement that he made in the House on October 25, when he said: "The NDP position is that until all has failed, the United Nations must get the complete unqualified support of this government, this Parliament, and this country".

That is what the United Nations got this morning, and the NDP was not there.

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect, that is exactly why the Prime Minister's approval rating is where it is in the country today.

I asked him a very straightforward question. He could have clarified the understanding that his government got. Let me try once more in a slightly different way.

Will the Prime Minister make a commitment today to this House and to the country that before his government commits Canadian forces to offensive action against Iraq, he will come back to this House and seek its approval?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I answered that question in response, I think, to a question from the Leader of the Liberal Party yesterday or the day before yesterday.

I indicated that we had come to the House on September 24 or September 25, for a full debate, that we came to the House yesterday and today for a full debate, and that at any time circumstances warranted we would, of course, come before the House of Commons for a full debate.

* * *

## BÉLANGER-CAMPEAU COMMISSION

**Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations is not in this House, I would like to ask a question of the Prime Minister.

Since we now know from press that the Leader of the Liberal Party is going to appear before the Bélanger-Campeau commission—and perhaps I appreciate the fact that because the Prime Minister is Prime Minister he would not want to appear before the Bélanger-Campeau commission—does the Prime Minister or the government intend to have the so-called Quebec lieutenant or someone else representing the federal government

appear before this commission to give the federal message to that commission?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I understand that indeed there are press reports to the effect the Leader of the Liberal Party is planning an appearance before the provincial commission.

The Progressive Conservative national caucus is represented full time at all commission hearings by the hon. member for Outremont. He participates very actively on a daily basis, not only in questioning witnesses but in putting out the federalist position that is defended actively by members of the Progressive Conservative Party.

I do not know of the intentions of any other members of this House to appear before the Bélanger–Campeau commission. However, I am sure it would be an enlivening and enriching experience if the hon. member from Annapolis Valley—Hants decided to attend.

**Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Prime Minister for that answer. Who knows what might happen in this interesting world we live in?

Since the hon. member for Papineau—Saint-Michel is also a member of the Bélanger–Campeau commission and still represents, I think, the Liberal Party, that does not presuppose or pre-empt the leader.

If there has not been a decision made, I wonder seriously if a representative of the federal government, not a member of that large commission, will make its pitch to that commission with all the implications and consequential fall-outs therefrom.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Willowdale.

* * *

## THE ECONOMY

**Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale):** Mr. Speaker, I invite you to listen to these words from *Hansard* of October 15, 1981:

> —many home owners, many farmers and small businessmen were literally kicked in the teeth—Why is it Canada must have interest rates that are 3 to 4 percentage points higher than comparable rates in the United States?

These are the words of the member who today is the Minister of Finance.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Nowlan:** If an interest rate spread of 3 to 4 points was wrong then, why isn't an interest rate spread of 4 to 5 points worse now?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that when I said that interest rates were in the order of 21.5 per cent, a good deal different. If you reverse the first two numbers, you might get the interest rate today. It is 12.1 per cent. I think things are fundamentally different than when I made that statement.

Let's be honest with each other. Interest rates are high today. We would like to get them down. We are trying to get them down. We brought them down from a bank rate of 14.05 per cent to today when the bank rate is a little over 12.25 per cent. We have had a significant drop in interest rates.

I have observed in this House on a number of occasions the inflationary pressures which are there that are causing us to exercise some caution.

Our intent is to reflect the weakness in the economy in a continuing reduction in interest costs. That will be to the benefit of the small businessmen and the farmers whom my hon. friend quoted just now.

**Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale):** Mr. Speaker, in response, I can do no better than to quote from the same *Hansard* the minister's own words. He said then:

> —the arrogance of that answer to people who have been—suffering for a long time under the policies of this government, is just incredible.

Since the leopard has changed his spots and is now the champion of high interest rates, since the minister admits that the GST will increase inflation significantly, and since his own interest rate calculations have been so far off, my question is: Will interest rates go up between now and March 31?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I can see from the hon. member that the whole Peterson family has taken up acting.

**Some hon. members:** Encore, encore.

*Point of Order*

**Mr. Speaker:** There will be a single question from the hon. member for Etobicoke North, followed by a single question from the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair.

* * *

## TRADE

**Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday I said that Mexico and the United States had agreed that energy would not be on the table in the trade negotiations.

In the absence of the Minister for International Trade, the Minister of State for Privatization and Regulatory Affairs claimed that my information was incorrect. By now the minister has informed himself that both the Mexican Minister of Commerce and the United States Secretary of the Treasury have stated that Mexican oil is not on the table.

• (1500)

Can the minister explain why Canada should have ceded more sovereignty over energy than Mexico, or does the government now intend to negotiate a trilateral agreement which will restore full Canadian sovereignty in our energy industry?

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, we have full sovereignty over our energy industry. Those claims are silly. If the hon. member would look back to an agreement that the Liberal Party signed in 1973 with 23 other countries in this world called the International Energy Agency, it promised to share energy resources during short periods of time. There is nothing different in the trade agreement with the United States than with the International Energy Agency agreement that was signed by the Liberals quite some time ago, absolutely nothing.

* * *

## IMMIGRATION

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair):** Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. A refugee claimant received a letter, which is not on letterhead, which says, "With regard to an immigration matter, kindly contact my office at your earliest convenience," at such and such an address. Presumably, this is the hon. minister's department but no one would know that. When he got to the office, he was advised that he would be deported from the country.

He subsequently received from the same office a piece of paper, handwritten, which says the following: "Report for removal to immigration at Holiday Inn". Is this the treatment that your department is giving to refugee claimants in this country?

**Mr. Speaker:** I would ask the hon. member to put his question through the Chair. The hon. minister may wish to respond.

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has difficulty with a refugee case, as many members of this House do from time to time, I am quite prepared to take a look at it. I think there are many hon. members on all sides of this House who know that I do deal with all those cases on an urgent basis.

* * *

## PRESENCE IN THE GALLERY

**Mr. Speaker:** I wish to draw to the members' attention the presence in the gallery of Dr. Michael Woods, Minister of Health and Social Welfare of Ireland.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## POINT OF ORDER

### BÉLANGER–CAMPEAU COMMISSION—ALLEGED PRIVATE MEETINGS OF THE PRIME MINISTER

**Mrs. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a point of order before the Prime Minister takes the floor, since it concerns his reply in the House. When the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier asked a question about the Prime Minister's presentation before the Bélanger–Campeau commission, the Prime Minister made it clear to the House, following a suggestion I made, that he was having private meetings with Mr. Bélanger and Mr. Campeau about Quebec's constitutional future, either within or outside Canada. I would like to ask him the following question, Mr. Speaker: Why was he not prepared to reveal the whole truth in response to the excellent question put by my colleague, the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier? Why is he having private meetings, without having—

[*English*]

**Some hon. members:** Order.

**Mr. Friesen:** Withdraw.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member is using a point of order to carry on Question Period. If she wishes, on another occasion, to continue debate then, of course, that is open to her but it is not a proper use of a point of order. If there is a need for the hon. member to withdraw, I will look at the "blues" and consider it.

* * *

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

### WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** This being Thursday, before I ask the usual question as to the work that the government will propose to the House, I wonder if members would agree with me that we should adopt a motion of thanks and congratulations, and offer our sincere thanks to the three members of this House, Messrs. Axworthy, Corbett and Robinson, who, in my view, did a very good humanitarian job.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, having said that, I wonder if the minister could tell us what the business of the House is for tomorrow and next week.

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we will be calling Bill C-40, the report stage of the Broadcasting Act.

Tomorrow morning I would like to call for second reading of Bill C-88, the European Bank for Reconstruction. Perhaps if we can engage in some discussions for progress, since it is a relatively non-controversial piece of legislation, we could, upon conclusion of that, call for report stage and hopefully, third reading of Bill C-79, amendments to the Parliament of Canada Act.

On Monday, I will be calling the Broadcasting Act back for completion of report stage. If our previous discussions turn out to be accurate in terms of the progress we might make, hopefully we will complete the Broadcasting Act on Tuesday, December 4.



I will be engaging with my homologues on the other side in terms of further work for the remainder of next week.

* * *

## POINTS OF ORDER

### COMMENTS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Given the Prime Minister's response to my question today and the response I got on Monday to the same question, that the Secretary of State seemingly without difficulty could table the requested documentation regarding sanctions in Iraq, I feel that there is no need for delay. I would ask that the documentation be tabled forthwith.

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, as was pointed out, the hon. member asked this question yesterday and again today. She got an answer. She did not approve of the answer and then is bootlegging it as a point of order to make her political point again.

She has an opportunity during Question Period. Why is that not sufficient to make her point. Why must she bootleg with specious points of orders—

**Some hon. members:** Order.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member rose on a point of order and, of course, one has to listen to the point before one rules on it. I am not at all sure that it is a point of order. Certainly, the hon. government House leader has indicated his disapproval of the use of a point of order to carry on a debate. However, I do want hon. members to know that before I can decide whether it is appropriate or not, I usually have to hear at least a little bit of it. The hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier.

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** I may agree with you that it is not what I would call a very strict point of order, but it is a point of fact that the government has offered these documents, has not come forth with the proof that these sanctions are working. The member is only asking that the government put up or shut up. That is all.

**Mr. Speaker:** But we have just finished Question Period and those questions were put and they may well be put again.

EXPANSION OF NATIONAL HOCKEY LEAGUE

**Mr. Terry Clifford (London—Middlesex):** Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among many of our colleagues on all sides of this House. I would like to ask for consent to move the following motion, which is seconded by the hon. member for Stormont—Dundas. I move that:

> Whereas the National Hockey League is considering expansion and whereas this House is of the opinion that any future expansion of the NHL would benefit from the inclusion of Canadian teams, therefore, that this House supports the efforts of Ottawa and Hamilton in their bids to obtain National Hockey League franchises.

• (1510 )

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Members have heard the terms of the motion. Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### BROADCASTING ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Tuesday, November 27, consideration of Bill C–40, an act respecting broadcasting and to amend certain acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunication, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee; and Motion No. 17 of Mr. Waddell (p. 15801); and Motion No. 30 of Mrs. Finestone (p. 15801).

**Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean):** Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to speak today to Bill C–40, an act respecting broadcasting and to amend certain acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunication, as reported with amendments from a legislative committee.

Although this bill encompasses several positive steps, it needs further revision. The motion before us today addresses one of the fundamental flaws of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as you have indicated, we are resuming debate on motions which include the excellent motion of the hon. member for Mount Royal which is before us for discussion. The motion reflects the deep dissatisfaction within the substance of Bill C–40. This bill drops the CBC's 1968 mandated role to foster Canadian national unity. Specifically it reads:

> —to contribute to the development of national unity and provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity.

For the first time in Canadian broadcasting history, the national role of the CBC was reaffirmed and legally bound to resist threats to unity. I have read the rationale for removing this fundamental clause but I simply cannot agree with it.

I was all the more concerned when the independent member for Shefford, Quebec, spoke to this motion on Tuesday. I guess the Bloc Quebecois separatist position matches quite well with its desire to see the CBC robbed of its longstanding mandate.

The CBC as a national institution must be there for all Canadians and must continue to represent the views of all.

As for the clause itself, there has been no indication whatsoever that the concerns of the government and the bill are founded in fact. Specifically, there is no threat that the CBC will be an instrument of the state. The intention and the effect are for the CBC to be an instrument of the people, of society, of the Canadian nation, not—and I cannot stress this enough—the government or the state.

The government's reasoning is clearly suspect in this regard. One only has to read the remarks of the CBC's long-time president, Pierre Juneau, to realize there is no threat to the objectivity of the CBC or to any part of its continued effective broadcasting in this country. Monsieur Juneau has gone on record as saying that the national unity phrase had not caused any problems during his tenure at the CBC.

The CRTC has concurred with this position. The simple fact is that the clause in question has never precluded the effectiveness of the CBC in fulfilling its over-all mandate.

The CBC has historically been a unifying force in this country and should continue to be given this responsibility as a central aspect of its mandate. Removing this aspect from the CBC's purview would be a significant detriment to the corporation and the country. It amounts to the disembowelment of the CBC as a national institution.

Sixty years ago Prime Minister R. B. Bennett said that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, as he helped to found it, would be an instrument of national consciousness and unity. He said that it was needed to bring the country together in those difficult times. He recognized that Canada's autonomy and independence hinged on the control of our communications system. Has really that much changed over the intervening years? I do not think so. The need is still as great as ever for a national institution to act as a unifying force.

I would argue that they are needed now more than ever before in our Canadian history. We need the CBC to act as a bulwark against the various decentralizing forces that bombard Canada from all its corners, from inside and outside this country, even from within this very House of Commons, from within this Parliament of Canada.

Canadians have diverse backgrounds and lives and so it is particularly important for federal institutions like the CBC to act as a unifying force, pulling Canadians together through the promotion of our common interests and perspectives.

National radio programs such as *Morningside*, *As It Happens*. *Sunday Morning*, *Cross Country Check–Up*; as well as television shows like *The National*, *The Journal*; documentaries like Patrick Watson's *The Struggle for Democracy*, Ken Dryden's *Home Game*, and even *Hockey Night in Canada* provide a unifying influence on Canadians.

I am sure that this would continue at least in the short term without the national unity mandate specifically spelled out. But the focus might change. Over time the CBC could lose its effectiveness as a pro–Canadian force.

Some more cynical analysts have said that this bill in its present form could be the government's first step toward privatization of our beloved Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Any move in this direction would be tragic. The vast majority of Canadians believe that they have an incredible service at their disposal and would shun any move toward changing the 60–year mandate of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

It is incumbent upon us here today to make a stand with these initial signs of erosion. The Mulroney government has already cut the CBC's budget with abandon and disregard. We have seen this time and time again. We cannot also allow them to take away the fundamental mandate of the CBC through this flawed legislation.

It is clear that this bill must have changes made. The amendments we consider today, therefore, must be accepted in order to make broadcasting law in this country reflect the needs of this nation.

Broadcasting provides a unique opportunity to bind us together. It must not be ignored or tossed aside, especially at this time in the country's history when Canada is being pulled apart from many sides.

It is particularly ironic to me that the Prime Minister of Canada has named Keith Spicer to head a Citizens' forum intended to promote national unity, but he supports a broadcast bill that so fundamentally contradicts his expressed concern about national unity.

If the government is as eager to promote unity as it would like Canadians to believe, it can start by amending Bill C–40 and not so easily dispense with the essential mandate of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

In conclusion, this act is so fundamentally flawed that it cannot, and must not, go through without amendment. As written, Bill C–40 precludes the CBC the opportunity to explore the vision of being an agency of national consciousness and of contributing the vital component, the national sounding board, for our common thoughts, interests and ideals.

This is a tragedy that must be corrected by those of us assembled here in this House of Commons. Therefore, I urge the government to support this critical amendment and to re–establish more substantial support for the CBC.

**Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in this very important debate. It is a debate, I feel, which proposes to alter the very foundation of the Canadian broadcasting system.

I am deeply concerned by most aspects of this destructive bill, but what disturbs me most is the clause which would remove from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation the mandate to contribute to the development of national unity and provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity.

• (1520 )

The promotion of national unity has been a principle of the CBC since its foundation. If there ever was a time to eliminate this principle, this is the worst possible time.

Almost 60 years ago, Prime Minister R. B. Bennett said that the CBC would be an instrument of national consciousness and unity. I believe that the CBC has fulfilled that mandate and that to deny it the means and the will to continue doing so is a tragic mistake.

The CBC has acted as a unifying force throughout its existence. For many, if not all of us here today, the CBC and Radio–Canada played a major role in our lives as we grew up and continues to do so today. Before television and in many cases beyond, the radio was the best source of popular entertainment and information to be had by Canadians. There was an immediacy about radio, a sense of participation and presence that was lacking even in newspapers, and was highly valued.

Television is the dominant medium in the world today and the CBC has demonstrated its ability to stay at the forefront with innovative programming and bold initiatives such as the all news channel Newsworld. But while doing so, it has not neglected radio. Any fan of *Morningside*, or *As It Happens*, or any number of other fine programs can attest to this.

CBC programming, both radio and television, serves to bring Canadians together, to teach us about each other. We are a small population scattered over a huge expanse of territory, and the challenge of communication is a major one. The CBC has played a vital role in ensuring that Canadians communicate with one another, that they feel connected to one another. This is especially true of Canadians living in the outlying and isolated areas of Canada. For them in particular the CBC is and always has been a strong and badly needed link to their fellow Canadians and to the world. For the bulk of the Canadian population densely clustered along the 49th parallel and the Great Lakes, the CBC serves to acquaint them with the other Canadian experience.

If not for the powerful voice of CBC many Canadians would be more familiar with the United States than they would be with their own country. To allow this to happen would be to weaken the bonds and the potential of this nation. To do what we can to familiarize Canadians with their own culture with their fellow citizens, is not to promote "intolerable propaganda" as the Minister of Communications would have us believe, it is to provide Canadians with the opportunity to learn about each other, an opportunity they would not otherwise have.

The Prime Minister has stated that everything we have accomplished as a country can be traced back to our sense of national purpose, to our national unity. That is the very essence of the reason why national unity must remain a part of the CBC's mandate. It is not there to force the CBC and Radio–Canada to act as a propaganda machine for the state. If that were the result of the mandate surely this government, with its low standing in the polls, would want to keep it. It is not there to force the CBC to relay the news with a state or even a Canadian bias. Rather, the mandate to promote national unity is vital in an intangible way.

A sense of national purpose is badly lacking in Canada today and national unity seems very fragile. If the mandate to promote unity has been some kind of iron fist wielded by CBC, I have yet to see the results. That does not mean that eliminating the mandate is a trivial or meaningless action, one that should hardly cause a ripple. Indeed, we need that mandate more than ever. It can do no harm and it could be of great help. Canada is becoming more and more decentralized, economically, socially, culturally, linguistically, regionally, and even spiritually. We are pulling apart at the seams. The CBC has the potential to serve as a bulwark against these decentralizing forces but only if we allow it the means and the will to do so, and only if we have the willingness to listen and to learn.

A mandate to promote national unity: Those are not empty words but a statement of purpose and the articulation of a dream. We are a nation built on dreams. Many Canadians are descendants of those who came from across the sea seeking a better life.

The national railway which allowed westward expansion was born in the imagination of a few men. For a nation such as this, a statement of purpose such as the promotion of national unity by CBC is not only necessary, it is natural.

We desperately need a sense of unity. We need a sense of national purpose. We need a sense that there is something worth fighting for. What kind of message does the elimination of the national unity mandate send to Canadians? It is a terribly negative message, and this is

the worst of all possible times for the federal government to be issuing negative messages.

Most of us in this House believe that Canada is worth fighting for, and I believe that most Canadians feel that way too. In the fight, we need a purpose. We need rallying cries. To gut our national broadcasting institution of its mandate to promote Canadians unity is to tell Canadians that the dream is dead.

In saying these things, I speak from the heart. There are other aspects of the government's proposal to eliminate the national unity mandate, and indeed aspects of the entire bill which disturb me in a more concrete way. I fear that there is an underlying message in Bill C–40, and that is the end of the CBC as a government funded institution.

Since 1984, this government has cut the CBC's parliamentary grants by over $240 million, including severe reductions to its high–tech equipment. The government does not seem dedicated or even interested in developing the CBC's great potential. That is what the government did to passenger rail in Canada. It killed it bit by bit.

I am afraid that is what is happening to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. The presence of the federal government in rural Canada and in the regions is decreasing. Post offices are closing. Military bases have been scaled down or closed, such as CFB Summerside in my province of Prince Edward Island.

The government's obsession with the free market is causing it to sell off Crown corporations such as Air Canada and Petro–Canada. The government's presence in the areas of transportation and natural resources allowed Canadians some measure of control over the forces which affect their lives.

The same is true of communications. Given this track record, and given the contents and the tone of Bill C–40, I cannot help but suspect that the government intends to gradually abandon the CBC. Canadians in smaller and more remote population areas such as Prince Edward Island fear that their local stations, CBC Charlottetown, for example, will be among the first to go.

Rumours to that effect have been circulating for some time now, and with Bill C–40, they grow stronger. The people of Charlottetown and of P.E.I. for one would like this government to promise that they will not lose their publicly funded CBC, which has served them well for so long.

To vote for the passage of Bill C–40 is to condone and to assist the government's plans for the CBC, none of which are good. If we have any remaining doubt about the government's attitude toward this most Canadian of institutions, we need only to think of its intention to eliminate the promotion of national unity from the CBC mandate. That says it all.

This aspect alone of Bill C–40 is a tacit admission by the federal government that it believes Canadian unity to be a dead dream. So far as it is concerned, the fabric of this country has been torn beyond repair.

Either that, or this government does not believe that Canada is in need of unifying symbols, statements or ideals. I strongly disagree with both of these. I believe that by sending such a negative message to Canadians, the federal government is abandoning its responsibility to do everything within its power to keep this country together and to make it strong.

"To contribute to the development of national unity and to provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity." Those words do not pose any threat to the freedom of the media. They have not had that effect in the past, and they will not have it in the future. What they have done is represent what we value most about the CBC, which is that it provides us with a mirror reflecting back both the good and the bad, allowing Canadians to continue to examine and re–evaluate ourselves and our nation, and to ponder what Canada is and what it can be.

• (1530 )

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege to speak, however briefly, to Bill C–40, an Act respecting broadcasting and to amend certain acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunication. I am glad to see the Minister of Communications is here today to listen to the most fundamental aspect of this legislation which concerns Canada's national unity. I would like to start by congratulating the hon. member for Mount Royal on her excellent work on this bill and on what she did to clarify for Canadians the national unity aspect that

forms the nucleus of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's mandate in Canada.

Today, I will make my comments in French, and I do so for a very specific reason. Although my last name is LeBlanc, French is not my mother tongue, but I went to Quebec in the early 80s, when the national unity question was a subject of lively debate, especially in the province of Quebec. I was there as a student, to learn French, in an environment where this fundamental question that goes to the heart of our nation was very topical indeed.

I must say that my experience during those four years was a very valuable one, especially from a cultural point of view, because of the friendships I made and also because I was able to learn and understand a little more about the culture, values and principles of a society in this country that is very proud of what it has accomplished during the past three or four centuries, and which at that time was intent on discovering its identity.

I had an opportunity, since this was another critical period in our history, to see things from the perspective of a student at Laval University in Quebec City. I often watched CBC television to know what was going on across the country, and I saw that in Quebec as well, there was this yearning for an identity. Even out there, I realized there was, nevertheless, a national presence, a national government that recognized the aspirations of people in that part of Canada but at the same time did not intend to give way to these divided factions. It met them head–on and used the means at its disposal to tell Quebecers: Your future is in Canada.

This message has failed to come across since 1984. This government's statements and the messages and signals it sends are increasingly lacking in substance. One of the most discouraging indications of this lack of leadership, this failure to express our national identity, is the clauses we find in Bill C–40 before the House today. The purpose of the motion before the House today is to try and reverse this trend.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that if we believe in this country, we, as Canadians make an effort to reverse these trends and start speaking out to say that our country is Canada. We must defend our values and take pride in them.

If we start diluting the legislation that defines the mandate of our national broadcasting institution by saying that French and English are represented by two different communities or that national unity is no longer an important part of the mandate of our national television network, we are sending a message that the national government and our national institutions have lost the will and the courage to defend our country.

It is even more regrettable today, in 1990, when we look at other parts of the world and realize what we have here in Canada, compared with the situation in other countries around us.

Since I was elected, Mr. Speaker, I had a chance to visit Canada from coast to coast, not just Quebec and Western Canada but also the North. Every visit, every trip fills me with wonder at the splendour and riches of this country, and I ask myself what we can contribute to the world. We cannot help, however, if we are beset by internal divisions, if we are afraid to speak with a national voice and if we let ourselves be torn in so many directions. We cannot contribute effectively, for instance, toward resolving conflicts in the Middle East or help draft resolutions or rebuild a new world in the Soviet Union or elsewhere, as in the Third World, for instance.

I repeat, I am convinced that one area where Canada has a very important contribution to make is the environment. However, if we are distracted by internal divisions and are afraid to speak out, and if our government fails to give us any leadership in this field, we will be unable to make that contribution. The twenty–first century, which was to be Canada's century, will pass us by, and that would be regrettable for us here in Canada and even more so for people in other countries throughout the world.

These considerations go straight to the heart of the motions before the House today which are a particular concern of my colleague, who worked so hard to improve this bill in committee.

Mr. Speaker, one of our great Canadian philosophers was Marshall McLuhan, who had so much to say and contributed to our thinking about the media and communications in what he called the global village. McLuhan said: The medium is the message. He said the world had become a global village, mostly because of television. Television has caused the world to shrink and thus made it possible for us to express common values. However,

television can also be a source of division, separation and discord inside a country.

• (1540)

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, I would like to say that Canada should stop acting like a young man who is perfectly healthy but all of a sudden decides to throw in the towel because life is no longer worthwhile and the challenges are too great. That is the general impression given by our national malaise. In fact, it is not a bad simile: this dynamic young man, who all of sudden feels that the challenges and opportunities of the future are just too much of a responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, they are not too much for us. What we need is time and a government that is prepared to pursue every avenue, to show leadership and to take a strong position in all areas, and that will start by improving the mandate we give our national telecommunications institution, which is why we are here today.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina):** Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on this subject on which I am very far from being a specialist, but I have become very concerned about it quite recently, partly from an experience I had last week, which I will mention.

The point of this amendment is that we should restore the principle that part of the CBC's mandate is to contribute to national unity as well a shared national consciousness or identity. It is very unfortunate that the government has undertaken to take out from the original mandate prior to the bill the duty to promote national unity.

If the objection is that it would be government propaganda, there are ways to deal with that so long as the duty is clearly defined because the government is only one of the governments in Canada. Unity does not mean uniformity, that everybody thinks the same, that everybody speaks the same language, that everybody wears the same clothes or supports the same hockey team. Unity means—especially in a country like Canada—unity of diverse groups that find how we can fit together and enrich each other. In other words, a very important part of a national broadcasting corporation should be to help the different regions and the different groups in Canada to know each other by letting them participate. That should be part of the duty and it should be clearly stated under the obligation to promote national unity.

The reason I want to speak on this is that last weekend I happened to have two interesting but somewhat distressing conversations. One was with an old friend in rural Ontario. He is an anglo. Frankly, he is not very sympathetic with francophones in Ontario, or in Quebec, and he gave me some of his reasons why.

I was a little alarmed at the distance between him and me on that subject because I felt he did not know a great deal about what actually goes on in Quebec, about how the people live in Quebec in the most simple ordinary sense.

This person is a retired trade unionist from the factory in which I used to work where I was the secretary at one time and he the union president. He is a man of social responsibility. But what he does not know about the French people of Canada, especially in Quebec, limits his sympathy, and he is worried about national unity. He gets quite upset in saying that he would fight to stop anyone from splitting Canada in two. He means it. He does not intend to be hostile. He thinks that there are some hostile people over there. That was Saturday evening.

On Sunday evening I was speaking with another old friend in Montreal, again a manual worker and a person with a good deal of education and self-education. Unfortunately for me he is bilingual. He is francophone but fortunately much more bilingual than I. He was shocked at how little I know about what is going on recently in Quebec regarding certain briefs to the Bélanger–Campeau Commission and so on.

We see each other several times a year. I live in Toronto and in Ottawa. My background is in Winnipeg and central Ontario, except for a very few years in Quebec. He feels that my understanding of him is very limited. He describes himself, and rightly so, as a federalist. He is aware of a separatist tide in Quebec, and he is very worried about it. He does not want our country split. He is distressed that I know so little, in his opinion, of the things in Quebec that matter to him.

Personally my situation is rather comical. I am in the middle between my anglophone friend in rural Ontario and my francophone friend in Montreal. I do not mean to blame any institution or any action, but the point is that we need the kind of institution that can explain the south to the north, the north to the south, Quebec to

Ontario, Ontario to Quebec, francophones to anglophones, Chinese, Ukrainians, Italians, Japanese Canadians, the black people in Canada, or whomever. We have many groups in Canada that have their own characteristics and can be unaware of others and can be misunderstood by others. The CBC has been one of the main channels, in my experience, for enabling us to learn more about each other. We need more of that rather than less of that.

I am very sorry that over the past five years the CBC's operating budget has been cut every year. In 1984–85 it was $943.3 million. I will not go through all the years, but it goes down year by year to $812.5 million in 1989–90. In other words, there has been $130 million cut out of its budget. Part of the programming that has been deleted because of those cuts is the regional programming, telling the north about the south, the south about the north, and the east about the west.

I am luckier than many Ontarians. I have been able to visit the maritimes sometimes and the west coast sometimes. For the most part, I do not know the maritimes. I have a son in Newfoundland, but I only see a little bit of Newfoundland when I visit there.

The programs on the CBC are very valuable. It is unfortunate that many of those very Canadian programs—and by that I do not mean uniformly Canadian; I mean Newfoundland, Vancouver, Yukon, northern Ontario, the Eastern Townships of Quebec, or many other groups—have been cut back. It is very unfortunate that CBC has been, by the budget cuts, pressured to abandon its goal of 95 per cent Canadian content in prime time.

• (1550)

Prime time is pretty important, especially for our children as they are growing up; in my case our grandchildren. They have to have the chance to watch these Canadian content programs when they should not be in bed or at school.

There is nothing we can do today, in this bill, about the budget cuts, but we can at least, if the government will see the point, restore the principle that the CBC has a duty to promote national unity. We have heard a great deal during the past year or two about the need for national unity.

It is very unfortunate and strange, and for some people it is very offensive, that at the time the Prime Minister speaks about national unity his government is demolishing, piece by piece, slice by slice, budget cut by budget cut, and now with legislative changes, one of the main instruments of national unity created by the Canadian people.

Whether the government is planning to sell off the CBC in whole or in part, I do not know of course. It has done that with many other groups created by the Canadian taxpayers and labour, often sold at a ridiculously small price. What its plans are for the CBC, it has not told us yet. It should not take out of the law this duty to promote national unity, or else the Prime Minister will have to be seen by Canadian people as not meaning what he says when he talks about national unity.

**Ms. Ethel Blondin (Western Arctic):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to rise in the House today to address Bill C–40 respecting broadcasting and amendments to certain acts.

I would like to direct my comments to the whole issue of national unity. I come from an area that represents a mosaic of Canadians. First Canadians are in the majority in the area that I represent, and basically these people have their own languages and their own cultures. This a reflection of Canada and what Canada is all about.

Bill C–40 drops the CBC's 1968 mandated role to contribute to the development of national unity and to provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity. My feeling is that the removal of the national unity reference was recommended by both the Caplan–Sauvageau report in 1986 and the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture in 1987.

The standing committee had been concerned that this clause might interfere with CBC's ability to ensure that its programming reflect and interpret as fully, as fairly and as accurately as possible Canada's cultural, social, political, economic, linguistic and regional reality and diversity.

Former CBC President Pierre Juneau told the standing committee that the phrase national unity had not

caused any problems during his years at the CBC. The CRTC noted that its interpretation of the term never precluded a free political discussion from all points of view.

Coming from the Northwest Territories and from an area that is highly represented by a multiplicity of factors which lead to a very diverse population of languages and cultures, my feeling is that the systematic dismantling of the CBC will have serious effects on the quality of our lives as Canadians.

Local news broadcasts may have to be cancelled. Some regional radio stations will have to close. Commercials will have to be reintroduced on CBC radio. The current level of regional programming cannot be maintained. This is particularly serious in the north because we depend on information which is critical to our safety, such as on the weather and flying conditions.

Liberal members of Parliament believe that because our country is so vast we need a sufficiently funded CBC in order for the whole country to have access to this service.

The CBC unites our country. It is precisely because the CBC is a public network that it can offer wholly Canadian programming. By destroying the CBC, the government is destroying an important part of Canadian culture. Canadians have moulded the CBC over the past 50 years into the quality Canadian programming of today. What justification does the government have for reversing all this in one fall swoop?

If we are to preserve our identity as a nation, we need to invest in our cultural institutions. I believe the government, by cutting funding to the CBC, is ensuring that our children will grow up with less than a true sense of what it is to be Canadian and what Canada is all about.

We know that many Canadians share our concern about the impacts the cuts will have on the CBC and on Canadians. It is essential that we tell the government loudly and clearly that it is not acceptable to destroy and erode the public broadcasting program of Canada.

I feel so strongly about the CBC and the role it plays in educating Canadians about Canadians that I wrote to Patrick Watson and Gérard Veilleux in February to ask why they do not provide the Newsworld service and if they would provide the news world service to the Northwest Territories.

We were hosting a major leadership forum which focused on national issues, issues of national importance and ones which particularly referred to issues of aboriginal populations across Canada. There was much reference to Arctic sovereignty. There was reference to the whole issue of self-government.

These are things that Canadians want to know about. It would be important for the whole nation to have seen this, and this is what I wrote to Mr. Watson and Mr. Veilleux. In part I wrote:

> Sovereignty is important to all Canadians but it is the residents of the Arctic who have maintained the north's sovereignty through traditional use and occupancy of the land and water. What political development means with or without the Meech Lake Accord is unique to the two territories. Environment issues in the Arctic are different than those in other areas. Energy is equally important. The north has the resources to make Canada energy self-sufficient. I could go on but my point is that the forum this weekend will be dealing with many profound problems that would be extremely educational and interesting for all Canadians.

I want to provide this House with at least part of the response I received from these two very honourable gentlemen, because it indicates the belief of CBC management with respect to the role that CBC plays in national unity. It is important for me to share this with the House. Mr. Veilleux wrote: "The CBC fully recognizes the importance of bringing concerns of northern Canadians to the attention of the whole country. Indeed, with respect to Newsworld in particular, every weekend we broadcast *Focus North* from Yellowknife and *Mayda* from Whitehorse. Regularly throughout the week we have inserts from Yellowknife into our prime time Calgary program *This Country*".

He continued: "In closing, I wish to stress that the advent of Newsworld has heralded a dramatic increase in the coverage of the political agenda of Canada. It has also brought an unprecedented level of regional coverage to all parts of the country. What is more, the region that has benefited most from our formats and our editorial imperative to show Canadians other parts of Canada is the north. Never before have northern concerns been so presented so frequently and so directly, and without being filtered through a central and southern Canadian perspective".

As well, former CBC President Pierre Juneau, to whom I referred to in a previous statement, told the standing committee that the phrase national unity had not caused any problems during his years at CBC.

I must say there has been a devastating impact, though, because when we talk about national unity we talk about the strength of that national unity in terms of what languages and what cultures there are in a country.

In the area that I come from I guess the expression of national unity comes from the majority of people who live there. This particular bill respecting broadcasting refers to this. Page 6 of the bill indicates that programming which reflects aboriginal cultures of Canada should be provided within the Canadian broadcasting system as resources become available for the purpose. This is the statement of commitment within the body of this bill. I have here a couple of press releases from the Inuit Broadcasting Corporation. In one of these press releases, a lady by the name of Blandina Makik, Executive Producer of Children's Programming in Iqaluit, in the Northwest Territories, calls the $600,000 cut to the Inuit Broadcasting Corporation spiritual genocide. She states that the cuts are expected to be felt in cultural, educational, news and current affairs programs, broadcast in Inuktitut to homes where many of the older Inuit do not speak English. Essentially, the reference is to a unilingual group.

• (1600)

The other thing which is quite devastating for this particular area is that in the $600,000 cut was included a very, very important program called *The Super Shmoo* series, which had a funding of $215,000. The native communications programs were cut back and this does not do anything for national unity. It does not give the complete expression of language and culture of all regions of Canada.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that Canada is a cultural mosaic, and we are more influenced than any other nation by our vast geography and vast wilderness and by our environment. Part of what has helped to build our country, from east to west and to the north is our infrastructure, such as the public broadcasting system. We have enforced a sense of Canadianism in ourselves through the CBC, which helps define a sense of our own identity as a nation. So now, more at this time in history than any other time, we need this institution of national unity to speak to one another.

[*Translation*]

**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 Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon)—The Environment; the hon. member for Cape Breton Highlands—Canso (Mr. LeBlanc)—Scotia Synfuels Project; the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Proud)—Goods and Services Tax.

The hon. member for St. Boniface.

[*English*]

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to be able to speak to this legislation today. Frankly, if we want to be serious about national unity, and I believe that every single Canadian in his or her own way wants to be, we have to think very seriously about our national institutions. One of these is communications, and certainly we have to think equally seriously about the importance of restoring the national unity clause.

Many of us are particularly preoccupied with what is happening in the country today. We recognize the great conflicts and the great pressures in the country. When we think about national unity, surely we need to acknowledge that every single man and woman needs to feel as if they can get what is their fair share from this country. Canadians, whether of aboriginal ancestry, French, English, or other ancestry, needs to feel as if they belong and they count. The five to seven million functionally illiterate Canadians need to believe that they can improve their lot and participate more fully in Canadian society. Every poor Canadian of the more than five million poor in this country needs to believe as well that he or she will break out of this vicious circle of poverty.

Until all of our regions, whether in the great north or in the western provinces, Ontario, Quebec or the Atlantic provinces feels that it will be treated fairly, that there are mechanisms in place that will help it to communicate, help it to work out its differences, we will not have the kind of strong united country that we want.

[*Translation*]

I would like to ask the government to stop dismantling what we have built, what unites us, to stop destroying the institutions that give us a chance to talk and get to know one another.

[*English*]

Let us look at some of the decisions that have been taken.

[*Translation*]

I believe that some of the decisions that have been made did not contribute anything at all to make Canada a strong and united country. Consider for instance the cut-backs at VIA Rail where more than 2,700 employees have been laid off, or the Air Canada privatization deal not long after that which was the end of the line for over 2,900 men and women. I am sure you remember the sale of Route Canada by the CN and that you are aware of the fact that nearly 2,000 men and women have been are still suffering because the government does not seem to be able to do anything to help them.

With respect to the privatization of Petro-Canada, we can see now that we had just the right organization which, had the government been willing to act, could have met the energy needs of all Canadians. Why did the government fail to come up with a policy. After all, we have had six years to achieve energy self-sufficiency.

Just looking at the number of bankruptcies, which are now at an all-time high, is enough to realize that the country is being torn apart and falling down. The government-created recession, a fact admitted by the ministers involved, is certainly not going to help strengthen national unity. Some of the CBC cut-backs—my colleague has just referred to them—have been driving Canadians even further apart, and this is true from one end of the country to the other.

[*English*]

What we really need to do is start listening to the people again. If we were to ask Canadians whether or not they want this government and this Parliament to make a sincere and profound commitment to national unity, we would get an unequivocal yes. People would be telling us to do everything in our power to make sure that the country is able to bounce back, that it is able to become much more united and much stronger than it has ever been.

We need to start listening to Canadians, to its five million poor, most of whom are women, many of whom are seniors, about one million of whom are children. We need to start talking to and listening to the functionally illiterate Canadians, who number between five million and seven million, and who feel sometimes as if they will never be able to break out of this difficulty that they are experiencing. Disabled Canadians often feel marginalized. We are talking about 3.3 million Canadians. We have to start listening to all of them in all regions of Canada from each and every single province and each of our two territories.

The removal of this particular clause is another blow, another kick, another shot, if you like, at Canada. It will damage the concept of national unity, which is so precious and so essential to a nation such as ours, particularly one as large and complex and so vast that many, many Canadians do not understand it nearly as well as they should or could.

I ask the government to consider the restoration of the national unity clause. We need to admit that we need information about ourselves. We know too little about each other, and because we know so little, we often misunderstand each other.

Let me complete my address by simply using an analogy. If a family is going to be strong and united, it needs good information within that family. We need open communications. We need to know each other so that we can reach out to each other.

[*Translation*]

The members of a strong and united family talk to each other. We need to have open and honest exchanges that will make it easier to understand one another, to work and play together and contribute to our unity. I believe the same is true of a country like ours. Without sound information about other Canadians from the various regions and without open communication lines we will not go very far.

[*English*]

With those particular comments, I will ask the government to ensure that it looks at this particular clause, that it makes sure that the tools that we, as Canadians, need to build a stronger more united country are, in fact, given to us. I believe most of us would agree that until every single man, woman and child in this great nation,

whether he or she is aboriginal, French, English or of other ancestry, no matter where he or she lives, feels he or she belongs, is able to understand each other, we are going to continue to have serious difficulties.

• (1610)

[*Translation*]

I sincerely believe that we must have open lines of communication and sound information that will enable us to know each other better. Without these communication networks we stand to lose a lot. We even stand to lose everything.

[*English*]

**Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex):** Mr. Speaker, broadcasting, whether it is television or radio, brings Canada and the world into our living rooms. It brings in a world of news, sports, entertainment and public affairs. Broadcasting is a key medium which unites us by reflecting Canada to our fellow Canadians at a time when unifying the country is more critical than ever before, given the deep divisions and racial intolerance that are dividing so many communities.

Given these realities, Liberals believe that Bill C–40 moves away from the strong national broadcasting system that Canada has always held as part of this elusive Canadian identity, letting us share a common purpose. For this reason, we believe the government is wrong to weaken the CBC in its proposed broadcasting legislation.

With the passage of Bill C–40, the CBC will no longer be required to contribute to the development of national unity. It will be dropped from its mandate, just when the government should be doing everything in its power to give each and every Canadian a true sense of belonging and participation. For us on this side of the House, our goal for Canada is developing a national personality, building a sense of national unity and a national consciousness. We believe we need a strong national institution like the CBC to weave all of the regions and all of the diverse participants of Canada into a united nation that is working in the interests of all Canadians.

Just last spring we in the rural communities across this country lost a valuable resource in the agricultural community. We lost George Price, one of CBC radio's last farm reporters. His position had been cut. I strongly disagree with this decision. We already miss George Price.

He has been an excellent agri–food industry reporter. However, even though George Price is no longer with us, what is more important is the CBC has eliminated his position. The farmers of Canada who have relied on this information service for input on agricultural issues will have a grave loss. Farmers do not have the time to catch regularly scheduled newscasts but they always listened to George Price and his program while driving their tractors or their combines in the fields.

Yet, in the response from the CBC when I wrote about this they pointed out that farmers get up–to–the–minute information from computers, fax machines, wire services, all news television and a variety of other sources, as well as CBC radio. The did not see CBC radio as a loss.

I have to point out that I am not only a member of this House, but I am also a farmer. Certainly we have some of the services I have just listed in our homes, but we do not have them on our tractors and our combines, other than the radio. George Price's program was something we never missed, whether we were on the tractor, the combine or in our homes. He was one of the few reporters who was factual, he was on the job and he kept the other elements of the news media honest. George Price was a very conscientious person who always gave an unbiased account of what was happening.

I have to compare this with some of the headlines over the last few weeks. Some of that was instituted in the House of Commons, when the minister of trade chastised the Minister of Agriculture for giving the farmers $8.8 billion in subsidies, which was a concocted figure. We had a headline saying, "Lavish farm subsidies milking consumers", and of course the poor reporter did not know if that was a factual figure.

George Price would never have let them get away with that.

Another one from the Montreal *Gazette*: "Farmers being dragged kicking and screaming into the 1990s." This is an account of a report put together by the Canadian Consumers' Association. They say that Canadians paid double the average world price for milk

because of restrictions that protect the domestic dairy industry from cheaper imports.

That reporter, and obviously the newspaper, did not realize that input costs are higher here in Canada. They seem to think the farmers are getting the extra indirect subsidies.

Even *The Globe and Mail*, November 19: "The policy panel" by a former Deputy Minister of Finance of this government and also a former president of a bank, compared the $2.7 billion subsidies to marketing boards as an indirect subsidy from the consumers to the producer.

He did not stop to realize that input costs here in Canada are 25 to 30 per cent higher than they are in the United States. I countered to him that perhaps we could look at the interest rates. This is a former bank president. Interest rates are higher in Canada than in the United States.

I have to ask you, Mr. Speaker, if it necessarily follows that Canadian milk prices are higher than they are in the United States and so are Canadian interest rates, are the banks not being subsidized by the consumers and small businesses and big business.

Let's follow that theory through and be fair and honest. If George Price was there again, they would never have gotten away with it.

To top it all, here we have some massive cuts in CBC's budget. Yet, this government funded the Canadian Consumers' Association with $790,000 to come out with a report as inaccurate as this, obviously displaying a double standard.

Other businesses in society must have a profit to survive. Agriculture is no different. If it does not have that profit, then the whole industry is going down the tubes. I can never remember a time, even back into the 1930s when I first remember going to town with my dad for supplies, when things were as tough as they are out there at the present time, and this government is completely insensitive.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that this country is going to hold this government accountable not only for the cuts it made to the CBC but for what is going to happen five years down the road. We know what is happening in Russia at the present time. There are food shortages there.

Their system of corporate farming did not survive, and it is not going to survive here in Canada. If George Price was still in the CBC, he would be reminding the government and the people of Canada that the farmers, too, deserve an income that is commensurate with the rest of that of society or they are not going to survive.

When I look at what has been happening here with this government, it does not really seem to care about any of our national institutions. It simply wants to promote the world trade at the cost of those institutions in Canada that served us well over the years. It has ignored the reasons behind the need for the Canadian Wheat Board when it was brought in by a Conservative government back in the 1930s.

It has ignored why the Canadian Dairy Commission was brought into being. It has ignored the reasons why the Egg Marketing Agency, the Broiler Marketing Agency and the Turkey Marketing Agency were brought into being. It forgot the chicken and egg wars. It forgot the other things that happened in history that brought about the creation of these institutions.

Institutions were always accurately reported by George Price, not like the garbage that we have been hearing in last six weeks from the concerted media attack on these institutions that have served this country so well. I have to wonder who is orchestrating these attacks, because the Minister of Agriculture has been very quiet on the whole issue.

As a matter of fact, in a meeting last week in Winnipeg, one of the senior officials of Canada Agriculture in charge of policy stated that perhaps the consumers should be setting the price of milk. What is going to happen if they are going to insist on setting the price of milk? Will they set the price or our input costs too? Are they going to set the price of what you have to purchase as a consumer?

I think not. I want an explanation from the Minister of Agriculture as to why he is letting one of his officials state these types of policies that are surely going to establish a double standard. Or, is he going to move to the corporate farms? I think this House deserves an explanation from the Minister of Agriculture and from that official.

This Conservative government since 1984 has cut CBC's parliamentary grants by over $240 million, which includes severe reductions to our high-tech equipment. Certainly, the CBC should be made a vehicle for promoting Canadian unity, more so than the other institutions that we have in society. It must remain that

way as a safeguard against various decentralizing forces at work in this nation. I want to reiterate that such a drastic cut to the position such as George Price held is not acceptable to this side of the House. I urge strongly to have that taken into consideration and have it reinstated as quickly as possible.

• (1620)

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James):** Mr. Speaker, the record shows that I follow several speakers from this side of the House who have expressed profound concern for the future of the Canadian broadcasting system.

Let the record also show that the Conservatives, on the other side of the House, have not taken part in this debate. That includes the hon. Minister of Communications who sits at his desk and refuses to come to the defense of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I say shame on the Minister of Communications. I say shame on the whole lot of you.

We are here today involved in what I would describe as a very strange debate. It is strange because it deals with a clause in Bill C–40, this broadcast bill, that will take away the national unity mandate from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. It seems that only in Canada can we have this kind of occurrence. We have a cherished and treasured public broadcasting system which has done a tremendous job for more than half a century. It has been as important to this country as the railway that was built from coast to coast well over a century ago.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has played an absolutely crucial and indispensable role in the development of Canada. It was a noble idea from the beginning and it is still a noble idea. A public broadcast corporation like the CBC reflects the country and ties us together. After all, this is a huge sparsely–populated country. The CBC reflects Canada. It tells us about our woes, our dreams, our controversies and our hurts. The CBC reflects most everything that is Canada.

We now come to this clause in Bill C–40. If it goes through—and Tories are pretty good at ramming things through—it will remove the national unity mandate from the CBC, as if it were some kind of disease. The argument that this government has put forward with respect to taking away the national unity mandate is that it is concerned about turning the corporation into some kind of propaganda machine. It would not want to have the CBC behaving as if it were some kind of a propaganda outlet.

I worked at the CBC for 18 years. I think that I know something about the corporation. I can assure you that if you leave the national unity mandate with the CBC, it is not going to be in any way in the future a propaganda machine.

Let us get an understanding of the CBC because I think this is where the Tories go wrong. They do not understand the function of the CBC. They do not understand the kind of work the CBC does. The CBC is much more than just a news disseminating agency. If the CBC was just gathering, writing, editing and delivering the news, perhaps I could question the national unity mandate because reporters are an independent–minded people, they really do not care about politics. They are concerned about delivering the news, good or bad.

The CBC is so much more than that. It is a national broadcasting institution that ties the entire country together and reflects the Canadian story. That takes resources. It is an enormous job and I think it is the responsibility of the government to say to the corporation that part of its job is national unity, not by twisting the news or concocting some kind of silly political story, but by doing the job. It takes a lot of resources and an enormous amount of commitment to carry out the national unity task. That is why the government should be standing behind the CBC and telling the CBC that it is a force for national unity.

Let me use an analogy, Mr. Speaker. If we did not have a CBC television or radio outlet in the province of Manitoba, could one not make the argument that that is not good for national unity? I would suggest to you that if the national public broadcast system ignored one of the provinces, I do not think it would be very good for national unity. I think it would be right and proper for the government to tell the CBC that it wants an outlet in the province of Manitoba for it to do the job that the CBC is charged to do.

When it comes to the matter of national unity, if the CBC is charged with that mandate it can then turn to the government to say that it needs resources to do its job. It might mean more news editors, producers, and directors in the province of British Columbia. It might even mean needing more entertainment programs. Whatever it is, it

is all part and parcel of this job in the name of national unity.

Let us forget about the nonsense of propaganda. We are not talking about propaganda, we are talking about the corporation doing its job. When the CBC does a good job, be it news, entertainment, current affairs, *Hymn Sing*, it is all under the aegis of doing it for Canada, and therefore doing it for national unity.

By taking the national unity mandate away from the CBC, it sends a very bad signal. It sends a signal to certain people in the country who would like to Balkanize, break up and separate the country into two countries. I do not think that is the responsibility of parliamentarians and certainly is not the responsibility of the federal government charged with operating a healthy CBC.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** One minute.

**Mr. Harvard:** Perhaps I should not be very surprised by this proposal on the part of the government because this Conservative government does not have faith in public institutions anyway. Ironically, if the CBC were privately owned I would not be surprised if it had a mandate with respect to national unity, and we would not have this clause at all.

• (1630)

We would not have this clause in the bill because then the Tories on that side of the House would say: "Ah well, they know what they are doing. If they need a national unity clause, so be it". But they do not have any faith in this public broadcast system. It is a darn, darn shame. It is a terrible shame.

Let me just finish by saying this: The Conservatives and this government like to spread the rumour that Canadians have lost faith in their institutions, and that includes the CBC. Not true. There was a recent survey in western Canada which shows once and for all that Canadians do have great faith in their institutions. It is just this government that spreads a lot of bad news which is not factual.

**Mr. Ferguson:** Mr. Speaker, I detected that my colleague is only half way through his speech. Is there unanimous consent for him to carry on?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**An hon. member:** There are three or four of us.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** At report stage we all have 10 minutes. There are several speakers. The next speaker for the party is the hon. member for Dartmouth.

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Mr. Speaker, I could have listened for days to my hon. colleague on his speech about the CBC. He is a distinguished broadcaster who certainly knows not just a lot about broadcasting, but about national unity.

I have the great occasion recently on a trip to western Canada to sit with him many afternoons, along with some distinguished western Canadians, to discuss issues such as national unity. It truly is too bad that we did not have unanimous consent of the House so that the House could benefit from his wisdom and experience.

I want to get right to the meat of the matter in dealing with the motion that is before us in Bill C-40, the broadcasting act. I grew up way down east. Anybody who listens to me in the House knows that I am very proud of where I come from. I am proud that I am a Canadian from Atlantic Canada. But when I was growing up there was a saying that my father used to quote often. It was: "If it ain't broke, don't fix it".

I have looked at the amendments being proposed here in Bill C-40. I cannot believe that a minister of the Crown and a government that claims to govern for all of Canada—not for just a part of it—would have the gall to remove a clause from a Crown corporation like CBC, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—Radio-Canada, which is a piece of national infrastructure. It is a piece of Canadiana.

Sure, there are a lot of things that should be improved in the broadcast bill. We have heard much debate on it. We probably will hear more before the day is over. But for the minister to propose to take out what I consider to be motherhood just blows me over. The minister indicated that he wants to take out the clause, and I will read it:

> Perhaps the CBC 1968 mandated role "to contribute to the development of national unity and provide for continuing expression of Canadian identity".

The minister found that so objectionable that he had to put a clause in the bill to remove it. He was quoted by the Toronto *Globe and Mail* on September 12, 1990, as saying that he found that 22-year old national unity mandate as intolerable interference because the CBC was maintaining this political valve artificially.

I think that is a bunch of hogwash. We are in a situation in this country because of the activity of this government since 1984, when it assumed power and told the Canadian public that it was fit to govern, that it would create great economic prosperity and wealth across this country, but most of all, that it could keep this country together.

Since 1984 we have seen this government on the front benches opposite not only wreak economic devastation from coast to coast to coast in this country, but to dismantle the—the minister is over there and I would hope that he would listen. He is a member of this government, as is the Minister of Communications.

What this government has done has systematically dismantled the national infrastructure of this country. Every instrument of national unity has been subject to attack, a battering, assault and battery by this government.

I cannot believe the Minister of Communications can sit there and read through his press clippings. No wonder he cannot look most of us in the face. I do not know what he thinks the mandate of the CBC should be. Should the mandate of the CBC be just a commercial endeavour? Should the mandate of the CBC be just to report the news as it is seen in Montreal and in Toronto? Well, I am a Canadian and I happen to come from the east coast of this country and I believe in this country.

**Mr. Lewis:** That's their problem.

**Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth):** The Minister of Transport says that is my problem.

**An hon. member:** That's their problem.

**Mr. MacDonald:** If it is anybody's problem, it is your problem because you guys do not like what you hear most days from this side of the House because you cannot stand to hear the truth the way it is spoken on this side of the House.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth):** I want to get into this thing about the national unity clause. I do not know if the minister really has a firm commitment to national unity in this country. He has under his ministry responsibility for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

He is from the province of Quebec, a province that currently is expressing some great reservations about the merit of staying in this country. It has established a commission of the provincial government to look at options as to whether or not they should stay in this country.

We hear all kinds of talk from the official opposition in Quebec City about sovereignty, or sovereignty association, and one of the main implements and instruments of national unity as mandated by statute is the CBC to promote Canadian unity. At this time in our history when the country is just about to fly apart, the Minister of Communications comes forward and is absolutely determined to remove the mandate of the CBC, one of the few remaining pieces of national infrastructure, threads of national unity. He wants to strip the mandate to promote Canada and understanding between Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I started off by saying that when I grew up my father told me that if it ain't broke, don't fix it. So I cannot quite get it through my head why this minister, when he is coming in with this bill which tampers with a whole lot of things with the Broadcast Act, felt so determined that he had to remove the mandate for national unity. I have read a lot of his statements and statements from people in the broadcast industry.

More important, I have listened to Canadians. I have listened to Canadians in the west, in Ontario, in Quebec, and in Atlantic Canada. Canadians are starting to wonder if this government really wants this country to stay together. Canadians are starting to wonder if ministers like the Minister of Communications really believes that this country is worth saving, really believes that this country can survive, or if what they are doing is trying to adjust the statutes of this country to a reality that they see, a reality of a country that is no longer together. Maybe it is a reality of a country unfortunately split along linguistic lines or geographic lines, but probably linguistic.

I am going to stay here to hear the minister. would like to hear a rousing defence of national unity, a strong federalist speech from this minister, dealing with communications and the role of the CBC and cultural institutions that come under his mandate, and promoting and preserving national unity in this country.

As well I hope everybody who is watching television stays tuned to the debate. I would like to know if this minister has given up on the concept of a strong federal country called Canada or if he has already thrown in the towel and is simply trying to adjust the current legislation on the federal books to reflect his view that there is more than one Canada, that there are two Canadas here.

The motion that has been put forward is one that everybody in this House should support. There comes a time when partisanship in this House has to give way to national good. In this particular case the amendment put forward reinstates into the Broadcasting Act that it be imperative that the CBC promote national unity. That is something that each and every individual in this House, male and female, east, west, central Canadian, French or English, should see as imperative these days when our country is being faced with such tugs and strains to the fabric of unity. I would hope that the ministers would review the program of systematic destruction of the fabric of national unity in this country and see that what this minister has proposed in Bill C–40, particularly this motion which we are debating now, is not only regressive but it is destructive, and see the danger that this particular clause causes and talk to the minister, before he gets up, and tell the minister that we need a speech of unity from him. What we do not need from this minister is more gobbledegook and—

• (1640)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret the hon. member's time has expired.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** I cannot see why you would be so surprised, Mr. Speaker, because this is after all a debate that concerns all Canadians.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rise on this debate and, in particular, speak to the issue about which I think every Canadian should be thinking around this time of the year, Christmastime.

We are probably at a very critical time in the history of our country and we need leadership on a national level to help keep this country together. I happen to believe that as Canadians and, in particular, as parliamentarians too little is being said in this national Canadian Parliament about the values that we share together. One of those values is the capacity to communicate in our two official languages and the capacity to communicate by the instrument that links this country from coast to coast.

One of the reasons that I fear for the future of this country is because Canadians spend too little time communicating and speaking together. How many French Canadians know the names of Barbara Frum and Peter Mansbridge? How many English Canadians know the names of Denise Bombardier and Simon Durivage? If we are going to keep this country together, it is clear that we need instruments like the CBC to promote national unity. Marcel Masse, is that such a dirty word, to promote national unity?

I ask that because the minister has not had the courage to speak in the House to this issue, nor has his Prime Minister. At a time when the very future of this country is at stake, surely we can expect leadership on the national level to address these questions.

Quebecers have a right to ask themselves the question: is there anybody in this country who cares about whether they belong to Canada or not? That is the question that is being asked right now in the Bélanger–Campeau commission. Whatever the outcome of that commission, they are examining their future in a serious, constructive, and complete way. I am sorry to say that the same cannot be said of our Prime Minister and the pathetic effort called the Spicer commission with commissioners working possibly two days a month, maybe two days a week, commissioners who do not have a mandate, and posts that are being left empty, a Prime Minister who is not even prepared to speak publicly to the Bélanger–Campeau commission about the future that Quebec might still have within a country called Canada.

[*Translation*]

And the Minister of Communications stands there, looking unconcerned. That does not concenr him that he is depriving us of one of the instruments of Canadian unity. If he wants to do away with Canada, he should say so. If we still want Canada after Meech, Mr. Speaker, we must be able to communicate with one another and, at least, instruments such as the CBC will ensure we can do jsut that. I am not referring to Clyde Wells's language, which I suggest is not so much a form of communicaton as a form of excommunication. I prefer to have language—

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point to the role of national unity that can be played by instruments like the CBC and Radio–Canada. I am not suggesting that there be journalistic gerrymandering. I worked as a journalist and heaven forbid that the government should tell journalists how to write. When *Le Point* and the CBC, in the weeks leading up to the Meech debate, developed a joint program where they explored the lives and reactions of Canadians, the very different views of the process leading up to the constitutional reform known as Meech Lake, it was clear that programs of that nature finally gave Canadians a chance to see how the other half felt.

How many English Canadians really understand why Quebec feels rejected, why Quebec is prepared, and possibly in the very near future, to give up on the country of Canada? We do not understand it, because even in our pan–Canadian news network called Newsworld we cannot hear the news in French. We can get the nightly news from Japan, but we do not have a French Canadian network through the Newsworld channel in the way that we should have.

[*Translation*]

One third of all Canadians are denied the right to listen to news in their own language. That is absolutely ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. During the Liberal leadership race, the leaders debate, in Montreal, had to be translated back into English to be broadcasted in the province of Quebec. You call that national broadcasting? That is ridiculous! Instead of using this bill to strenghten our means of communications, the minister is using it to deprive us of one of the last instruments at our disposal to precisely touch the hearts of the Canadian people and more particularly in these times that of the people of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only the issue of the Canadian unity clause, but also the fact that the minister is not prepared to protect Radio Canada International, nor to specifically mention the parliamentary channel.

[*English*]

It is not only the issue related to the national unity objectives of the CBC, but also the fact that the Minister of Communications is not prepared to outline in law a mandate for the parliamentary channel. Surely, if there is one way that we are going to keep this country talking together, it is by virtue of channels like this parliamentary channel that permits Canadians from coast to coast to hear the laws of the land in both official languages.

Not only is the Minister of Communications giving up on Canadian unity, throwing in the towel on the capacity of Radio–Canada to act as an instrument of national unity, but he is further cutting back on Canada's view internationally by refusing to reinforce the role of Radio Canada International.

We know that there are cuts and that the other shoe is about to drop. We will see fewer and fewer Canadian messages being sent out to the world. Neither is he prepared to protect the parliamentary channel. Northern Services also was a portion of the CBC that should be protected by legislation, and he is unprepared to act.

If there is one thing that we are going to be able to do, it is going to be by communicating through the mass media. I hate to say it but Marshall McLuhan was right: the medium is the message. The medium that is the message of a very power nature today is the medium of television. It is clear that both radio and television in the CBC have a very important role to play in educating and teaching Canadians about one another.

[*Translation*]

And the role the CBC plays, Mr. Speaker, as a link between the people in Western Canada and in Eastern Canada, is a capital one that should be mentionned in the bill. I do not understand why the minister refuses to answer. Maybe he is too busy with his own cable tax which will cost millions of dollars to the people of Quebec, whose language he did not protect. He did not protect the French language when he imposed the same base tax rate to the people who never watch English

television. The minister, who talks so much of protection, missed the point in his own bill.

[*English*]

I am pleading with the minister to reconsider his position, to re-assert the capacity of the CBC to act as an instrument of national unity, and to make sure that the mandate of the CBC includes the notion of embracing not only our two cultural and linguistic groups that founded this country but also the one-third of Canadians who claim neither English nor French as their mother tongue. That must continue to be the respected and deserved mandate of the CBC.

• (1650)

[*Translation*]

I hope that, if he wants to have a say about the future of Canada, the minister is at least prepared to safeguard our means of communicating with one another in both official languages.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret the hon. member's time has expired. We can give her extra time if we have unanimous consent?

**An hon. member:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** We do not have unanimous consent.

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Mr. Speaker, it is not that I do not enjoy hearing the hon. member for Hamilton East, but our time this afternoon is running very short and I want to have an opportunity to speak to Bill C-40 and the amendment before us today put forward by the hon. member for Mount Royal concerning reinstating the mandate of CBC to have a national unity role. In fact, Motion No. 17 indicates that the CBC should contribute to national unity, shared national consciousness, and identity.

The fact that we are debating this issue in this year, 1990, is really remarkable. It is simply unbelievable that any government, especially this government, would be bringing forward this Bill C-40 which would take away the responsibility of the CBC to play a national unity role.

In my opinion the CBC has a unique position in this country. We have the ability of CBC radio and television, but especially radio, to nip into every community right across this country, whether it is the outports of Newfoundland or the forestry communities of British Columbia or on the prairies or in Ontario or whatever. CBC radio has a special role and ability, whether it is *This Country in the Mornings* or the *Gzowski Show*, whether it is *Cross Country Check-Up* on Sunday afternoon, whether it is the *As It Happens* program at 6.30 in the evening, or a number of newscasts. There is practically no other instrument that knits this country together the way that CBC radio and CBC television do.

To take away this mandate of national unity from the CBC is really remarkable at a time when we have separatists sitting in the House of Commons, after going through the Meech Lake fiasco and after seeing a government that carries with it something like 14 per cent or 15 per cent support in the national public opinion polls.

It is incredible, when we have the Bélanger-Campeau Commission looking at what role Quebec will play in the future of Canada, when similar commissions are being set up by other provinces and now that the Prime Minister has established the Citizens' Forum on the Future of Canada, that this government would be removing national unity as one of the mandates of the CBC. This is unbelievable. I would certainly hope that the Minister of Communications would agree. Regardless of what his previous thoughts were about Canada or even what they are now, surely the Prime Minister should put his foot down.

I was appalled and surprised today, when the former Conservative member from Nova Scotia put a question to the Prime Minister on whether he or the senior minister in his cabinet responsible for federal-provincial relations was going to make a presentation before the Bélanger-Campeau Commission, that the Prime Minister looked dumbfounded. When a commission in Quebec is looking at the role of Quebec in the future of this country, surely the Prime Minister should go before that commission and put before it the federalist national view of this government with regard to unity, to a federal role for the Government of Canada, and to a national unity scheme to ensure that Quebec plays a vital role and that we are a united country.

I could not believe that he had no response. He fobbed it off by saying that there was a member from the caucus on the commission. It simply makes one wonder where this government really stands when it comes to national unity. I hope that the members of the Tory caucus will vote with their heads, their minds, their conscience, and their heart for Canada.

Surely this country and what it has done for each and every one of us is far more important than the Tory Party, the Liberal Party, the NDP, or any other party in this country. I would hope that the Tory members would vote with their conscience and with their hearts for Canada when this resolution comes before them sometime next week.

I want to speak as well about the unique role that I see for the CBC in this country, not only in national unity but in informing us of what is going on. Not very often do I have the opportunity to listen to programs like *This Country in the Morning*, but sometimes in the summertime and at times when the House is not sitting I do. It seems to me that it gives us a unique capsule of the problems of various parts of the country, what the people are thinking, and what the issues are. Private radio and television cannot do that. It is not something that can be done easily, but CBC radio has a unique capacity.

People who are posted abroad in Latin America, or I suppose in the Persian Gulf, and certainly our Armed Forces in Lahr and Baden-Baden in Germany tell me that being able to receive CBC Radio Canada International keeps them in touch with a feeling for not only their section of the country they come from but for the entire country.

I believe that CBC radio has a very special mandate to bind the country together in that way, to keep us informed and to keep us feeling concerned about our fellow citizens. Likewise, in regions of the country such as northern Ontario, which represents 88 per cent of the land mass, we have two broadcasting studios: one in Sudbury and one in Thunder Bay.

Surprisingly CBC radio, which has covered most of northern Ontario only for the past few years, does a tremendous job of keeping us informed even in the regions. The area is so vast that its role is really very well carried out. It keeps us advised. If you live in Sudbury you do not hear much about Sault Ste. Marie except through CBC radio; likewise across the entire north. I think CBC radio does a tremendous service.

Another area I want to touch on relates to the cuts in CBC. This government, in its wisdom or lack of wisdom, has cut CBC's budget by some $240 million since 1984. This is really shameful when we look at its national unity role, the role to inform Canadians. CBC radio has a special role for one area of our country which is perhaps more important than any other, and that is its role in rural Canada.

Rural Canada is suffering in every sector of the country, but in no area of public life does CBC play a more important role than in agriculture because it is so diverse. We do not have one country when it comes to agriculture; we have about five. One important role that CBC Radio has carried through the years was the agriculture and resources representative on Parliament Hill.

It was done for many years by George Price. It was a terribly ungracious way that CBC advised him that he was not only being retired, but that his position was being dumped.

The agriculture committee of the House of Commons fought that decision. We got some commitments that the service would be continued. It has not. The government has failed—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret that the hon. member's time has expired.

[*Translation*]

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—MOTIONS

[*English*]

### THE ENVIRONMENT

#### PROTECTION FOR WHISTLE BLOWERS

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider providing legislated protection to all environmental "whistle-blowers".

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity today to speak on M-149, which is a motion

in my name, asking that the House and the government consider providing legislative protection for whistle blowing.

For many who are listening and watching, they probably do not know what such a motion is about. I would hope after I have covered the waterfront for 20 minutes, they will have a better idea of why it is so important that this Parliament and this country have whistle blowing legislation.

It is just as important as access to information or as having an environmental auditor. Without whistle blowing legislation, we will continue to see an awful lot of environmental offences continue without being reported to the appropriate authorities or being made public.

The intention of whistle blowing legislation is to protect the whistle blower, those who either phone the RCMP, Environment Canada or a local newspaper, or who make an environmental problem public.

It is to protect the environment and taxpayers from crime, losses from crime, criminal activity, and illegal and improper activities related to the environment. It is desperately needed not only to protect those workers, both public and private sector, but it is needed to protect the environment.

Many people fear job loss should they blow the whistle on their employer. They fear pay cuts, law suits, harassment and intimidation for reporting either on their industry or employer, even if they are just a member of the general public reporting on an environmental problem that they see occurring in, around or near their community.

The purpose of the legislation would be to encourage those who witness or are aware of illegal activity that significantly impairs the environment to report it and make it public. I am glad to see the minister of health listening to this most interesting debate, because he would know that within the medical and health field, whistle blowing is practically built within the system.

If there are problems with drugs or a certain kind of health care, the whistle is blown on them internally within the medical or health care system so that those problems can be dealt with quickly prior to the health or welfare of individuals who might be in the hospital or in the health care system being negatively impacted.

However, in the years that I have served in this House, I have witnessed many public and private sector whistle blowers who had been singled out and punished. I suppose more members of the opposition receive brown envelopes than do government members. Quite often, I find members of the opposition, including myself, know of things before some ministers do. That seems to be the nature of some kinds of negative policy decisions, that the opposition is made aware of them quickly, before they can be implemented.

Those who are punished, particularly those where there is a negative political impact or where the corporate masters are embarrassed or forced to clean up, quite often the political or corporate master will take some kind of singling out or punishment against those who have reported.

I have attended many meetings with trade unionists in recent months and years. For example just two weeks ago I attended the Canadian Labour Congress environment conference in Edmonton where there was extensive consideration for the need for whistle blowing legislation. Workers who witnessed, for example, spills at pulp mills, either intentional or accidental, at nuclear facilities, whether it was intention or accidental, or at other industrial sites, have found that many of their co-workers from the shop floor who have reported illegal activities that they have seen, or accidents that could endanger the environment, are singled out or red circled, or other kinds of punitive action are taken against them by their employers. There is a widespread fear for an individual's job when he or she reports on offences. Despite that, many trade unions are setting up special committees that go ahead and whistle blow anyway.

Offences that are criminal, for example, where the teller in a bank reports on a robbery, generally the manager or someone else within the banking system lauds that kind of whistle blowing. Quite often they are given a raise in pay and are seen as heroes in the community. The recent wave of white collar crime that we have seen both here and in the United States indicates how much stronger the whistle blowing legislation hotline tip system needs to be if we are to root out the degree of white collar crime that has been unleashed upon us within financial institutions and in other areas of our society.

Whistle blowing legislation is necessary to turn around the prevailing fear of punishment in order to make whistle blowing a right and respected duty. In some cases, it should provide for fine splitting, something we find in some areas of federal legislation already. There needs to be that kind of encouragement in areas where there are particularly nasty forms of environmental degradation going on. Where the courts ultimately bring a fine against those who have been perpetrating the offence, the fine should be split with those who have been involved with blowing the whistle.

Whistle blowing legislation is necessary to halt environmental degradation. I recall the former Liberal Minister of the Environment in this province of Ontario who, after there had been 13 spills in a one-week period on the St. Clair River, described that as industrial incontinence but did not proceed to lay charges or to levy the kinds of fines that would be necessary to stop that kind of industrial incontinence.

I recall the former federal Minister of the Environment telling me that some 80 per cent of the toxic and hazardous waste produced on a daily basis in this country is improperly or illegally disposed of. It is dumped in rivers, dumped in sewers, dumped on farmers fields and it requires whistle blowing legislation to start getting these kinds of activities reported so that kind of future problem can be disposed of before it occurs. I see the minister of forests is here. He is a big supporter of whistle blowing legislation. I hope he takes it to cabinet this week and we see it back here fairly soon.

In the forestry sector, we need some whistle blowing, mostly whistle blowing about what the minister is not doing. I recall that Dr. Rankin from the University of Victoria Law School did an assessment and an evaluation of class one and class two waste management permits in British Columbia last year. He found that fully, three-quarters of the waste management permits in some areas of the province in some categories had been in significant non-compliance for more than a year.

At the federal level, we found from the Auditor General that there has been a 240 per cent increase in non-compliance among mining companies, as an example, since the Conservatives came to office. I do not think the government understands how strongly Canadians feel about protecting the environment and stopping that kind of improper use of our environment.

The Auditor General found that most of the mines audited in this country were non-compliance with the federal legislation that they were operating under. The majority of the mines or workers at all or most of these sites know that there is improper activity going on. The drivers of the trucks that are hauling and dumping toxic waste out into some farmer's field in British Columbia or in Prince Edward Island tonight know what they are doing. The environment is being destroyed in many areas of Canada by what is described as insignificant increment; a spill here, a dump there, a fire here, some radiation there, an oil spill here and some acid mine drainage there. Whistle blowers legislation to encourage and protect workers and citizens for reporting environmental accidents and hazards is a fundamental piece of legislation that must be passed by this House.

It is federal policy within the NDP. It is the only party that has the kind of process to set policy prior to getting into government. I certainly hope and expect that we will have a chance to perhaps bring in this kind of legislation. If the Green Plan had any real guts—I suppose we may not see the Green Plan now in 1990 according to the latest rumours around here—but if it had any real guts, whistle blowing legislation would be a centrepiece, just as an environmental auditor general would be a centrepiece, and major amendments to access to information and environmental liaison centres would be similar centrepieces in the legislation.

• (1710)

The chances are low. The reason I say that is we can measure it under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, which is the direct responsibility of the present Minister of the Environment. The Auditor General found that since the legislation became law more than two years ago, there have only been three prosecutions in the whole of Canada, three prosecutions and three convictions under the most important and broadest based environmental legislation in the whole country. The prevailing philosophy of this government in a big business is that the environment is free, and one externalizes waste to increase one's profit.

There is no Green Plan either coming or existing under the Tories in my view. What we are seeing is an environmental and ecological brown-out. We are seeing immunity from prosecution, Order in Council exemptions for special friends, such as the Alcan Kemano II project in British Columbia, special laws on liability, such as the ones put in place for the Atomic Energy Control Board. Let me give a direct example on the government's mythical war on pollution and protection of the environment.

There was a discretionary immunity memo leaked some time ago that I made public. We know now that fisheries contamination from industrial pollution and toxins from B.C. pulp mills is far worse than ever expected. On the front page of today's *Vancouver Sun* the headline is, "Six mill areas cited. Dioxins spark expanded bans". We see that areas as much as five times the size of the area already closed have been restricted. Affected are the waters around the Fletcher Challenge's Crofton mill near Duncan, the Fletcher Challenge mill near Campbell River, the MacMillan Bloedel mill at Power River on the Sunshine Coast, the MacMillan Bloedel mill near Nanaimo, the Canadian Forest Products mill near Gold River and the Eurocan mill near Kitimat.

Already 1 per cent of the fisheries in British Columbia are closed because of environmental pollution from pulp mills. That is shellfish, it is crab, prawn, shrimps and now it is starting to move into the fish populations. It is truly incredible. The question of compensation for fishermen has not been addressed. The prosecution of companies and agencies involved has not been addressed. The matter of ruined native fisheries has not been addressed and matter of public health has not been addressed.

The only reason the government finally acted on November 23, 1989 was because a former federal public servant by the name of Otto Langer wrote a memo of November 15, 1989 which outlined the inconsistent application of the Fisheries Act, which was leaked to the press, embarrassed the government into taking some action, band-aid actions, after the fact actions, too little too late action, but with whistle blowing legislation the public would not have to wait for a situation to reach crisis proportions economically, ecologically and environmentally and then hope that someone leaks the information to trigger a response.

On the inconsistent application of the Fisheries Act as a case in point, I am not talking about a rare isolated example. What Mr. Langer revealed is that the issue is one of continuous non-compliance, for example, involving 19 years of the Department of the Environment environmental protection never charging anyone despite the knowledge that the pulp mills were totally out of compliance with the pulp and paper effluent regulations. It is an issue of chronic non-compliance. "Senior management and conservative legal opinion has recently created new classes of immunity for certain polluters or those that destroy habitat". This led to examples of abandoning court cases when clear "others beyond our influence did not want the trials to continue". In other words, forget prosecuting the big polluters.

The leaked memo continues on the top of page 4 and I quote again:

> The impact of creating the above classes of immunity have far reaching consequences for the morale of our staff and ultimately the future of the fishery resource and associated environment—A continuation of this philosophy will result in a wholesale loss of fish habitat and a continued degradation of water quality.

If repeated violators are not being dealt with, what kind of an environment are we going to be left with? Just yesterday in *The Toronto Star* there was a very good article called "The Mythical War on Pollution" which said the following:

> —since 1970, Ottawa's enforcement of federal environmental laws has ranged from timid to non-existent.
>
> The evidence of that 20-year regulatory failure is overwhelming. Internal Environment Canada reports and memos confirm that many of Canada's worst polluters in 1970 are still the worst today.
>
> Among the most notorious are Canada's pulp and paper mills. Almost half are still breaking the Fisheries Act regulations each day they operate.

I am blowing the whistle today but is the minister of fisheries going to go out and charge any of these hundreds of polluters who are violating federal law? Well, we will find out tomorrow morning but you and I both know the answer, Mr. Speaker. This government is granting immunity to prosecution to hundreds of corporations in this country who are breaking the law at this very moment.

The article goes on:

> From 1985 through 1988, the average Fisheries Act fine was $4,100. Only 56 convictions were registered during those 48 months and a minority of the prosecutions were initiated by Environment Canada. What happened to the public policy?

The paper goes on to conclude that there is an interim immunity from prosecution.

> Each secret deal Ottawa made with these companies triggered demands from competitors that they get the same break.
>
> This pattern is reflected in a Statistics Canada analysis of capital expenditures by Canadian manufacturers between 1985 and 1989. Of a total capital investment of $25 billion, 96 per cent was spent on expansion and modernization. A mere 2 per cent was spent directly on pollution abatement and most of that money was federal and provincial anti-pollution grants.

That is a pretty telling story about what is going on and what is not going on.

Let us look now for a moment at what the Auditor General has found. I think I can demonstrate why workers want it, why the public wants it, why the environment deserves it, why federal public servants need it, and why we need to stop companies from breaking the law.

In 1984 and 1985 he looked at 13 departments and in 1985 he reported it to the President of the Treasury Board. In February, 1987, the President of the Treasury Board sent out a policy circular called "Losses of Money Suffered by Her Majesty and Offences and other Illegal Acts against the Crown".

In 1988 the Auditor General took another look and this is what he said that most of the six departments examined had not established the procedures required by Treasury Board for reporting all suspected cases of fraud and other offences to the RCMP, the deputy attorney general and the Treasury Board and for reporting all proven cases to Parliament.

I quote from section 19.10:

> We are concerned about the tendency by some departments to not always report cases to the RCMP.

Well, what is going on, Mr. Speaker? Illegal activity is found in 13 departments by the Auditor General. He goes to the President of the Treasury Board, who then circulates it. Five years later the Auditor General goes back and looks at half those departments again and finds the illegal activity is still going on and it is not being reported to the RCMP.

Obviously we need whistle-blowing legislation. My colleagues in British Columbia have introduced a bill to protect no-pollution informants. It is Bill M 208.

Let us take a look at the evidence of the Auditor General again when he appeared on December 12 of last year before the public accounts committee in his discussions about the need for a hot line. On the hotline idea, he said: "The first principle it needs to clear is that the government bears the primary responsibility for preventing and detecting waste, mismanagement, and fraud in government, not my office".

That is the auditor general. He said they audited the government's fraud reporting practices in 1984. "We reported serious deficiencies. Departments continue to express concerns that individuals would be reluctant to report for fear of reprisal".

Mr. Speaker, my legislation is a proposed way to protect those individuals who fear reprisals for reporting to the RCMP. I go on and quote:

> The absence of reports of significant frauds in the Canadian government raises another question. Is it the case that fewer frauds are detected and reported in Canada, or is there actually a lower level of malfeasance in the Canadian government.
>
> One of the objectives of the hotline is to provide a more effective line of defence against fraud and to provide information to answer the question of extent of fraud against the government.
>
> This is an important question and needs to be discussed. Most frauds are, in general, not discovered by audits but rather by tips or by accident. We receive many brown envelopes. Most are anonymous. It takes tremendous courage to report serious wrongdoing. I believe that such people should be protected and assisted. We cannot expect people to come forward when they are subject not only to possible reprisal from powerful institutions but to derision as a tattle-tale. The hotline procedure we propose would fully protect such people, by not taking their names and by conducting audits in such a manner that they would not be identified.
>
> Even if a hotline is not established, the question of adequate protection of whistle-blowers remains. There are clearly doubts as to whether the existing protections are adequate. Perhaps specific legislation protecting the identity of callers is needed.

• (1720)

This is precisely it, Mr. Speaker. The Auditor General has identified it throughout the Government of Canada and I have identified it in every environmental department in the country. Corporations are wildly in violation of the law, from coast to coast. The environment is the big loser and health is the big loser. The fishing grounds in British Columbia have just been closed again today,

with encirclements five times the size they were at the last closure.

Let me conclude with a couple of other remarks of the Auditor General, and I quote from his evidence before the committee:

> The United States has an extensive system of hotlines—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret the hon. member's time has expired.

**Mr. Ken Hughes (Macleod):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate and to follow my esteemed colleague, the hon. member for Skeena, who has once again given evidence as to why he has a widely recognized expertise in chronic effluent. I am pleased to speak on this motion, proposed by the member for Skeena. The motion states:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider providing legislated protection to all environmental "whistle-blowers".

I would like to start by reminding my hon. colleagues that the government has, in fact, seen fit to provide such protection under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. The matter was discussed before this House. Members of the committee that was struck to carry out the clause-by-clause review of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, then known as Bill C-74, heard submissions and arguments both for and against this point. It is obviously an issue about which there are different points of view, and there was debate before the committee. There was also debate on other clauses of the bill designed to encourage public participation in enforcement of federal environmental statutes.

For example, the clause which gave the right to individuals to oblige the minister to investigate alleged violations of the act did, in fact, give rise to considerable debate for and against the question. Some briefs showed a fear of increased public participation. They were against giving individuals the right to require the Minister of the Environment to investigate alleged offences under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act as well as the right to receive a report of the investigation.

Some briefs did not support whistle blower protection and others wanted such protection, across the board, for every offence under the proposed act. Some of those who opposed further public participation in the implementation and enforcement of federal environmental law believed that the government was running the risk of creating a highly politicized climate of confrontation which, in fact, could jeopardize the pursuit of environmental objectives. Others saw the public participation and public rights sections of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act as devices for ensuring the public's help in enforcement and for reinforcing the public's belief that the government was committed to protecting the environment.

The House of Commons, doing clause-by-clause review of Bill C-74, decided to promote further public participation. This review reduced the number of individuals who may require the Minister of the Environment to investigate alleged offences against the proposed Canadian Environmental Protection Act from 12 down to two. Section 108, Section 109, and Section 110 of the act outline the requirements.

> 108. (1) Any two persons resident in Canada who are not less than 18 years of age and who are of the opinion that an offence has been committed under this act may apply to the minister for an investigation of the alleged offence.
>
> (2) An application for an investigation shall be accompanied by a solemn or statutory declaration.
>
> A) Stating the names and addresses of the applicants;
>
> B) Stating the nature of the alleged offence and the name of each person alleged to be involved in its commission; and
>
> C) Containing a concise statement of the evidence supporting the allegations of the applicants.

Section 109 goes on to continue to spell out these requirements:

> 109. (1) On receipt of an application under Section 108, the minister shall acknowledge receipt of the application and investigate all matters that the minister considers necessary for a determination of the facts relating to the alleged offence.

Clearly this is designed to ensure that the minister has in his or her hands all of the facts relating to the case. It continues:

> (2) Within ninety days after receiving an application under Section 108, the minister shall report to the applicants on the progress of the investigation and the action, if any, that the minister proposes to take.

(3) The minister may discontinue an investigation where the minister is of the opinion that the alleged offence does not require further investigation.

(4) Where an investigation is discontinued, the minister shall

A) Prepare a report in writing describing the information obtained during the investigation and stating the reasons for its discontinuation; and

B) Send a copy of the report to the applicants and to any person whose conduct was investigated.

110. At any stage of an investigation under Section 109, the minister may, in addition to or in lieu of continuing the investigation, send any records, returns or evidence to the Attorney General of Canada for consideration of whether an offence has been or is about to be committed against this act and for such action as the Attorney General of Canada may wish to take.

In addition, it also decided in favour of experimental so–called whistle blower protection. The committee limited the right of individuals to request anonymity solely when they report the unauthorized release of a regulated substance under Part II of the act governing toxic substances, or a release of regulated emissions, effluents and wastes under Part IV of the act governing federal departments, agencies, commissions, boards, works, undertakings, as well as federal lands and federal Crown corporations.

Accordingly, in Part II of the act governing toxic substances, section 37 requires that an individual who has knowledge of an authorized release or of the likelihood of an unauthorized release must report this information to a designated inspector or to any other person designated by regulation as empowered to receive the report.

That section also provides for voluntary reports from individuals who are not required under law to transmit their information but who in the interests of environmental protection may choose to do so. A person not required to report may request that his or her identity remain confidential. Once an individual makes this request, no person may release or cause to be released the identity of the informant or any information or detail likely to reveal that identity. I quote:

37. (1) Where a person has knowledge of the occurrence or reasonable likelihood of a release into the environment of a substance specified in the list of toxic substances in Schedule I, but the person is not required to report the matter under this act, the person may report any information relating to the release or likely release to an inspector or to any person to whom a report may be made under Section 36.

I believe that my time is close to expiring. I will simply wrap up by saying that I am sure over time the government will consider many types of measures. One of those might be the extension of whistle blower provisions. If this is studied, I am sure the government will find the most appropriate way of using such protection, keeping in mind, of course, the rights of the accused and other important factors.

• (1730)

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak out in favour of this motion. Canadians are becoming increasingly serious about their responsibility for the environment, both as individuals and as employees.

[*English*]

If we truly want to create a system where every individual can be a guardian of the environment, the kind of legislation proposed in the motion is absolutely essential. Individuals want to take responsibility in the workplace as well as in their personal lives. Fortunately, more and more businesses are also recognizing the importance of being guardians of the environment and are recognizing that doing things in an environmentally friendly way also makes good sense economically and for their increased productivity and efficiency as businesses.

Others are putting their heads in the sand, pretending that this concern about the environment is a new thing and it is going to go away, if only they ignore it. Sooner or later, the world will get back to more important things and leave them alone to pollute our air, water and soil.

However, that is not what is going to happen because people are fundamentally realizing that the environmental problems they face now are a question of their own personal health and safety, that if we do not act urgently on such problems as ozone depletion and global warming, we will not have air to breathe and we will not have clean water to drink, and that the time horizon for that is sooner, rather than later. So people do want to take their individual responsibility very seriously.

They know that in their place of work perhaps effluents are being put into rivers, lakes and oceans, damaging the ability of life on earth to survive in the future. They know that chemicals are being used and not disposed of safely. They know that their own personal health and safety as employees is at risk in their

workplace. They want to protect that, but just as important, they want to protect the environment that they are going to leave to their children.

The hon. member opposite who was speaking quoted the provisions in the current legislation. One of the things I noticed is that it obliges reporting on behalf of individuals who are aware of existing pollution or potential pollution, but it provides no protection.

It is much more than a question of simply keeping confidential the identity of an individual who has made a complaint or made a report. It requires a very positive legislative provision which protects that individual from retaliation, and gives them a complete mechanism if they have been retaliated against. That ensures that they, in their interest to do a public duty in protecting the environment by lodging a complaint, will not suffer the loss of their job, lose employment opportunities or suffer the retribution and wrath of their employer.

We have to take this motion seriously because the ability of government to enforce environmental legislation is limited by the resources available, by the number of people who can be hired by a government at any particular time to go into virtually every small factory, shop and plant in this country, and determine how environmentally sound their practices are. I do not think any of us want to see a situation where only through an army of inspectors and enforcers can we achieve a cleaner and safer world.

The cost of that would be horrendous. But the cost of not dealing with this problem is also horrendous. I go back to one particular experience when I was on municipal council. It had to do with a very small amount of copper sulphate spread on the parking lot of a high technology company in the west end of this region. That is a standard way of disposing of some chemicals for some companies. It leaked into the water and literally put out of commission for many days the sewage treatment plant so that for close to a week raw sewage was going into the Ottawa River, simply because of one careless act by one careless business, and at a public cost for those few days of $3 million dollars to put that sewage treatment plant back into condition.

If we want to avoid these things without a massive bureaucracy that will go into every workplace across Canada, the best way to do it is to give the people working in those plants with those employers the ability to draw attention to problems that occur so that they can be dealt with and solved before they create this kind of horrendous damage and public expense.

Many employers are starting to realize this and are putting into place a mechanism whereby their employees are free to bring these problems or suggestions to the attention of management or suggestions as to how they could use less resources to dispose of waste more safely and generally create a more environmentally friendly workplace and a more environmentally friendly corporate citizen. However, many other companies are not doing that. Employees who dared to make a report or to talk to a senior manager about damaging practices would lose their job and benefits very quickly. People are not prepared to fulfil their social responsibility if that is the cost. If it is a social responsibility, it is a social obligation to protect them when they fulfil that duty.

I have seen what happens to people when they come forward and complain of wrongdoing in their place of employment, whether it is theft by other employees or whether it is fairly rampant fraud within an employment situation. Despite the best will at the political level to protect them and to protect their jobs once they return to their work unit, other forces take over and it becomes impossible to protect them, except through legislation.

We see this happen when there are complaints, even in the Public Service, possibly and particularly in the Public Service when there are complaints of violations of human rights or complaints of harassment. We still have not put in place a system whereby somebody can make that kind of complaint against systemic discrimination and have it dealt with without suffering the consequences of having made a complaint.

I have known and I continue to hear from people who are without a job because they dared to complain against their employer. I met with one as recently as this morning. I have met with people who have taken up to 10 years to get justice against a complaint of harassment, sexual, racial or religious.

We cannot allow that to happen in the environmental area. We cannot allow people who are trying to carry out a responsibility to society and to the future of the world to be punished for it.

Within the Public Service generally there has been a call for a long time for whistle blowing and, as my hon. colleague who introduced the motion said, the support of the Auditor General is very strong for a system that would allow employees to bring to the attention of management, or of politicians, complaints about theft from government, fraud in government, complaints about anything that is not being done according to government policy and is being done to the detriment of the public. I think that is good legislation.

We want to create responsible, independent thinkers in our public service and in the private sector, but in our public service particularly because we are the largest employer in the country. We want to make it not only a right but a responsibility of every employee to take their environmental responsibility seriously without fear of retaliation.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret the hon. member's time has expired.

• (1740 )

**Mrs. Dorothy Dobbie (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, the motion proposed by my colleague, "That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider providing legislated protection to all environmental 'whistle-blowers'," is a most interesting proposition.

I am very pleased to make some comments on this matter. Whistle blower protection provisions to protect the identity of informants of suspected or apparent violations are fairly new in federal legislation. At least three federal statutes provide limited protection to individuals who bring complaints or participate in proceedings or other enforcement activities. These are the Labour Code, the Canadian Human Rights Act and the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

In the Canada Labour Code, employees are protected from employers engaging in unfair practices such as harassment, firing or suspension when employees exercise their rights under the code. For example, to lay a complaint, disclose information about employer violations of the code, or testifying or otherwise participating in proceedings under the code. If the Canada Labour Code board judges that unfair practices have indeed taken place, the board can make corrective orders or direct that compensation be paid. The protection is limited, however, to employers' unfair practices and does not extend to concealing the employer's identity at his or her request.

One section of the labour code that does allow an employer's identity to remain undisclosed is clause 146 (4) of the code. It provides that a person who provides information to a safety officer in relation to inspections will have his or her identity concealed. Disclosure is not compellable before any court or other tribunal. Violations of section 146 are punishable on summary conviction.

I quote clause 146.(4):

> No person to whom information obtained pursuant to section 144 is communicated in confidence
>
> a) shall divulge the name of the informant to any person, except for the purposes of this part; or
>
> b) in competent or compellable to divulge the name of the informant before any court or other tribunal.

There is additional protection as well. The Canadian Human Rights Act, for example, provides in section 59 that no person shall threaten, intimidate or discriminate against an individual because he or she made a complaint, gave evidence or assisted in any way in a proceeding under the act. The penalty for contravention of this section by an employer is a fine of up to $50,000, and for any other party, a fine of up to $5,000.

Again, I quote from section 59 of the act:

> No person shall threaten, intimidate or discriminate against an individual because that individual has made a complaint or given evidence or assisted in any way in respect of the initiation or prosecution of a complaint or other proceeding under this part, or because that individual proposes to do so.

Also, there is the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. It is unique among federal environmental statutes in that it provides the right to request anonymity for those who provide information to enforcement authorities in certain situation. These circumstances are limited to reports of an unauthorized release or of a likely release of a toxic substance to the environment, where the individual is not legally bound by the statute to make a report and does so voluntarily.

There are similar provisions for persons reporting unauthorized releases of effluents, emissions or wastes by federal departments, boards, commissions, agencies, federal Crown corporations and federal works or undertakings on federal lands. If the informant is an employee of the federal entity, there is an added benefit. The employee making the report cannot be disciplined, dismissed or harassed for having done so.

More specifically, subsections 37 (2) and (3) and 58 (2) and (3), provide that there a person making such a report requests to remain anonymous, his or her identity shall not be released unless he or she authorizes the release in writing. Subsections 37 (4) and 58 (4) provide that no employee shall be disciplined, dismissed or harassed for making a report to a CEPA inspector.

It is fair to say that most managers would certainly prefer to learn about a release of a toxic substance at their facility from an employee rather than from a visiting CEPA inspector. For this reason, managers are advised to encourage their staff to report to them any release or suspected release or conditions that are likely to result in release.

The government is satisfied with the operation of these existing provisions. While extending the current protection to all environmental whistle blowers may seem attractive in some cases, there are important considerations to ponder.

For example, when my colleague refers to protection for all environmental whistle blowers in his motion, I wonder if he means all informants who report alleged environmental offences. Under the Constitution Act, 1982, the provinces have exclusive jurisdiction over local works and undertakings, except for navigation, railways, canals, telecommunication companies, broadcasters, banks, aircraft, airports, commercial air services, interprovincial ferries, trucking and other transport. All other works come under provincial jurisdiction. This is repeated in the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

Since provinces have jurisdiction, it is provincial law which governs the right of employees in the work place. We have a practical problem here, because to legislate this protection for matters that are dealt with in provincial law would require intensive study by the Department of Justice to determine even if such a thing was constitutionally possible.

In addition, decisions of Canada's high courts are tending to erode some of the previous traditional claims to protection of personal identity made by informants of criminal offences. The courts must weigh the right of the accused to face his or her accuser against the benefits of receiving tips or other evidence of criminal offences that enforcement agencies may not otherwise have been able to receive.

While more than one community has pointed to the success afforded by Crime Stoppers or other programs where informants are paid for information leading to successful convictions and guaranteed that their identity will be protected, it is true that a person who reports a Criminal Code offence under the Crime Stoppers program still has no legislated protection under that program against harassment or loss of employment, if he or she has made a complaint against an employer or against a fellow worker.

There appears to be a growing trend, however, in other jurisdictions such as British Columbia and the United States to look more extensively at whistle blower protection, but there are problems with this. In their paper for the recent book, *Law Reform for Sustainable Development in British Columbia*, two lawyers published a short discussion of the problem of whistle blower protection in British Columbia for reports of suspected or apparent environmental violations. They defined whistle blowers as employees who disclose employer violations of environmental laws to their management, union, government, or the media.

The authors of this paper note that given current resources for law enforcement employees can be an adjunct of enforcement, but it is important to note that this can happen only if they report offences without jeopardizing their livelihood. The authors do not deal, however, with the protection of identity but with legislative provisions that would protect any employee's entitlement to his or her job. There is also the argument that there is a possibility of whistle blowing legislation being used as a means to harass employers by disgruntled employees.

Whistle blower provisions in statutes of various provinces seem to lean more toward job protection than protection of an informant's identity. The statutes of other countries such as the United States and court decisions related to the interpretation of these statutes

are interesting. We must study all these things very carefully and very soberly.

We would certainly agree that my colleague has brought to the government some food for future thought.

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, I understand that you are very attentive on this matter of whistle blowing, because I know that when you played for the Edmonton Eskimos, immediately the whistle blew, you relaxed and stopped tackling.

• (1750 )

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I must say, since the hon. member raised the topic, that we did win a few games then. In fact we won a few Grey Cups then too.

**Mr. Waddell:** You are quite right, Mr. Speaker. The Eskimos have need of you. I will not speak for Mr. Don Getty. He can speak for himself.

**An hon. member:** He may have been hit a few too many times.

**Mr. Waddell:** "He may have been hit a few too many times", my colleague says, but not you, Mr. Speaker.

Anyway, I want to address whistle blowing. I heard the parliamentary secretary speak. I thought she was nit-picking a bit. This is not a radical motion. The member for Skeena, as I understand it, has phrased the motion so that the government can consider providing—that is not acting on it tomorrow—whistle blowing legislation. He is trying to push the government along in this matter. The parliamentary secretary admitted, did she not, that there are some precedents for this sort of legislation.

As the member for Skeena pointed out, the environment is the No. 1 issue in Canada. It is crucial that we protect and save the great Canadian environment. We have an environment crisis in Canada and in the world. We have to do something about it. Ask high school students in this country, and they will tell you that right out front. They will even say to the member for Skeena: "You are not radical enough. Get moving on this matter".

I point out too that the parliamentary secretary brings forth that old chestnut in Canada: "It is our Constitution. Maybe it is a provincial matter". I can just hear them in the provincial House if they brought forth similar legislation: "Well, that is a federal matter". It falls through the cracks.

We have to look at the environment differently. We cannot regionalize it or provincialize it. It really is a national matter, indeed an international matter. The member for Chambly, our member from Quebec, who likes to talk about Quebec having a lot of control over constitutional matters has always said consistently that he thought environment should be a national matter. Let us approach it as if it were a national matter and deal it with it that way.

The member for Skeena, in his motion, wants the government to consider legislation for protecting people who blow the whistle on environmental offences. The problem is clear. Oftentimes in the woods, chemical factories, pulp mills, tar sands in northern Alberta, and so on an environmental illegality happens. It is convenient to get rid of the slush; it is convenient to do this, even though the people or the company really should not be doing this.

If an employee such as a wood worker, pulp worker, chemical worker, or oil worker sees this and his conscience bothers him because he knows that it is against the law, immoral and unethical to pollute the environment, he wants to tell. The only way we can ever find out what is going on is when this employee tells, but, if he tells, he is liable to lose his job and his wife, family and so on suffer, and he suffers. We have to try to find ways of protecting him so that he is not singled out and punished.

I tell the member for Skeena quite directly as justice critic of our party that I have some concerns about the motion, because we do have a principle in Canada that you have a right to face your accuser. We have to be very careful that we do not have neighbourhood committees spying on people, employees spying on other employees who can report things, and then not having to face the persons they accuse. We have to think about that principle. It is a problem, but I think we can get around it. We can deal with it in a just way, especially when it comes to the environment. We might have to restrict it when we get to a bill.

However, the member for Skeena is simply asking for a motion. He is simply pushing the government, which I and other members of the House support.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gabriel Fontaine (Lévis):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your allowing me a few minutes—

**Mr. Waddell:** Only three minutes!

**Mr. Della Noce:** Five!

**Mr. Fontaine:** —to deal with this motion whose purpose is to provide protection to all "whistle-blowers".

When dealing with Bill C-74 currently known as the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, the House of Commons and the Legislative Committee considered providing this protection. During their clause by clause review of Bill C-74, the members heard many representations concerning this. Of course, some of them could not be accepted, in view of our legislative system and the distribution of responsibilities and powers between the various levels of government.

Providing legislative protection to all environmental "whistle-blowers" was one of the proposals which all committee members involved in the review of Bill C-74 supported. Their discussion resulted in the provisions of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act which guarantees the anonimity which my hon. friend suggested in his motion.

Allow me to explain to you what already exists under federal legislation. This protection is provided twice in the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, the first time under Part II which deals with toxic substances, and the second time, under Part IV which deals with federal departments, agencies, Crown corporations, works, undertakings and lands.

First of all, under Section 37 of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, any person who has knowledge of the unauthorized release into the environment of a toxic substance may report any information relating to the release to an inspector or any person designated by regulation to whom a report may be made. Moreover, a person making such a report may request that his or her identity not be released. He or she may also request that any information that could reasonably reveal his or her identity be kept confidential. Mr. Speaker, I should like to quote the relevant section:

37. (1) Where a person has knowledge of the occurence or reasonable likelihood of a release into the environment of a substance specified in the List of Toxic Substances in Schedule I, but the person is not required to report the matter under this Act, the person may report any information relating to the release or likely release to an inspector or to any person to whom a report may be made under section 36.

(2) A person making a report under subsection (1) may request that the person's identity and any information that could reasonably reveal the identity not be released.

(3) Where a person makes a request under subsection (2), no person shall release or cause to be released the identity of the person making the request or any information that could reasonably be expected to reveal the identity, unless the person making the request authorizes the release in writing.

(4) Notwithstanding any other Act of Parliament, no employee of a department, board, commission or agency of the Government of Canada, or of a corporation named in Schedule C to the *Financial Administration Act* or of a federal regulatory body shall be disciplined, dismissed or harassed for making a report under subsection (1).

To conclude quickly, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the motion moved by the hon. member could normally be justified within a legislative framework which would not protect individual "whistle-blowers" against possible prosecution.

Under Bill C-74, our present legislation however, any Canadian citizen could report to the proper authorities any act detrimental to the environment without fear of prosecution. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that our current legislation is adequate.

• (1800 )

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** 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.

*Adjournment Debate*

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 is deemed to have been moved.

THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that this follow-up to an earlier question should follow this debate on environmental issues. That, of course, is at the heart of the question which I wish to follow up.

In April of this past year, a cross river barge project was established in the city of Windsor against the objections the various downriver communities in the area, which make up part of my constituency.

In a series of questions with the government, I raised the possibility of what I consider to be the necessity of an environmental assessment review proceeding taking place with respect to this new barge, because this barge service was not just a service to provide transportation across the river. It was specifically a service designed to take dangerous goods from one side of the Detroit River to the other. It was to be devoted exclusively to such dangerous goods.

Since the question was originally raised in a series of questions in January, April and May of 1990, we have been able to get access under Access to Information to the file which is kept in the Department of Transport with respect to this project.

On the basis of the material in that file, which has been released to us, I have to make a number of charges with respect to the government's treatment of this whole question.

First, I charge that this government deliberately covered up the fact that this barge project was proceeding forward and was being given considerable attention by various departments of government, was of considerable importance and was recognized to be of such by the people of the city of Windsor and the downriver communities. Yet at no stage did the government of this country see fit to tell the people of Windsor and Essex county that this barge proposal was being revived.

Despite the fact that in the information which has been provided to us under Access to Information there were September 1989 meetings which took place specifically on the issue. It was reported that this barge proposal had been revived and was being considered in detailed meetings at the very highest levels within ministries here in Ottawa.

Yet, as I say, at no time was any information on this subject provided to the people of the city of Windsor and the county of Essex.

I raised a question in the House on January 26, 1990 with the Minister of Transport about this subject. The Minister of Transport, at that stage, said to me that this was simply a possibility. He said to me that the question was premature. This despite the fact the files now show that this government and the minister's own department had been for a period of at least four months considering in detail the question of whether this barge should go forward.

• (1805)

I also have to say that the file shows quite clearly that the government suppressed information with respect to barge operations on the Detroit River. In particular, they refused to tell people in our community that there had been seven accidents in the previous period of less than seven years with respect to other barge operations taking place, barge operations that did not exclusively handle dangerous goods.

I also have to charge on the basis of the files which I have seen that the government did not at any stage undertake a serious environmental review of this barge proposal. This is despite the fact that the Minister of National Revenue stood up in the House and said that such a serious review would take place.

I raised this question on May 7, 1990 with the Minister of the Environment asking him why the government, despite concerns expressed by the community, had rejected public environmental assessment hearings on this Windsor barge. The minister did not respond to the question and did not provide us with any justification for the cover-up and the suppression of information, which had clearly taken place with respect to this question.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Plourde (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Science and Technology):** Mr. Speaker, the government is familiar with the proposal made by Barge Transport Incorporated of Detroit, which plans to load tanker trucks carrying hazardous sub-

stances on barges, to cross the Detroit River in the Windsor area. An initial plan was examined in 1987. If the company had followed through, the plan would have been subject to the environmental assessment review process, since it concerned federal land.

However, the company withdrew its initial plan and, after considering other possibilities, has now proposed another plan that does not involve federal land. Nevertheless, because of concerns raised by members of the local community, a thorough review was made of the new plan to determine, without going through the environmental assessment review process, whether any federal requirements or regulations applied. After wide-ranging consultations by senior officials from various federal departments, it was concluded that the plan was well within all regulatory and other requirements concerning health, safety and transportation of hazardous materials as defined by the Canadian Coast Guard, which is responsible for ships' safety. The federal government will carry out inspections and a take samples as required, to ensure compliance with the emergency order on imports and exports of contaminated fuel, issued under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the CEPA regulations on imports and exports of hazardous wastes are expected to come into force by early 1991. They will authorize the federal government to control future imports and exports of hazardous wastes.

From the risk point of view, the planned barge transport compares with the way in which any other product, like oil, for instance, is shipped on the Great Lakes. At the present time, a number of companies are transporting hazardous materials by barge in international waters, and they have excellent safety standards.

This plan offers an effective alternative to transportation over land. It helps reduce truck traffic on the Bluewater Bridge in Sarnia and in surrounding communities like Wallaceburg and Chatham.

• (1810)

The crossing by ferryboat would replace road transportation on roughly 400 km, reducing the risk of road accidents, hence spillage of dangerous goods.

[*English*]

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to rise once again on a question I asked the Minister of National Revenue on November 8.

The question concerned veterans and other Canadians who have been told that a beeper which summons emergency health services does not fall under medical devices in the goods and services tax schedule. This would make it tax exempt if it did so.

The Department of Veterans Affairs must consider this instrument to be an essential service as it pays for the device under the Blue Cross. I asked the minister for his justification of taxing such a device which can mean the difference between life and death. The answer was rather confusing. He said that the Royal Canadian Legion is considered to be a charitable organization for the purposes of GST and therefore would not be obligated to pay or to collect the GST. This did not, in any way, answer the question. I was concerned with a device that is used by veterans and many other Canadians, and which is not distributed through the Royal Canadian Legion. Perhaps the minister was not listening and thought I was requiring about something else. I cannot be sure.

I rise today hoping to get a response and at this time I hope the response is pertinent to the issue. Following my question, I wrote a letter to the minister regarding the Health Line beeper. At this time I would like to briefly outline the contents of the letter to provide the House with some background on this very worth-while life-saving device.

The Health Line beeper is a portable device which allows the user to summon emergency health services by tapping the device. The message is relayed to a 24-hour monitoring centre and services are dispatched. This service is used primarily by elderly and/or chronically ill persons.

A constituent of mine, Cathy Collard, is the manager of Health Line Services in Charlottetown. She inquired whether the device would be tax exempt under the proposed goods and services tax. On her behalf I contacted officials within the minister's department who stated that since the device is not listed under "medical devices" in the goods and services tax schedule, it would not be tax exempt.

For chronically ill and elderly people, the possession of a Health Line beeper could mean the difference between life and death. I would like to stress that it is not a luxury item and I fail to understand why it is not considered a medical device for the purposes of taxation.

The personal emergency beeper is needed most by those who may live alone or who are left alone during the day. This service, without any argument, can be a life-saving service. It allows one to cope alone and with dignity despite age or illness. With one simple push of a button in a moment of need, the urgently needed assistance is on its way.

I am appalled that this government could even consider not making such a device tax exempt. Is this government so cold that it will not listen to Canadians for any reason, proving how insensitive it is to the concerns of Canadians. All I am asking is that a device that quite often means the difference between life and death be tax exempt.

At this time we are going through a full-blown, made-in-Canada recession. Everywhere you turn people are feeling the crunch. This is a time when we must help those people who need us most. I am referring to those people who need and deserve their independence and without an emergency beeper would not be able to do so.

I must stress that this government must start listening to the concerns of all Canadians and help those in need. It is time that this government began to realize that a price cannot be placed on human life. At this time, I would like to stress that I am quite aware that under certain circumstances devices such as this will in fact be considered as medical devices and, therefore, will be zero rated for the purpose of GST. However, as I checked into the matter with officials from the departments of Finance and National Revenue, as well as the GST hotline, I was told repeatedly that the health line beeper does not fall under that category.

• (1815)

I am also aware that communication devices, other than a device for use with telegraph or telephone apparatus, will be zero rated when specifically designed to assist an individual in coping with or treating an illness or chronic abnormal physical state. I must point out once again that I have been told by GST officials that this health beeper does not fall under this category.

I ask the parliamentary secretary tonight and hopefully he will do everything in his power to ensure that this device will be given all consideration and that it should be tax exempt.

**Mr. Vincent Della Noce (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague went through his question dated November 8, 1990, on page 15327 of *Hansard* where the minister answered his question. He said today that he was pleased that he was advised, but he did not mention that this government took its responsibility and the minister answered his letter which he had today.

I refer him to the second paragraph where the minister said: "I am pleased to advise you that in certain circumstances these devices will in fact be considered as medical devices and therefore will be zero rated for the purpose of the GST", which my hon. friend mentioned, but he did not say it was from the letter of the minister.

[*Translation*]

So, Mr. Speaker, I will go on. I wish to answer in greater detail to the question raised by the hon. member for Hillsborough on the exemption from the proposed Goods and Services Tax, of beepers used to communicate with emergency services.

Even without any additional information on the use of the devices the hon. member is referring to, I am quite sure these communication devices will be exempted. In some cases, the devices will be exempted for GST purposes, as the minister indicated in his letter.

The regulations established by the Department of Finance stipulates the conditions under which such communication devices, used for medical purposes, can be exempted from the GST. For example, communication devices, other than those used with phones and telegraph apparatus, will be exempted if they are specially designed to help sick or chronically-ill people. Consequently, beepers designed for this purpose will be GST-free. Moreover, breathing apparatus which can be used at home will also be exempted if especially designed to help the sick or the chronically-ill. It should be noted that beepers designed for use with telephones or telegraphs will be taxable.

Our government is committed to make health care readily accessible to all Canadians. To that end we have granted generous tax rebates on medical services, prescription drugs and medical devices. Under the proposed legislation most medical services will be tax exempt. This category also includes products or services whose cost is paid or reimbursed by a provincial government pursuant to a plan established through provincial legislation for the supply of health care services to all provincial residents covered under that insurance.

• (1820)

The tax on prescription drugs and medical devices will be removed. The prescription drugs listed in the various annexes of the Food and Drugs Act, the Food and Drugs Regulations and the Narcotic Control Act, other than drugs available without prescription, will no longer be taxable. The legislation provides that some medical devices will not be taxable if they are prescribed by a physician.

[*English*]

## SCOTIA SYNFUELS PROJECT

**Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso):** Mr. Speaker, I return once again to a subject I have raised numerous times in this House and which I raised on November 20 as a question to the Minister of Industry, Science and Technology. It has to do with the Scotia Synfuels Project, the project to create a refinery or converting a new technology for making petroleum distillates out of coal and heavy oil in Cape Breton, Nova Scotia.

It is a project which has widespread support in the region. It is a major economic development project for Cape Breton and eastern Nova Scotia. It is ideally suited for the economy of the area, particularly in the fact that it finds a clean use for Cape Breton coal which is known to be of a high sulphur content and therefore difficult to use, particularly because of the hydrocarbons it emits.

The Scotia Synfuels Project is a technology which has been in development for many years and is at a point now where it is nearly commercially viable and would be commercially viable with the assistance that is normally available through this federal government's programs had the Department of Industry Science and Technology, and particularly the minister, seen fit to exercise a little bit of creativity and take a risk on a project that is ideal for our region.

I must say the people of eastern Nova Scotia still cannot believe that the minister, after all the noises that have been made by the government, turned down their request for tax credits.

The reasons stated by the minister on November 20 for turning down the application for tax credits under the Cape Breton tax credit program were as he said in the House. What the promoters of the project requested was first that they wanted to have a $200 million Cape Breton tax credit. They wanted to have more. They also wanted to have a loan guarantee and an interest buy-down. That was not possible because of the fact there was no private sector money guarantee.

This is precisely the point. What the promoters had been asking the federal government for years, and particularly during the period of time when they had put in for the Cape Breton tax credit, was an indication from the federal government that if the tax credit would be forthcoming, they would be going on the private money markets to obtain the private sector funding that would be forthcoming, they believed, under current product prices for the petroleum products they were going to produce.

Therefore, what was being asked for by the company was simply an assurance by the federal government that those moneys would be available so that they could go out and get the private sector money. Unfortunately, this government was unwilling to even give them that undertaking and aborted the project in midstream.

What the minister is saying is not correct. There would have been major sources of private sector money involved and indeed the nature of the tax credit program is such that the government would be paying tax credits only after the project was in place and making money.

On top of that, the project had a potential to generate sizeable revenues for the government.

I want to put on the record some of the questions that were raised about this particular project. First of all, the project investment was $470 million. All of this would have to be raised from private investors and private financial institutions. They were requesting standard Cape Breton investment tax credits for 45 per cent of the capital cost of this project. They would reduce the $800 million of corporate taxes, which would be payable from earnings over the project's life, by approximately $200

million; that is to say, the government would realize a net gain in tax revenues of $600 million over the life of the project. This means that each $1 of the investment tax credit would generate $4 of new tax revenue. Of course they were requesting interest rate buy-downs. These are standard interest rate subsidies which have been offered by this government. This is a subsidy which the government has applied in other places, as well as the loan guarantees.

• (1825)

I compare the project to the Hibernia project, which we on this side of the House have supported strongly and have encouraged the government in achieving. That project was going to provide direct financial assistance in excess of some $1 billion or 25 per cent of construction costs, 40 per cent of construction costs to a maximum of $1.6 billion and other assistance, for a total federal contribution of $3.175 billion on this project.

With the private sector investment that would have been forthcoming under the Scotia Synfuels project and could still be forthcoming, if the minister would sit down with the principals and arrange some form of financial assistance and some terms which the principals would need to meet in order to receive this assistance, I believe this project would still be feasible. I call upon the minister and this government to continue to meet with the principals and assist this project.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Plourde (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Science and Technology):** Mr. Speaker, the governement must tell the truth to the people of Cape Breton. In economic matters, it would be indecent to give anyone false hopes.

During the ten years that the study of the Scotia Synfuels Project lasted, the federal government spent some $2 million on top of the $4 million from the private sector. Although all those reviews and studies have demonstrated that the project technology can be developed, other detailed engineering studies are necessary to ensure the prescribed volume and quality of synthetic fuel. As indicated, over the last ten years representatives of the federal and provincial governments met several times with the promoter in a effort to bring the project into being.

Since 1984, the government has spent $1.5 billion to develop the Cape Breton economy. I could mention for exemple the modernization of Sysco, the financing of DEVCO and the development of the new Louisana Pacific plant in Port Hawkesbury. Two weeks ago, the department agreed to provide a $24.5 million financial help to projects of Kelly Rock Limited and Point Tupper Properties under the Cape Breton investment tax credit program, while awaiting for environmental impact studies for the two projects. Together, these two projects will create directly 138 new jobs.

Some say that Synfuels is a better project than Hibernia. These projects are completely different as to size, technology and performance. From the very beginning, Hibernia has received of the private sector's financial support and offered tremendous opportunities, in terms of downstream and other benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Cape Breton Highlands—Canso will perhaps want to reflect on the comments of the project's promoter, Mr. Gillespie, who said, as quoted in *The Chronicle Herald* of April 1, 1986: "Accoring to a study completed last July the Synfuels project is feasable from a technical point of view, but not a financial one". Without a strong support from the private sector, Canadian taxpayers were asked to carry most of the project's risks. I don't think this is right, considering that the business community is not ready to do so.

**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 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 6.30 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Friday, November 30, 1990**

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

**Hon. Bill McKnight (for the Minister of Finance)** moved that Bill C–88, an act to provide for the membership of Canada in the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

**Mr. William Scott (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my remarks today on the second reading of Bill C–88 by concentrating on why this new institution, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development or EBRD has been created; by outlining Canada's interest in central and eastern Europe; and by discussing our reasons for seeking membership in EBRD. I will then address briefly the mandate of EBRD, and Canada's financial contribution to the bank.

The countries of central and eastern Europe are undergoing political, economic, and social changes of historic importance. The political and social ferment in these countries, combined with their acute economic problems, present risk and opportunities. These developments are potentially destabilizing, but also create the potential for a prosperous, freer and more integrated European and North Atlantic community. The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development can play a central role in permitting central and eastern Europe to reach its potential.

The concept of the EBRD originated from a French proposal that was quickly endorsed at a meeting of the European community in Paris in November 1989. Canada quickly endorsed this principle of a broad based bank to provide a focus for world–wide financial assistance to central and eastern Europe, in support of the process of political and economic change then beginning in that region.

Widespread interest in this initiative quickly developed beyond the confines of Europe. A large number of interested countries, including the U.S.S.R. and all other central and eastern European countries except Albania, conducted the negotiations on the bank's articles of agreement through a highly compressed series of negotiating meetings. Indeed, the unprecedented speed with which the establishment of this bank was negotiated is the clearest sign of the international community's commitment to support reform in central and eastern Europe.

This process culminated in the representatives of potential member countries signing the bank's Articles of Agreement, entitled *Agreement Establishing the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development* (Schedule–Section 2 of the bill), in Paris on May 29, 1990.

While backward in modern technology and burdened by the cumbersome and unproductive structures of the communist system, the countries of central and eastern Europe have a generally well–educated workforce, a good scientific base, and considerable technical skills. With strong and imaginative political leadership and support from the industrial world, many of these countries may be able to transform their economies and societies relatively quickly, thus enabling them to enter the European–North Atlantic community as active and self–reliant partners.

Mr. Speaker, it is the government's view that enhanced economic co–operation and integration among the countries of central and eastern Europe, and more broadly, will be vital to the process of structural adjustment that they require and would reduce the likelihood of regional conflict.

• (1010 )

The EBRD can assist this process through the provision of financing and technical advice for the steady and systematic introduction of private ownership and market forces into these economies.

Canada has a vital stake in Europe. More than half of our population trace their ancestry to Europe. Some 15 per cent of Canadians have direct ties with eastern and central Europe. Moreover, Canada's future peace and prosperity is intertwined with the peace and prosperity of Europe. As a consequence, Canada is deeply involved in the affairs of Europe through our participation in NATO, the Conference on Security and Co–operation in Europe and other multilateral forums, as well as our strong bilateral ties in both eastern and western Europe.

As a nation with broad political, economic, and security interests in Europe, we need to build on our traditional relations and to influence the evolution of Europe in ways conducive to our interests. This means, especially, expanding our political, social, economic and commercial relations with the countries of central and eastern Europe. That process is already under way, as demonstrated by the discussions on European peace and security that the Prime Minister is attending in Paris this week. We must also seek both bilateral and multilateral links with the region. One key vehicle will be the EBRD.

From a commercial perspective, economic liberalization in eastern and central Europe will generate increasing trade and investment opportunities for all, including Canadian business. The bank itself will assist Canadians to be aware of and to finance business with central and eastern European countries.

The EBRD is loosely modelled on the existing regional development banks in Latin America, Asia, Africa and the Caribbean. However, unlike these banks, the EBRD has a distinctive political mandate to support the transition to the market–based economies through the particular encouragement of private enterprise in those countries of central and eastern Europe adopting both political and economic reforms. The contracting parties of the EBRD have used the articles of agreement to state their commitment to democracy, the rule of law, respect for human rights and market economics. I would refer members to the preamble to the Articles of Agreement, which is Schedule 2 of the proposed legislation.

The bank is to be European in character, but broadly international in membership. Its membership will include the 12 member states of the European community; the European Economic Commission, the European Investment Bank, the countries of central and eastern Europe including the U.S.S.R., and other European and non–European countries that are also members of the International Monetary Fund. A list of signatories who intend to become members is included in the annexes to the Articles of Agreement.

The main objective of the bank is to promote the development of the private sector by focusing on those countries undergoing economic liberalization and democratization. To do so, it will need to co–ordinate its work closely with existing institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. In order to establish a mechanism for selecting those countries eligible to borrow and to ward against possible backsliding on reforms, the Articles of Agreement provide for an annual review of the bank's lending strategy in each borrowing country. This review, which was proposed by Canada during the negotiations, should ensure that only those countries consistently applying the principles of democracy, pluralism and market economics continue to be eligible for borrowing.

The bank's central task is to build a vibrant private sector in countries that have been dominated for the past 45 years by inefficient state planning and almost total state ownership. The articles specify that at least 60 per cent of bank funding will be targeted toward lending and equity participation in private sector enterprises. Lending to the public sector will be aimed at assisting in the transition toward greater competitiveness and eventual possible privatization of public sector firms. There may also be limited lending for infrastructure projects required to support the free market economy.

I would also note that, for the first time in the articles of agreement of any such international institution, direct reference has been made to the bank's role in promoting environmentally sound and sustainable development. The Government of Canada attaches special importance to this element of the European Bank's objectives.

The initial capital base of the bank will be 10 billion ECU, or approximately $16 billion Canadian. Of that amount, 30 per cent of which must be actually paid–in, or deposited by members with the bank. The remaining capital is callable, that is, capital that is not paid–in but for which the members are liable should the bank encounter financial difficulty.

As in the case of the other development banks, the EBRD will be able to borrow further funds in capital markets at attractive rates of interest on the basis of the callable capital in convertible currency of its most creditworthy members. This will enable the bank to lend almost triple the level of funds represented by its paid–in capital. Thus, the establishment of this bank will create a multiplier effect. Every dollar that member governments provide to the institution will catalyze an additional $2 in investment capital for central and eastern Europe.

All powers of the bank are to be vested in the board of governors, which in turn will delegate responsibility for the bank's management and policy development to the board of directors. The Minister of Finance will be the Canadian governor for the EBRD. Canada will have one of 23 seats on the board of the bank.

Canada was present at all the negotiating sessions for the EBRD and has been an active participant in the key political, financial, and technical discussions to ensure that Canadian interests are fully represented. Based on the negotiations among the 42 founding signatories to the articles of agreement, it is proposed that Canada initially purchase a share of 3.4 per cent of the capital of the bank. Such a share would make Canada the eighth largest shareholder after the United States, the other G–7 countries, and the U.S.S.R.

Canada has elected to pay its subscription during this initial period of capitalization in U.S. dollars, just as we make subscription payments to the other development banks, such as the World Bank, in U.S. dollars. A share of 3.4 per cent would entail a paid–in investment not exceeding U.S. $120 million in respect to Canada's initial subscription of shares. The total callable portion of our share would be up to U.S. $280 million. Thus, Canada's total financial commitment, actual and potential, to central and eastern Europe through the EBRD will be some U.S. $400 million, or approximately $460 million Canadian at current exchange rates. Support of this magnitude is a powerful indication of the government's commitment to political and economic change in eastern Europe.

Although the EBRD will only become operational once the process of ratification by members is completed, there are clear indications that the international business community is eager to co–operate with the bank in developing a vibrant private sector in eastern Europe. Within Canada, government officials have already detected a strong interest in the EBRD on the part of banks, business people, the legal community, academics, and many others. I am confident that Canadians will use the resources of the EBRD to seek out a range of business opportunities in support of the economic transformation of eastern Europe.

Madam Speaker, the shares we are proposing to purchase in the EBRD are an investment, not just in the narrow accounting sense, but in a much broader sense: an investment in democracy and pluralism, an investment in economic freedom, and, above all, an investment in the people of central and eastern Europe. We are establishing an institution that will build productive assets and let the people of central and eastern Europe help themselves to grow and prosper.

To conclude, Madam Speaker, I must emphasize that for Canada to be a founding member of the bank, legislation allowing for the communication to the bank of our ratification of the agreement must be in place as soon as possible and certainly before the end of this year.

• (1020 )

I look to my hon. colleagues in the House to give timely consideration and passage to this bill.

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure this morning to speak to Bill C–88, a bill to establish Canada's participation in the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

In speaking for the Liberal Party, in general I must say that we support the establishment of this bank and Canada's participation in the bank, but we would like to hear the government be on record as to a couple of particular concerns that we have.

The bill that is before us this morning, establishing Canada's participation in the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, is understood as important because it is addressing a very urgent critical situation which exists in East European countries and the Soviet Union today. Even this week, day by day, we are becoming more aware of the very crisis that exists in

eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, which in some ways has the possibility of rivalling the Gulf crisis in its severity.

We are hearing, and we know, that Mr. Gorbatchev, the President of the Soviet Union, is committed to *glasnost* and *perestroika*. We support his policy initiatives and his desire to see the region become more democratic. But we understand, as well, that the upheaval of that change is enormous and we see the consequences of that upheaval today with a breakdown in the delivery of food to the citizens of the Soviet Union, in particular, and the difficult attempts that are being made to change the Soviet Union from a state-oriented economy to a free market economy. We see on a rather regular basis the results of racial and ethnic tensions erupting in the region. We realize that, if we in the western world are going to keep the lid on this critical situation and keep the process that Mr. Gorbatchev has in mind progressing, then we must do our part in Canada to assist the process.

In April and May of this year, I had the opportunity of visiting the Soviet Union and East Germany. It was very evident from that visit that a lot of assistance was required and certainly the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade recommended that Canada establish new ways of relating and supporting the transition process in the Soviet Union and east European countries, as well as opening up new avenues of our involvement in the area.

The bill before us today, not only authorizes Canada to participate in the bank as a member of the executive board of the bank, but also authorizes an expenditure by Canada of Canadian dollars in support of the capital base of the bank.

The total capital base of the bank will be $10 billion European currency units, or approximately $14 billion Canadian, with 30 per cent of that amount to be paid in initially. The Canadian share of the bank, as my colleague across the floor said, will be 3.4 per cent, entailing a paid-in investment of approximately $30 million Canadian each year for five years. This share ensures Canada a seat on the executive board of the bank as the eighth largest contributor behind the U.S.A.

What is worthy of note with this particular bank that makes it different from the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund—which people have suggested could fulfil the role of the EBRD—is that the U.S.A. will hold only a 10 per cent share of the proposed European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. It holds the majority share of the the World Bank and the IMF. The other G-7 countries will each share approximately 8 per cent and the Soviet Union will share 6 per cent of the shares in the EBRD.

Beyond, I think the Canadian public would want to know who will hold shares in the bank. That would include most of the countries of Europe and the G-7. They would also want to know who the recipient countries are going to be when this bank is set up and functioning. The recipient countries will be Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Yugoslavia. Given the difficult circumstances that exist in those countries, especially the Soviet Union today, it is important that Canada support this bank.

This morning there was a newspaper article from Moscow. It stated: "Last night in Moscow, a Soviet transport plane landed with 37 tonnes of food for Germany, a load of margarine, and 63,000 meals of lentils, noodles and a pea and meat soup will be distributed to orphans' homes, children's hospitals, and among ethnic German groups." It goes on to say that a Russian major, "an army officer and veteran of the Afghanistan war, said he felt ashamed that his country had to accept hand-outs from the Germans, the nation the Soviet Union and its allies defeated in 1945."

Although it is essential right now that the Soviet Union receive the food assistance necessary, it is important for us to formalize a process that allows the Soviet Union and east European countries to receive the support from the western world in a more dignified fashion.

One of the concerns that I have has to do with the crisis in the Soviet Union and East Germany and our need to address and highlight the need in that area. In doing this, we must not forget the extremely serious

concerns of Third World countries. Because of the Middle East crisis that exists at the present time, the burden of coping for Third World countries has increased enormously. It is not just the Soviet Union and east European countries that are experiencing increased problems economically and politically these days. It is also Third World countries which are also showing some signs of moving to more democratic regimes, but because of the severe impact of the gulf crisis, on top of the international debt crisis that they have been experiencing for the last years, they are also in a very precarious situation.

The Government of Canada has said—I would like to have it on the record in the House—that the budget for what is termed official development assistance, that which goes from Canada to assist Third World developing nations, will not experience any further cutbacks. We want to ensure that official development assistance dollars will not be used to help fund the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

We have to recognize that here in Canada we have our own economic difficulties. It is also important that Canadians understand the linkages of Canada's well-being to the well-being of the world as a whole. One of the worst things that could happen to the world today would be for the richer western nations of the world to become isolationist in their policies. In the long run, Canada would suffer grievously from taking those types of policy initiatives.

• (1030)

Looking at the bill, there are some very positive aspects. I would like to just speak for a moment to the preamble of the bill which I think is important for one very significant reason. In the preamble, it states:

> Welcoming the intent of Central and Eastern European countries to further the practical implementation of multiparty democracy, strengthening democratic institutions, the rule of law and respect for human rights and their willingness to implement reforms in order to evolve towards market-oriented economies;

That specific reference to human rights is not in the statement of purpose. Why that is not so is not clear, but the fact that the reference to human rights exists in the preamble to the bill is important and significant.

There has been a proposal from the lawyers committee for human rights in the United States that this preamble notion of protection of human rights be given emphasis. The lawyers committee suggests that there should be developed within the structure of the bank a human rights department which would assess the human rights implications of proposed bank loans and investments through the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

It is unfortunate that the same emphasis on human rights is not given to making loans and investments through our other development banks around the world, but we hope the proposed department will be received positively and be set up. Hopefully, it could be a precedent for the other banks that exist in the world.

The lawyers committee for human rights suggests that the proposed department would provide expertise during the pre-project review and appraisal stages to enable the bank to consider, one, the effects of human rights observance in a country on the purpose or likely success of the proposed loans and investments and, two, the general and potentially reciprocal relationship between human rights observance in a country and economic development.

The results of a human rights review would be considered along with other economic factors in evaluating a proposed project. To quote their document: "The drafters of the proposed charter for the European bank for Reconstruction and Development understood that economic development in Canada and eastern Europe has been seriously impaired by the denials of basic civil, political, social and economic rights". This, I applaud; this statement, I applaud; this fact, I applaud. But why the drafters of this bank would see that very important relationship and not give full credence to the same view and value to the other development banks, including the IMF and the World Bank, is beyond me to understand.

The proposal of the lawyers committee for human rights is supported in Canada by the task force on churches and corporate responsibility. In a letter to the Minister of Finance by that group, they commented that they are hopeful that Canada, if it becomes a shareholder in the new bank, will be in agreement with the proposal to set up a human rights department, and that a similar move on human rights criteria would be possible.

A concern that we have on this side of the House with regard to the institution of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development is the fact that this will be the first of the development banks to have our

Minister of Finance sit as the director rather than the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Personally, I feel that that distinction is significant because the Secretary of State for External Affairs would have a much broader view of Canadian policy *vis–à–vis* east European countries and the Soviet Union than the Minister of Finance who basically has shown us so many times that it does not matter what other policy or program in this country exists, or might exist, that economically it is cash that is the bottom line. It is of great concern to us really that this change has been made and we ask why would the government have done this.

One other aspect that is important and which we support on this side of the House is article 2 (vii) which states that one of the bank's purposes is to promote in the full range of its activities environmentally sound and sustainable development. I can just say again that having visited the region earlier this year, certainly the very first and impressive impact that confronts one when landing in that area is the severe and critical environmental damage that has occurred in the Soviet Union and east European countries at this very point. It is a serious crisis. If we as Canadians want to really understand the importance of cleaning up our own environmental act, one only needs to see the consequences of not acting, as they exist at this point in time in the Soviet Union and east European countries.

Certainly if western nations which will be members of the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development are going to be involved in helping the Soviet Union and east European countries to become successful democratic societies, we must give importance to all of the projects which are funded being environmentally sustainabale.

To conclude, we on this side of the House are in support of this bill. There are aspects of it which we feel are very important. The last one, that I just mentioned, the bank's funding would support only environmentally sustainable projects and programs. The second is that for the first time we have a bill that suggests and recommends that funding given to countries by western nations to developing democracies take human rights considerations into account as an important factor. I hope that factor will be seen as important wherever this country lends and invests Canadians funds.

My final word is that we support this bill, but would like the government to go on record saying that our representation on this bank will reflect Canada's total foreign policy *vis–à–vis* these countries and not merely dollars as the bottom line, that there is other conditionality to the funds that we will make available through the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. As well, we would like to have the government on record to say that funding for this bank will not in any way impact upon the current funding that is provided to official development assistance by this government.

**Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant):** Madam Speaker, I too welcome participation in the debate this morning with respect to Bill C–88, an act to provide for the membership of Canada on the board of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

It has already been mentioned by the two previous speakers. We are looking at a situation which has taken a long time to develop but which has been thrust upon the international stage in a relatively short period of time. Of course I am referring here to the dire economic situation in eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union.

• (1040)

After some 45 years of oppressive Marxist–Leninism, highly centralized economies, economies that could not function in the post smokestack industrial world in which we live today, industries and economic systems that could not adapt themselves to modern technology or to the electronic age, in short to the modern marketplace, have left a legacy of not only bitterness at the human level, but chaos at the economic level and in the marketplace.

Let us just pause for a moment and take a look at the central and eastern European and Soviet Union situations today. We may indeed be almost too late at this moment to assist some or many of those economies. For example, in the Soviet Union under *perestroika* absolute chaos reigns today. It is not that the Soviets cannot produce, they have never been able to produce enough in many areas such as food, but they cannot transport their goods and services from source to market. Consequently there is a tremendous lack of goods and foodstuffs in the Soviet Union that is creating tremendous hardship.

Indeed, this winter it is estimated that between unemployment and inflation there will probably be upward of 10 million citizens wandering the countryside looking for shelter and clothing and food alone, to say nothing of the many more millions who will be unemployed.

In eastern Europe the situation is not that much better. In areas of Poland, eastern Czechoslovakia, even in parts of Hungary, and particularly in Romania and Bulgaria, we have a growing danger and unless we can get the economic systems kick-started, there may indeed be a resort to *coups d'état* for the re-establishment of oppressive regimes not of the left but of the right, military, quasi-Fascist in other words.

Eastern Europeans and people in the Soviet Union have lived under such oppression for so long that they are extremely anxious to get moving and to get into the process of liberalization and democratization. Hundreds of thousands, indeed millions, may not be prepared to wait for the normal market adjustments and for the normal regulation and change from the old system to the new. This will manifest itself, I suggest, in many different ways.

As I alluded to a moment ago, I think there is going to be a period in some areas of some of those countries of extreme social chaos. I think there may be some political activism that is of an extremely unsavoury nature.

I also think that many of these younger people who do not have the ties that older family people have in central and eastern Europe may decide, as many of them already have, to pick up and move west. This is going to create tremendous stress on the economies of central and western Europe because these people know no national boundaries today in eastern Europe. They are simply moving from Poland into what is now eastern Germany, from Czechoslovakia into Germany, from Hungary into Germany and so on. It is creating a very large pool, a sort of a floating population, in central and eastern Europe that is potentially explosive. I suggest that unless we can get a handle on the orderly development and transition from the old Soviet-style economy to the more modern industrial market-oriented and liberal economies of western Europe, we may be in for a very rough time.

Madam Speaker, my party is pleased to participate in this debate. We wish to point out that we first of all do not oppose Canada's participation in this new regional development bank. We think it is extremely worth while, but we do have a few reservations.

As has already been stated, the purpose of this legislation will enable Canada to become a founding member of a regional bank for the modernization and development of eastern and central Europe. Nations potentially eligible for funding are Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the former G.D.R., Hungary, Poland, Romania, the U.S.S.R., and Yugoslavia.

Yugoslavia, incidentally, is a country that is on the brink, I believe, of civil war; certainly some kind of civil disruption at this time, not based so much on its economy but because of the ethnic tensions and stresses in that area.

Canada is contributing 3.4 per cent or $479 million of the bank's capital, which ensures it a seat on the board of directors. The agreement must be in place by March 31, 1991. The EBRD will control $15 billion Canadian in funds.

This is a wonderful idea. As I said earlier, my party supports it. It was mainly the brain child of Francois Mitterrand, the President of France, and indeed the first president of the bank will be a French banker.

We have some reservations—and I will get to them in a few moments—in that the constraints being placed upon these various countries will limit the kind of enterprise into which individuals, groups and corporations can enter.

For example, public enterprises of a democratic nature will be virtually excluded. Co-operatives may indeed be excluded. There will be an overemphasis on purely private owned operations. As we know, throughout the world, economies are much healthier when there is a mix between privately owned, co-operatively owned, and publicly owned but working with the parameters of a free market in those areas, regions, and countries.

I would like to give a little background as to how Bill C-88 came about. The articles of agreement to create the EBRD was signed in Paris on May 29, 1990 by our own Minister of State for Finance at that time, along with 39 other founding countries, specifically the European Economic Community and the European Investment Bank. This bank is the result of a proposal presented, as I said a few moments ago, by French

President Francois Mitterrand during a session of the European Parliament held in November 1989.

The headquarters of the bank will be located in London, England. The first president of the bank will be, as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Jacques Attali from France, an of course the agreement must be ratified by March 31, 1991.

Even though time is of the essence, we in this party would hope that the bill will go to a committee where it can be properly analysed, scrutinized and debated, so that perhaps there could conceivably be some important, positive, added input by Canada into the financial arrangements and into the construction of this kind of enterprise.

EBRD will control $10 million ECU, which is approximately $15 billion Canadian in funds. The original authorized capital stock shall be divided into paid-in shares, 30 per cent or $3 billion ECU, and into callable shares, 70 per cent or $7 billion ECU.

Prospective subscribing members are divided into four groups. The first group includes the member companies of the European Community, the European Community itself as distinct from its membership, and the European Investment Bank. This group of members would control $5.1 billion ECU or 51 per cent of the total. In this group, France, Germany, Italy and Great Britain each control 8.5 per cent of the shares.

Another group contains members of the European Free Trade Association, other European countries such as Turkey, and a middle eastern country, the state of Israel. This group will control $1.137 billion ECU or 11.37 per cent.

• (1050)

The third group includes recipient countries of central and eastern Europe and control 1.35 million ECU or 13.5 per cent.

The fourth group includes Canada, which will control 3.4 per cent of the shares, the United States, which will control 10 per cent—and this makes the United States the largest shareholder—and Japan with 8.5 per cent.

The initial paid-in capital by Canada amounts to 120 million ECU or 3.4 per cent of 3 billion ECU or U.S. $119.04 million, with payments spread over five years. Under article 6 of the agreement, payment must be in ECU, U.S. dollars or Japanese yen, based on the average exchange rate for ECU between September 30, 1989 and March 1990.

Nations potentially eligible for funding are Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the former G.D.R., Hungary, Poland, Romania, the U.S.S.R., and Yugoslavia.

There are two articles of importance, particularly to me and to the New Democratic Party Article 1 states the purpose. The purpose of the EBRD is to foster the transition toward open market oriented economies and to promote private and entrepreneurial initiative in the central and eastern European countries committed to and applying the principles of multi-party pluralism and market economics. I would have hoped that in that article, along with the stress on the free marketplace and the liberalized marketplace, human rights would have been put at the top of the list because that has always been the major problem, certainly since the 1940s, in those countries. Human rights were virtually non-existent. Another clause that should have been included in article 1, as was mentioned by my Liberal colleague, was a direct and specific reference to environmental impacts. As a modern banking document, human rights and environmental concerns should have been right up there at the top of the list, along with specific market mechanisms and financial and economic mechanisms, in the article. It would have signalled a modern, contemporary approach to banking, if in the act itself setting up a new regional bank the governors of that bank would have put at the top of the list, along with banking mechanisms and instruments, respect for human rights and respect for the environment.

That to me would have been a giant step forward, but it is not there and it is unfortunate it is not there. I call upon the government to attempt to put it there in its continuing negotiations with their American, Japanese and European counterparts as we move on toward March 1991.

Turning to article 2, the activities of the EBRD are listed in this article. It is for the purposes of implementing economic reforms, including demonopolization, decentralization and privatization, promoting productive, competitive and private sector activity, to provide technical assistance for relevant projects, stimulating development of capital markets, and promoting environmentally sound activities and sustainable development. It comes

in the second article, but it is not specified or emphasized.

So far so good, in our view. As I alluded to a few moments ago, we do have very serious reservations about the exclusivity of the trust and philosophy behind the setting up of this regional bank for reconstruction. It places total emphasis on the private sector in a liberalized marketplace and does not make accommodation for such things as co-operatives and state owned enterprises, which exist and flourish in many democratic countries. They used to flourish in this country in many respects, although we are doing everything we can right now to privatize those that are the most productive, effective, and efficient in their management and organization.

We would like to see some movement, some accommodation, so that this bank would simply not reflect or be a mirror image of the American, the German or the U.K. marketplace but would be broad enough and flexible enough to allow individual eastern European countries and individual republics within the Soviet Union to develop their own kinds of market oriented economies and their own kinds of market oriented enterprises. Therefore we would not restrict them or make it exclusively a private ownership kind of approach. Co-ops and even state owned enterprises would be included in this whole area of economic and commercial development.

After all, there is still a majority of international airlines in the world which are state owned. they have not all been privatized, by any stretch of the imagination. Most of the railroads, for example, in western Europe today are publicly owned; they are state owned. One has to be flexible here to allow greater latitude in the type of commercial enterprise anticipated by the EBRD.

The use of the resources and facilities of the EBRD is exclusively tied to the implementation of articles 1 and 2. This is basically what I have been talking about. The EBRD may not provide more than 40 per cent of its total committed funds to the state sector. We would like to see more committed to the state sector, including state owned enterprises.

In each individual state, no more than 40 per cent of the bank's committed funds may be provided to the state sector, and that of course is in article 11. The EBRD is required to work in close collaboration with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, as well as the OECD.

What we are doing here is perpetuating financial institutions of a totally western hue and colour. We are not allowing, I would suggest, enough creative latitude on the part of the eastern Europeans and the various republics in the Soviet Union. One should keep in mind that it is unlikely that we will be dealing with the U.S.S.R. for very much longer. As far as I can understand at this moment, the U.S.S.R. no longer exists, except in name, in the office of its president, and in the Soviet military. Within very short order we are going to be dealing with at least five or six former Soviet republics as more or less independent nations. I think that is a good thing. That is the way things are going over there, so we have to make certain that this act is amenable to accommodate those new republics which may very well become independent nations.

I understand my time is up for now. I do not know how much time I will have left following Question Period, but I will call it eleven o'clock at this time, if I may.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** To answer the hon. member's question, he was allowed 40 minutes so he has a lot of time left yet. Does the House agree to calling it eleven o'clock?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Translation*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** It being eleven o'clock, 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

[*English*]

### BILL C-210

**Mr. Walter Van De Walle (St. Albert):** Madam Speaker, Canadians are appalled at the number of foreign criminals, using Canada as a haven from justice. Our present extradition law, with its lengthy procedure, enables these fugitives to remain in Canada for years. Canadians are demanding that the extradition law be changed.

I welcomed the recent announcement of the Minister of Justice that the goal of the government was to introduce new, comprehensive extradition legislation.

A private member's bill which would limit the number of appeals available was introduced into the House of Commons by the member for Peterborough. It deserves the support of all members. The government and the Official Opposition have agreed to move this bill forward. However, the NDP is blocking the speedy passage of this legislation. I urge all hon. members to support Bill C-210.

Canadians are demanding an immediate change to the Extradition Act. Foreign criminals are not wanted in Canada.

* * *

• (1100)

[*Translation*]

## MINING

**Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard):** Madam Speaker, today it's official: we are in a recession. Its effects are particularly severe in our northern regions where the government has systematically cut assistance for resource development. I am referring to the unfortunate demise of the flow-through shares program, a Liberal policy that literally caused the rebirth of the mining industry in Canada. This program has proved be one of the best tools for regional and entrepreneurial development, which is probably why the NDP was initially against it.

Tax benefits linked to flow-through shares should be reinstated to help northern residents get their economy started again. These are dynamic people, people with vision, and they should be given the tools they need. The Tories have never understood the problems of our northern regions, and by cancelling this program, they once again demonstrate their lack of understanding.

* * *

[*English*]

## WORLD AIDS DAY

**Mr. Geoff Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth):** Madam Speaker, tomorrow, December 1 is World AIDS Day. This year's focus, women and AIDS, recognizes the very important contribution women make in fighting this disease. While a great deal of progress has been made, anyone can be at risk. The incidence of HIV infection among women in Canada and around the world is on the rise.

In addition to becoming increasingly vulnerable to AIDS, women face an added burden. As the principal caregivers in most societies, both in the helping professions and in their traditional role as nurturers, women are called upon to bear a heavy load in this struggle.

Women are one of the identified target groups in the national strategy on AIDS. Health and Welfare is working closely with community organizations to produce education and prevention materials specifically designed for women.

This government is committed to protecting all Canadians from the further spread of this deadly disease. We are pleased to support Canada's participation in World AIDS Day.

* * *

## WORLD AIDS DAY

**Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing):** Madam Speaker, tomorrow is World AIDS Day. While I would like to express my support for the thrust of this government's response to the AIDS epidemic in the form of the National AIDS Strategy released in June, it is important to realize that the strategy leaves many issues unaddressed.

The principles contained within the strategy and its direction are sound. Unfortunately, the lack of resources threatens the strategy's implementation.

The government needs to increase funding for AIDS education, research and prevention. It needs to increase funding for community groups and for human resources within the Department of National Health and Welfare. It needs to do so over the long term so that long-range planning can take place. Stronger government effort is needed to educate and inform the public. In particular, the federal government must fulfil its commitment to add sexual orientation to the human rights code.

The Minister of Employment and Immigration should remove the restrictions on travel and immigration in Canada for persons with HIV or AIDS, and resources must be made available to address the growing problem of AIDS in Canada's prisons. The federal government must also collaborate with the provinces to ensure adequate resourcing of provincial plans, anonymous

AIDS testing, increased support to community groups and access to affordable treatment.

In conclusion, it is important to recognize that the minister has taken an important step forward with the National AIDS Strategy.

* * *

## BILL C–210

**Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie):** Madam Speaker, Charles Ng, wanted for mass murder in California, is fighting extradition proceedings. Already he has spent five years in a Canadian prison.

Thousands of Canadians want changes to the Extradition Act. Our procedure now allows foreign fugitives to remain in Canadian custody rather than face justice at home. A bill presented by the member from Peterborough would reduce the extradition proceedings up to a year and a half.

We had the opportunity to vote and the NDP delayed the vote. The means are here to improve the act but the NDP has thwarted these efforts.

The bill should be voted on and sent to committee.

* * *

## WORLD AIDS DAY

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Madam Speaker, it is not without reason that World AIDS Day on December 1 has for its focus the increasing impact of AIDS on women, for 5.2 per cent of all adult AIDS cases in our country are women.

This may appear to be a small percentage. However reports show that new cases of AIDS for women are increasing at about the same rate as that of men, an alarming and unforeseen new concern.

Women who come into contact with AIDS and HIV infection face many stresses and forms of guilt like their male counterparts. Additional harmful psychosocial effects includes blame for the risk of transmission of HIV infection to their newborn and a lack of power in negotiating sexual practice which often results in violence and abuse.

These problems will not solve themselves. It is our responsibility to do everything in our power to initiate and maintain programs that will encourage behaviour changes in both sexes, particularly education toward safer sex, responsible sex, the use of condoms, the right to advertise information on our television channels and the right and choice to just say no.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Jean–Guy Guilbault (Drummond):** Mr. Speaker, Mr. André R. Nadeau, president of Pinard and Nadeau, the Ford Mercury Lincoln dealer in Drummondville, in my riding, recently sent me a copy of a letter adressed to Mr. Jean Chrétien, regarding the GST.

In his letter, Mr. Nadeau points out that in anticipations of the GST, his business has taken the necessary steps to prepare for its implementation, which was done at considerable cost. He even advised his customers that the price of cars would go down after January 1, which has caused many prospective buyers to postpone their purchases.

It seems, however, that the Liberal senators are prepared to go to great lengths to further postpone the final vote on the GST.

Mr. Nadeau is very concerned. Postponing the coming into force of the GST would be a potential disaster for his business, especially now that we are experiencing an economic slowdown. He therefore urges Mr. Chrétien to allow the immediate passage of Bill C–62.

Madam Speaker, this is tangible proof of irresponsible behaviour by the Liberal Party, at the expense of Canadian men and women.

* * *

[*English*]

## ATLANTIC CANADA

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Madam Speaker, the headlines in today's newspapers say it is official. We are in a recession. That is no news to Atlantic Canada. To prove my point let us review some headlines from Atlantic Canada on this government's economic mismanagement over the last two years. "New Brunswick to be hardest hit by VIA cuts"; "Military cuts, closures will hurt Nova Scotia"; "Federal funding cuts threaten troubled provinces"; "Change in grant policy another blow to ACOA"; "Maritime lads starve as Ontario gets fat"; "Atlantic chill"; "APEC sees $72 million yearly loss for Maritimes in military cuts"; "GST already damaging Nova Scotia economy"; "Federal policy hard on Atlantic economy"; "Nova Scotia to lose $40 million in UI benefits"; "Ottawa's bad–news downpour has Atlantic

residents reeling"; "Atlantic Canada, the nation's economic wasteland gets wasted again".

This is a consequential headline: "Tory support in Atlantic Canada at an all-time low".

However, there is one headline that is about to be written for December 11 that offers hope. That headline will read: "Jean Chrétien elected member of Parliament for the riding of Beauséjour". For the sake of Canada, that headline cannot come quickly enough.

* * *

## VETERANS AFFAIRS

**Mr. Barry Moore (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle):** Madam Speaker, I want to assure veterans and their dependants that the expenditure reductions announced last Friday will not affect their programs and benefits in any way whatsoever.

True, the veterans affairs ministry is having to bear its fair share of the cuts revealed in the supplementary estimates and has had to budget for $3.26 million in reductions. However, veterans affairs is managing to tighten its belt without touching direct services to veterans.

Mr. Cliff Chadderton, President of the War Amputations of Canada has applauded the approach taken by the ministry. In a news release Mr. Chadderton said the ministry's plan which includes a freeze on hiring is "a very gutsy decision by Veterans Affairs Minister Gerry Merrithew" and "is in keeping with the promise that the level of veterans benefits will not be disturbed".

I also congratulate the minister for ensuring that it will be business as usual for veterans and their families.

* * *

## UNITED NATIONS

**Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina):** Madam Speaker, 43 years ago on November 29 the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted resolution 181 (II). Known as the "partition resolution", it provided for a Jewish state and an Arab state, with Jerusalem under special international regime.

Since only the Jewish state came into being, the UN General Assembly in 1979, by resolution 34/65(D) requested member states to observe November 29 as the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People. The President and Secretary-General of the United Nations and the President of the Security Council lead a meeting of governmental and NGO representatives, and a message is read from the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

The objectives are: one, to draw the urgent attention of the international community to the continuing plight of the Palestinian people; and, two, to mobilize international public opinion in support of a just and peaceful settlement that recognizes the right of Palestinians to return home and to establish their own state in Palestine.

* * *

• (1110 )

## FISHERIES

**Right Hon. John N. Turner (Vancouver Quadra):** Madam Speaker, quillback rock cod tops the culinary list of Vancouver's Chinese Canadian community and is enjoyed by residents of Vancouver and tourists alike throughout the Pacific Rim.

The Chinese community in Vancouver is concerned about the Department of Fisheries proposal to reallocate quillback to the sportfishing sector and to impose a 300 tonne commercial quota without limiting entry requirements for full-time vessels. Without limited entry, the planned commercial cap will lead to a three-month season, making this fresh seafood available only from May to August.

While the volume production of quillback is relatively small, the social and economic returns are high. This labour-intensive fishery employs many people who maintain the live fish until sale, as well as supply wholesale and retail outlets.

The industry warns that the quillback stock could die within two years. On behalf of my constituents, supported by petitions which we will table later, I ask the minister to impose a limited entry program on vessels, to

establish an eight-month season on all Gulf fishing to protect the stock during spawning season, and to reverse the quillback allocation from commercial to sport by introducing the factors of culture and employment to the decision-making process.

Most important, I remind the minister, and of course the Speaker knows as well, of the unique importance of this fragile industry to the cultural mosaic of Vancouver and the British Columbia coast.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## FLEUVE ET MUSIQUE FESTIVAL

**Mr. Jean-Marc Robitaille (Terrebonne):** Madam Speaker, environmental awareness remains essential if we want to change our habits. This year, over 15,000 people took part in the Fleuve et Musique festival in Repentigny, in my riding, a successful event that was made possible partly thanks to federal support.

This week, *Fleuve et Musique* received support from the United Nations, through the UN Environmental Program, for the fourth edition of a festival that has become both national and international in scope.

I support the organizers of this great ecological happening, especially Mr. Pierre Lussier and his team. I urge them to keep up the good work and I want to congratulate them on their dedication to this worthy cause. As in the past, they can count on my support, and I hope the Canadian government will support a project that makes a vital contribution to environmental awareness in this country.

* * *

[*English*]

## LANDFILL SITES

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Madam Speaker, the Keele Valley landfill site in the federal riding of York North is expected to reach capacity in 14 months. To the shock and amazement of North York residents, the provincial NDP environment minister last week cancelled plans for two alternate landfill sites in favour of overfilling the Keele Valley site.

Keele Valley is part of the environmentally sensitive Oakridges moraine where area residents and environmentalists are struggling to ensure the protection of wildlife and fresh water spawning, and to stop development that would destroy the area's sensitive habitat forever.

Toronto's waste disposal problem is even ending up in the national capital region, as garbage is shipped to landfill sites just outside the city of Ottawa. For a government that wants to come across as the great green defender, the provincial NDP are looking more and more like the grey federal Tories.

* * *

## EDUCATION

**Mr. Ken James (Sarnia—Lambton):** Madam Speaker, more and more Canadians are recognizing the true value of higher education to both individual and national development. Mark Gerson, a Toronto journalist, is a good example. In his recent *Globe and Mail* article "Stop Squawking and Start Thinking" he raises a number of interesting considerations on the subject.

For example, should we consider a trimester system which ensures year-round use of university facilities and spread the student labour pool beyond the summer months, or should we actually merge or close some facilities or programs, to name just two.

In the end, the article's central theme is that we do not need some sort of knee-jerk exercise. Rather, what we need is an all-encompassing review of the future of higher education based on critical thinking.

He also proposes that such a review should include whether there is a need for a stronger federal presence in higher education.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Gerson adds his voice to the growing number of Canadians who are seeking more from our educational system. Canadians need and deserve a system which prepares them for productive employment and lifelong learning opportunities.

* * *

## MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Madam Speaker, it is not often that a New Democrat has the opportunity to get up in this House and thank corporate Canada for its donations to the country, but I would specifically like to thank the Dominion of Canada General Insurance

Company, the Empire Life Insurance Company and Beatrice Foods company and Curragh Resources Inc. for allowing the member for Vancouver Quadra to be in the House today.

I am sure his constituents and members of Parliament are very glad that he has had this opportunity. We would like to thank the corporation specifically for replacing Jean Chrétien who had exactly the same type of attendance in the House of Commons when he was on so many boards of directors and when he was in opposition, and felt no need to attend the House of Commons.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## WORLD AIDS DAY

**Mrs. Marie Gibeau (Bourassa):** Madam Speaker, tomorrow is World AIDS Day. This year, the emphasis is on women and AIDS.

The World Health Organization estimated that one third of the 8 to 10 millions infected with HIV worldwide are women. In the year 2000, there will probably be an equal number of new AIDS cases among women and men every year. On some 4,500 AIDS cases reported in Canada, nearly 5 p. 100 are women.

In Canada as everywhere in the world, women are increasingly affected by this pandemic disease. There are indeed the women who are themselves infected with HIV, those whose child or spouse are as well as all women health care workers, teachers, social workers and counsellors.

Women do play a key role in preventing the spread of HIV and they have been identified as a target group in our National AIDS Strategy.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member's time is up. We shall now move to oral questions.

# ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

## THE ECONOMY

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance.

Today, Statistics Canada has confirmed what thousands of Canadians who have been losing their jobs, farms, homes, and businesses have known for months. Statistics Canada has told us that the economy has actually shrunk for a total of the past six months, and that is the official definition of a recession.

Will the Minister of Finance finally use the dreaded *r* word and admit what everybody else in the country has known for months, that we are in a recession? Will he take steps today to get us out of this recession, the economic mess that his policies have created for all too many Canadians?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Madam Speaker, I think that I have been quite forthright with the Canadian people in talking about the weakness that we can expect in the economy this year. I mentioned that first in my budget of February of this year.

We are in a recession. The numbers in the Statistics Canada release today confirm that. This is something that has been apparent for some while now. I think it is significant, though, to observe that the numbers today are not as negative as what some economists had been calling for. There was some reduction in the level of negative activity in the second quarter, from minus 1.6 to minus 1.2. It is important to keep these statistics in perspective here.

There is weakness in the economy. That is very clear. But it is important that we not overdo this by excessive rhetoric about the state of that weakness. We are certainly not anything like we were in 1981–82, but it does mean that we have to do what we can to get interest rates down. As I have indicated on many occasions in the House, when we can see the easing of the inflationary pressures continue, we will be able to get interest rates down further.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, Canadians will find it astounding that the minister, in effect, says that he is sticking with the very policies that have gotten us into the economic mess that Statistics Canada has confirmed today.

Statistics Canada has identified high interest rates and the high dollar as major contributors to the massacre now under way in the manufacturing sector and, in fact, in just about every sector of the Canadian economy. This minister is sleep-walking to economic disaster, and he is dragging Canadians unwillingly along with him.

Will the Minister of Finance admit that his budget of last February was totally wrong and is now out of date, and that, in fact, his projections of growth and interest rates were totally wrong? Therefore, will he bring in a new budget right away to end the economic nightmare that his policies of recession, which he admits he has been putting in place, have been creating for Canadians and the economy? Will he do this today?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

• (1120 )

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Madam Speaker, this underscores the point that I have just made. We said in the budget that we are expecting an increase in the economy over the course of this year of 1.3 per cent. In fact, these numbers confirms that we are at about 1.0 per cent. That is very little change from what the projection was at the time of the budget.

I have commented on the deficit in the House. We are on track for something slightly less than $30 billion for this fiscal year. The deviation from my projection in the budget is equivalent to about 1 per cent of total spending. So, it is not a major deviation.

I do want to point out that consumer spending in the third quarter rose by 1.1 per cent. Residential investment and the non-residential investment, while off significantly, are coming off at extremely high levels of activity. In the case of housing, for four years running we were in excess of 200,000 housing starts a year. We had a huge investment boom in 1987 through 1989.

Another key factor here, going into this recession, is that interest rates were about 14 per cent whereas, in 1981-82, they were 21 per cent. The inventory balance is much better this time around than was the case in 1981-82.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, when the minister talked about the projections in his budget, he did not say a word about his projections on interest rates, and how the facts show the extent to which he is going to be off base on those.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, the Minister of Finance can no longer ignore the facts. Statistics Canada confirmed today that we are in a full-scale recession. I therefore want to ask the Minister of Finance to tell us exactly how long this recession will last and how much longer the minister intends to hide his head in the sand, instead of facing the facts and introducing new policies that will get us out of a recession that was brought about by the Minister of Finance in the first place.

[*English*]

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Madam Speaker, it is very frustrating to listen to the misleading statements that the Leader of the Opposition continues to make. I have commented on these on a number of occasions and I will continue to state what our best judgment is. I would match the record of our recommendations, our estimates, and our deficit projections of the economic and interest rate activity against the government of which he was a part any day, at any time of day.

The hon. member asks how long do we expect this recession to continue. I have said on many occasions that one of the key elements here is the inflationary pressures. We have seen some easing of inflationary pressures and we have been able to match that by close to 200 basis points drop in interest rates. We will continue to see those interest rates drop as we see inflationary pressures ease. Our expectations for the second half of next year is that we will see a recovery. But what we are putting in place now is a base for a return to non-inflationary growth on a solid basis well into the 1990s.

**An hon. member:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale):** Madam Speaker, so we are in a recession. This comes as no surprise to the thousands of Canadians who have lost their homes, farms, jobs, and their businesses.

There are only two possibilities: either the government has deliberately driven us into recession, or the government simply did not know what it was doing. Which is it?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**An hon. member:** Give it to him, Mike.

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Madam Speaker, we have had seven and a half years of strong economic activity in the country. As we have gone through this period of strong economic activity, there have been inflationary pressures building up. We have seen that in the investment boom and the housing boom we had in the 1987–88–89 period. The economy reached a point where there needed to be some catching of its breath.

We also saw, during the course of this period, significant inflationary pressures. We have had to take action to lean against those inflationary pressures and that resulted in higher interest rates. We are seeing some signs that those inflationary pressures are easing, but they are still there.

**Mr. Martin:** You're strangling the economy.

**Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre):** The hon. member from LaSalle—Émard is saying that the inflationary pressures are not there. They are very clearly there.

The inflationary pressures are clearly there. I have commented on these on a number of occasions. We are committed to getting these inflationary pressures turned down. If we are able to get the inflationary pressures easing further, we will see further reductions in interest rates.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale):** Mr. Speaker, this is not a question of the economy catching its breath, it is a question of the government having put a noose around the neck of Canadians.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Peterson:** The minister predicted in his budget a growth rate of 1.3 per cent for this calendar year. In order to reach this figure, we will have to have a growth rate of about 5 per cent in the last three months which we are now in.

Will the minister admit today that his growth forecast, just like his interest rate forecast, is way off the mark? Will he admit today his incompetence?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, what I will say is the hon. member's figures are wrong. The projection that we are making for economic growth for this current calendar year is 1 per cent. That compares to 1.3 per cent in the budget that I brought down in February of this year.

**Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth):** That's a 25 per cent drop.

**Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre):** Point three of 1 per cent in an economy of about $600 billion is not a very large reduction.

**An hon. member:** Tell that to all those people who have lost their jobs.

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Madam Speaker, it is official. Just like the Liberals in 1981–82, this government has led us into a recession. What is scary is that investment has decreased, exports have decreased, and the worst figures on economic growth are from the most recent months, August and September. I quote from Statistics Canada: "These were the largest back-to-back declines since April, 1982."

Will the Minister of Finance now admit that we are heading into a severe recession, hurting older workers, hurting young people, hurting women, and hurting poor people right across the country? Will he admit that this is a serious and important recession to which he has to respond?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Madam Speaker, this is precisely the excessive rhetoric that I think hon. members should avoid.

We are not in the same type of recession as 1981–82. We went into 1981–82 with interest rates in excess of 21 per cent. This time the peak in the interest rate was 14 per cent. In 1981–82, we had a major imbalance, a major build-up of inventories and in the recession there was a

huge drop. We are not in an imbalanced inventory position anything near what we were in in 1981–82.

That does not take away from the fact that we are in a recession, that businesses are hurting, and that people are hurting. That is why we brought interest rates down by close to two percentage points. As I have indicated on many occasions in the House, we will see a continuation of that if we are confident that we can keep our inflationary pressures under control.

I remind the hon. member that there is a recession under way in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia, so that this is not something that is purely a Canadian phenomenon. The difference between now and 1981–82 is that the Japanese and German economies are growing quite strongly.

• (1130 )

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Madam Speaker, I am not certain why the Minister of Finance thinks he can get away with that kind of nonsense.

He says that the United States is in recession. In fact, the third quarter figures in the United States showed a significant advance in economic growth, whereas the figures that have just come out show a decline. That is the reality and the minister knows it.

Like many members of Parliament, I have had—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I think the hon. member might want to put a question.

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** Your lights are out.

**Mr. Langdon:** Joe, if you stood up, perhaps you would be even smarter.

My question to the minister is this: Across this country, there are people weeping because of the jobs they have lost, because of the farms they have lost and because of the businesses they have lost. Is the minister prepared to take some action to change his policy thrust? Is he prepared—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** There was a question, I think.

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Madam Speaker, I have made statements in this House on many occasions. The basis for which we kept interest rates high up until the spring of this year was because we had significant inflationary pressures that, if we had let stand, they would have got out of control as they have in the United Kingdom today, where their inflation rate for 2 months running has been just short of 11 per cent.

In 1988, the British inflation rate and the Canadian inflation rate were about the same. That is the problem that we have avoided. The United Kingdom is going into its recession starting at much higher levels of inflation and much higher levels of interest rates. If I were in the shoes of my counterpart over there, I would not be very happy.

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Madam Speaker, it is the minister's responsibility to deal with this country and he has done a very poor job of it, as these statistics today show.

[*Translation*]

Canadians right across the country are feeling the impact of this very deep recession. So I ask the minister whether he is now prepared to change his policies? Is he prepared to lower the unduly high interest rates in this country? Is he prepared to reduce the value of our dollar to help Canadian exporters?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Madam Speaker, I can understand why the hon. member would insist on choosing the kind of excessive words he used in his question. We are in a recession, but it is not as severe as the 1981–82 recession. Current interest rates stand at 12 per cent, but in 1981 they reached 21 per cent and even more. The balance of inventories is now better than it was during the previous recession. My colleague would be well advised to weigh his comments and avoid using overly excessive words.

* * *

[*English*]

## PERSIAN GULF

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Madam Speaker, my question is to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Some states, notably the Soviet Union, have conditioned their support for yesterday's Security Council resolution authorizing force against Iraq on the need for the international community to try one more time to seek a peaceful resolution to the crisis.

Here in Canada, both the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs said that the choice of peace or war in the Persian Gulf is entirely in the hands of Iraq. Will Canadians be hearing from the Secretary of State for External Affairs or the Prime Minister about a Canadian initiative to encourage a

peaceful resolution in the gulf or is it the government's position that we leave that role to others?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Madam Speaker, it is inadvertent I am sure that the hon. member misleads the House.

The Security Council resolution that was voted yesterday, supported and indeed sponsored by Canada along with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and others, talks about a pause of goodwill.

As I indicated yesterday in some comments, that pause of goodwill proposal was in fact proposed by Mr. Gorbatchev on behalf of the Soviet Union in negotiations of which Canada was a very active and full partner. We were seeking to have a resolution which could send a very clear, unmistakable signal to Saddam Hussein that force would be used but that it would not be triggered with the adoption of the resolution yesterday.

What would begin with the adoption of the resolution yesterday was a period of time, some 47 days, in which it would be possible for all of us to try to seek some basis on which the Security Council resolutions could be respected, Kuwait could be restored to her sovereignty and the world could get on with the rest of its business.

Has Canada been involved in taking initiatives of this kind? Of course we have. I have just returned from extensive consultations in the Middle East. My colleague, the Minister of National Defence, was doing the same thing. During those discussions, we had conversations about, for example, the possibility of the kind of force that might be placed in Kuwait in a period after there had been a withdrawal of Iraqi forces were that to be the result of discussions between Iraq and Kuwait.

We have talked about a range of means by which the world, including with some help from a respected middle power like Canada, may be able to persuade Saddam Hussein that the rest of the world is very serious about the position that we have taken.

We are taking a number of initiatives. We will continue to take them, and I would hope that in future we, and the United Nations, might have the support of the Liberal Party in this House.

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Madam Speaker, I was trying to ask the Secretary of State what our next step was, not are we taking a pause to do nothing.

The UN resolution supported yesterday in the Security Council authorizes: "that member states use all necessary means to uphold and implement Security Council resolution 660 and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area."

Is the Government of Canada concerned that all necessary means, in effect, can encourage any country to use, for example, chemical weapons against Iraq, claiming justification on the basis of this resolution?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Yes, Madam Speaker, I am aware of international conventions signed by Canada and by the other countries that supported that resolution.

They have been breached by one country, Iraq. It would be an absurd distortion of the work of the United Nations for the hon. member to try to have the interpretation she has just put forward on behalf of the Liberal Party apply.

I was surprised, frankly, that the member did not ask me questions about sanctions. I have read about those questions being asked, but they have never been put to me in this House. Sanctions are the thin veil behind which the Liberal Party is hiding its failure to support the United Nations.

I am quite prepared to answer questions on that matter in this House. I am also quite prepared to put in place arrangements—if I have the attention of the House leader of the Official Opposition—that will ensure very full briefings for members of Parliament.

I can do that on two bases. I can do that on a basis that is available to all members of Parliament, or in addition to that, I can do it on the basis of a briefing available to Privy Councillors.

• (1140 )

The House will understand that some of the information that is available is highly sensitive. I am prepared to do everything within my power, as this government has been from the beginning, to ensure that the House of Commons can make fully informed decisions about this

issue which is critical to Canada, not only because we want to achieve peace in the gulf, but also because we want to maintain the momentum that we have built up for the United Nations.

For the United Nations to fail, for it to be backed away from as it was in this House yesterday, would be a tragedy for all that Canada has stood for over more than 40 years in foreign policy.

**Mrs. Coline Campbell (South West Nova):** Madam Speaker, prior to my question to the Minister of National Defence, I would point out to the Secretary of State for External Affairs why he is not forcing Committee 661, of which we are vice-chair, to give us a report on economic sanctions. They have been in existence for how long?

Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. The minister knows that the Order in Council passed September 15 sending our forces to the Persian Gulf cited only those Security Council resolutions related to the enforcement of economic sanctions against Iraq.

Can the minister say whether this government will bring forward a new Order in Council to cover the resolutions passed yesterday at the UN, calling for the use of "all necessary means" to get Iraq out of Kuwait?

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member forgot to mention that in the Order in Council which dispatched Canadian men and women to serve in the multinational effort was the deterrence of aggression.

I informed the House during the debate that took place the day before yesterday that if there was a change in the commitment of the Canadian forces, if there was a need to bring about that change, it would be brought forward to the House at that time.

This time what is covered in the Order in Council, the presence of the Canadian forces there and their capability and the tasks they have assumed, are perfectly concurrent and will remain that way. If there is any change, we will inform the House in due time.

**Mrs. Coline Campbell (South West Nova):** My supplementary is to the Minister of National Defence. Again, it is a question of interpretation, I am sure. Yes, the Order in Council used military forces, but it was to enforce economic sanctions of resolution 665.

We have had many resolutions since that, particularly yesterday's. The National Defence Act says that there must be an Order in Council specifying why our forces are going over there, particularly in light of yesterday, whereby after January 15 we will be sending them into a forum of war.

Will we at least have a debate in this House before January 15? Will he assure us that there will be a debate. He knows that the recess is coming. Will he assure us that there will be a debate on the change of our forces' role in the Persian Gulf after January 15, 1990?

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** Madam Speaker, I would ask my hon. colleague to review the National Defence Act. What the government did was comply with convention. We felt it was important to have a debate that would allow us to bring forward the Order in Council. It was not a legal requirement. It was something the government did because we believed it was important that the House put its signature on what we were doing at the time.

As I said earlier to the hon. member, if there is a change in the role of the Canadian forces, we have said, the Secretary of State for External Affairs has said, the Prime Minister has said, that we would bring it forward to the House for debate in due course.

I can assure the hon. member that there has been no change in the role of the Canadian forces in their function, in reality and in practice. They are there to enforce the world's condemnation of Iraq. They are there to bring about peace and security in a region where it is important, and I would hope that the Liberal Party would support them.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** We are getting into speeches today when this is a very important matter.

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs and concerns the gulf crisis.

Reports from Washington now state that the United States pushed the United Nations Security Council for a January 15 deadline because of declining troop morale, loss of domestic political support, changing weather conditions in the gulf and the approaching religious holidays. None of these reasons justify a deadline for war.

Are these the reasons the United States government gave to Canada for the necessity of the January 15 deadline?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member unfortunately is misinformed.

The idea of the pause did not come from the United States. The idea of the pause came from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It was proposed personally by President Gorbatchev in the discussions involving a number of world leaders with regard to the most effective way in which this matter could be dealt with in the United Nations.

Nor is it a deadline, nor is it an ultimatum. As the language of the resolution makes very clear, language voted for by everyone there except China, Yemen, and Cuba, it is a pause of goodwill. It is designed very explicitly—and the debate in the Security Council made that clear yesterday—to provide Saddam Hussein with a strong incentive to consider his options and to look for a way to peace.

I have just been informed—I have not confirmed this myself—that President Bush, in pursuance of this initiative, has just invited Tariq Aziz, the foreign minister of Iraq, to come to Washington and has indicated his willingness to have Secretary Baker go to Baghdad as one of several steps; some that Canada is taking, some that other countries are taking, to try to ensure that we use this pause productively so that we can end this situation peacefully in accordance with the resolution of the Security Council.

It was clear that before yesterday' action Saddam Hussein thought the world was bluffing and he was not prepared to seek a peaceful solution. We hope that that illusion has now been swept away and that he too will join the rest of us in seeking a peaceful solution.

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is to the same minister.

Canadians are not only facing a war crisis. We are facing an information crisis. Yesterday the government gave no information on the effectiveness of sanctions, and now it refuses to admit the real reasons for justifying the January 15 deadline.

This government continually talks of a pause of goodwill. Is not January 15 nothing more than an artificial and arbitrary deadline for war?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** No, Madam Speaker, it is not. I am sorry to have to repeat this several times to the member; I think the rest of the House understands.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** What it does is create a period in which it is possible first for the world to signal its seriousness to Saddam Hussein. The colleagues of the hon. member who put the question are shouting so that he cannot hear my answer.

First, it was seeking to send a very serious message to Saddam Hussein so that he would be prepared to enter into the kind of serious work that could lead to a peaceful solution but, second, it very explicitly declined to follow the normal practice which would have made the capacity to use force effective yesterday, and instead of yesterday it will be effective some time in the future.

This gives the world 47 days to work for peace. I think that is considerably better than having a situation in which there could have been the threat of force, the use of force, triggered yesterday. What was triggered yesterday was a process that can lead to peace if Saddam Hussein seeks peace.

I would hope that members of this House of Commons will put aside whatever ideology is driving them and join us in trying to find a solution to one of the most serious crises the world has faced in the last 40 years.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## HEALTH

**Mrs. Marie Gibeau (Bourassa):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In light of the seroprevalence studies which have just been made public and which indicate the presence of HIV infection in women, and considering that this year's theme for World AIDS Day is «Women and AIDS», would the minister tell the House what the government is doing to protect women against this fearful disease?

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** As the hon. member said, Madam Speaker,

December 1 is World AIDS Day and the theme is "Women and AIDS". According to the World Health Organization, one third of AIDS-infected people in the world are women.

[*English*]

We have taken a number of actions in Canada to try to address this problem, including the distribution of information kits to AIDS organizations and women's groups, the production of posters to help to educate people, the funding of a national conference and local workshops, the distribution of a special pamphlet on women and AIDS, and the development of a discussion paper on preventive strategies for women.

• (1150)

In this way we hope that we can stop this needless tragedy before more lives are lost.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## BÉLANGER-CAMPEAU COMMISSION

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. We know that the Prime Minister had a private meeting with co-chairmen Bélanger and Campeau. We also know that the Meech Lake failure was largely due to the closed doors process. Why is the Prime Minister now making the same mistake? Why is he not prepared to appear publicly before the Bélanger-Campeau Commission?

[*English*]

**Mr. Andre:** The failure was due to Jean Chrétien and Pierre Trudeau.

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Madam Speaker, my understanding is that under the terms of reference of the Bélanger-Campeau Commission it is not entertaining representations by elected members of Parliament and elected officials. That is my understanding. I may stand to be corrected on that but, if that is the case, then it obviously speaks for itself.

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Madam Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister is not aware of the fact that members of Parliament have already appeared before the commission. Surely the Prime Minister of Canada has the right to speak publicly for Canada before that commission. The public is tired of secret meetings and closed door, back-room politics.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister commit the government today to a public appearance by the Prime Minister to speak for Canada before the Bélanger-Campeau Commission?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Madam Speaker, as the hon. member knows, we have set up the Spicer commission to obtain the views of all Canadians about the future of Canada. There are various commissions undertaking studies and assessments into Canada's future that are being conducted by all of the provinces. Is the hon. member suggesting that the Prime Minister should appear before all of them?

My sense is that the federal government's leadership is being demonstrated in the establishment of the Citizens' Forum on Canada's Future. Obviously, on the basis of the input that is going to be received, the federal government will take further action down the road.

It has been pretty clear that what has been lacking in this whole process is the lack of opportunity for individual Canadians to participate in the process. We have provided that vehicle. Why doesn't the hon. member give it a chance to work? I think it deserves a fair chance.

* * *

## MINING

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Madam Speaker, in the absence of the the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, my question is for his parliamentary secretary.

The parliamentary secretary knows that in the community of Elliot Lake this year the mining industry has lost some 2,200 direct jobs and many more in the secondary sector. Similar losses were suffered in other areas of northeastern Ontario last year, representing over 15 per cent of all the direct mining jobs in the region.

Do the parliamentary secretary and the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources agree with their estimate in 1988 that at least $1.3 billion a year has to be spent on exploration in the mining sector in order to maintain this sector and maintain the employment?

Does the parliamentary secretary, on behalf of the government, agree with that estimate of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources?

**Mr. John A. MacDougall (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Madam Speaker, I can certainly agree with the hon. member for Algoma that his community, along with mine and other parts of northeastern Ontario, is going through a very difficult time in terms of mining.

The fact is that resources are mined and they come to depletion. There are also other pressures out there. The world price dictates the price of material not only in northeastern Ontario, but across Canada.

As a department we have certainly been monitoring and looking to see what can help not only Algoma and Timiskaming but other parts of the country. As well, through Employment and Immigration and through federal government committees chaired by ministers, we are looking at economic development and we will certainly continue to do that.

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Finance.

The minister will be meeting today with some mayors and reeves from municipalities in northeastern Ontario and northwestern Quebec representing 40 mining communities.

For 1991 the projection of exploration and development will fall to about one-third of what the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources estimates is needed in order to maintain the mining industry.

Would the minister make a commitment today to bring in new incentives to promote mineral exploration and development and ensure the very future of these mining communities, so that there will be adequate exploration taking place and the haemorrhaging and loss of jobs will be stopped?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Madam Speaker, I am looking forward to meeting the mayors from northern Ontario and listening to the points of view they will be expressing to me.

We are concerned, as the parliamentary secretary has just expressed. This matter is a world-wide problem. We have looked at our incentives in relation to other countries. We believe a very competitive set of incentives is in place now. The price of gold has been under pressure. This is affecting the willingness of companies to spend money in new exploration.

The fact that northwestern Quebec has a significantly higher rate of depletion supports the flow-through share concept and is not drawing large amounts of moneys from investors. I think that is a significant element in this whole problem.

As the parliamentary secretary and I said, we are looking at various alternatives here. I am looking forward to my meeting.

* * *

## AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Rod Laporte (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre):** Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Farmers do not have to see the figures today from Statistics Canada to know that for some time they have been in a recession. In fact farmers across the country are suffering.

In Saskatchewan we are facing the worst situation we have seen since the 1930s, with an average of four new foreclosure notices going on every single day.

What we need in this country is a permanent agricultural farm bill, which the minister has promised but has not yet delivered.

Will the minister be introducing a farm bill in this House before Christmas so that we can begin to give it the detailed study and debate required to have it in place for the 1991 crop year?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's support for the initiatives we are undertaking, namely the establishment of a grains safety net and stabilization program.

Discussions have been continuing with the provinces, because it will be a shared responsibility. We are pleased to report to the hon. member that we have reached agreement in principle on the major components of the program. It is our intention, hopefully, to work out the details so that we can have in place an improved safety net and stabilization program for the 1991-92 crop year.

**Mr. Rod Laporte (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre):** Madam Speaker, that is important, but it is also important that the bill is thoroughly debated in the House. If it is to be

in place for the 1990–91 crop year, it should come to the House shortly.

Some 24 farm and rural groups from across the province of Saskatchewan will meet tomorrow in Grayson to search for solutions to this tragic situation, and a strong viable agricultural base is crucial to the future.

Will the minister give a message to the people who will meet in Grayson that in fact the bill will be in the House before Christmas so that we can begin the debate and have the bill and a program in place for farmers for the 1991 crop year? Will he give some assurance that bill will be in the House before Christmas?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Madam Speaker, indeed it is a tragic situation. One of the issues we will be pursuing collectively as the government and with other like-minded agriculture exporting nations is the negotiations at Brussels involving the GATT, where we are firmly committed to ending the grain subsidy war by the reduction and indeed the removal of all export subsidies, along with greater market orientation and improved market access.

We believe this strikes at the very heart and core of the problems that western Canadian oilseed and grain producers are facing. We are clearly attacking this issue on two fronts: the international front and the domestic front. I would hope we will be in a position to provide those words of encouragement to which the hon. member has referred.

[*Translation*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Last question. The hon. member for Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead.

* * *

## ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

**Mr. François Gérin (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice and concerns the case of a Quebec minor, Maxime Gariépy, who has been held in a Florida prison for the past few months. The young man pleaded guilty and was sentenced to life imprisonment for a crime involving rather unusual circumstances. Could the Minister of Justice confirm that the government has been asked to consider a transfer to Canada and that it has the necessary information? Could she inform the House when, approximately, she will decide to allow this Canadian to serve his sentence in the country? Furthermore, since we have been informed that this young man suffered a severe beating in the U.S. prison, I would like to ask the Minister whether she could arrange with U.S. authorities to have this Canadian and Quebecer given the necessary protection.

**Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Transport):** Madam Speaker, I understand that the Solicitor General is aware of Mr. Gariépy's situation and is closely monitoring the request for a transfer to Canada. We are trying to accelerate the process in order to pursue the investigation by the Solicitor General.

* * *

## POINT OF ORDER

### PERSIAN GULF CRISIS—QUESTIONS ABOUT ECONOMIC SANCTIONS

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Madam Speaker, on a point of order. During Oral Question Period, the Secretary of State for External Affairs seemed surprised and even critical in his remarks about questions the opposition has been asking for nearly two weeks about current economic sanctions, in connection with the situation and the crisis in the Middle East.

[*English*]

We have asked for the information on the investigations or whatever the government has in its possession on the sanctions for several weeks. The member for Winnipeg South Centre asked for the information two or three weeks ago. This week alone my leader asked for it five times and the member who asked the question today asked for it at least four times.

Therefore, I am asking the Secretary of State for External Affairs, in the interest of open government, and in the interest of giving Canadians the information they require and need to assess the situation. We know that Canada is vice-chair of the sanction committee of the United Nations. We know that the government has those facts. I took it today that the minister is disposed to share information with the House of Commons, at least

with the standing committees on external affairs and defence.

I was wondering if I could ask the minister for his co-operation. I feel that he wants to give some information to us. Will he do it either in a statement on motions today or Monday or by officially briefing members of Parliament at an appropriate time or by briefing the external affairs committee, at which time all members could attend?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Madam Speaker, on the point of order, I simply found it curious that the opposition was putting questions to me on days when I was not in the House and when I was in the House did not put any questions, but that is perhaps their interpretation of parliamentary behaviour.

However, I think I gave an undertaking to the House. Let me repeat it. I want the members of the House to be as fully informed as possible about the impact of sanctions. Speaking generally, some impact of sanctions is being felt by the people of Iraq. There is no evidence that in the next several months there will be any impact upon the decision makers in Iraq.

If we were to rely only on sanctions, the consequence would be that over that period of time we would run the risk of more children dying, we would run the risk of Kuwait being sacked even more than it is now. We would run the terrible risk in that highly volatile region of some mistake being made which could inspire a conflagration that no one in this world wants.

It is important that as much detail as is possible be known to members. I indicated two categories of briefing that are imposed upon me by the circumstance. One has to do with information that can be generally available. Certainly I will find ways to have that organized and made available regularly to members of the House. Probably it would be easier to do that through either a general briefing or an appearance before the standing committee.

There is another problem. Some of the information with which we are dealing is highly confidential. Members would understand why that is the case. Some members of this House have sworn an oath as Privy Councillors. I would be prepared to try to work out some arrangement, if it is acceptable to members of the House and it may not be for good reasons, in which there could be another level of briefing on that basis of confidentiality to members who have sworn the oath as Privy Councillors. If the Official Opposition has other suggestions as to how this information can be made available more efficiently, I am prepared to consider that.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, I would like to address the same point of order. I think Canadians should realize that there is no time in the Question Period, if one sticks to the conventions as to how long a minister is permitted to answer, to provide the kind of complete detail that we have been seeking repeatedly over the past several weeks about how the sanctions are working.

I do not think the Secretary of State for External Affairs should leave the impression that there was time today or any time in Question Period for the kind of detailed information we have been seeking and that Canadians want.

Furthermore, contrary to his suggestion that the answers had to come from him, Canadians should know that the answers could have come from the Prime Minister or the Deputy Prime Minister or any one of a number of other ministers during his absence. The answers did not have to come only from him, especially when we wanted the information before the time came for the government to vote at the United Nations yesterday.

Therefore, we again say that we should consult and work out the best way to inform, not just a limited number of members who may be Privy Councillors, but Canadians generally. They have a right to know as much as possible about how sanctions are working to be able to make up their minds about the appropriateness of the conduct of the government.

That is why we asked for a statement on motions to which we could reply. That is why we asked for briefings open to all members and to the public, likely through the external affairs committee. Let's get on with that, rather than the minister being concerned that he did not get a chance to make a statement, which he would not be allowed to do in any event, during Question Period.

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on the point of order. I will be as brief as possible.

The impression I am interested in leaving, because it is the fact, is that I am looking for a way to inform fully as many members of this House as possible. I hope the Leader of the Opposition will not casually disregard the problem that I face. He, as a Privy Councillor, knows that some of this information is highly confidential and cannot be broadcast on the CBC. It should be held to members who have taken an oath in this House. I am prepared to take the extraordinary step of making that available.

I was a Leader of the Opposition myself and I know there are circumstances and reasons sometimes why an opposition does not want to accept an arrangement of that kind. That is fine. Within the limits of the possible, I will try to make all of the information that is available to us and that an be circulated, available to members of Parliament. If it is acceptable to brief Privy Councillors separately, I think I can make additional information available. In any event, we will do the best we can.

If the member wants a statement in the House so there can be a debate, that is a different kind of question. I am prepared to enter into debate. We have done it regularly on this issue. I think what he is asking for, if I understand him, is a calm, detailed outline of the information that we have, so that all members of the House can come to some understanding of the effectiveness of sanctions. I am really in his hands as to the way that can be done. I think it should be done in a way that encourages the presentation and consideration of objective information, rather than something that might simply be an occasion for debate. As he knows, I am always ready for debate.

[*Translation*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I accepted the question by the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier on a point of order, although it was not exactly a point of order. We listened to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and to the Leader of the Opposition. However, I don't think this is the proper venue for getting the kind of results the various parties would like to see, with respect to getting answers to questions as well as giving answers to certain questions. I think it would perhaps be wise to resume our proceedings and let those responsible get together and find a normal way to get answers to their questions.

• (1210)

[*English*]

**Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing):** Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Secretary of State for External Affairs for the spirit with which he put forward the suggestions. I did want to remind him and the House that not all parties in the House have Privy Councillors.

It would be useful and helpful, and in fact it seems to me necessary, for the briefing that he suggests to be available to all members of the House of Commons, whether they be Privy Councillors or not. I look forward to the discussions which will lead to a fruitful resolution of this issue.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 47 petitions.

* * *

[*Translation*]

### BILL C-84

PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

**Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Manicouagan):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the report of the Legislative Committee on Bill C-84, an Act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada, without amendments.

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

[*English*]

## IMMIGRATION ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-345, an act to amend the Immigration Act (visitors visas). He said: Madam Speaker, I wish to thank my colleague from Northumberland for seconding this private member's bill which will propose an amendment to the Immigration Act.

An increasing segment of Canada's population was born outside Canada. These fellow Canadians all have parents, brothers and sisters, and other relatives and friends in their countries of origin. Some years ago, in an attempt to stem the stream of fake refugee claimants—and there are many true refugees in addition to those—Canada initiated travel visa requirements for visitors from a number of countries including China, India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Jamaica, Guyana and Philippines.

Because of the new visa procedures, even bona fide family visitors are being denied visas. This has been the case for some time. Our visa officers are simply gun shy and feel they must refuse visas.

My bill would permit an individual Canadian to personally stand for and become a surety or guarantor of the proposed visitor. This specific procedure does not now exist in the act for visa applicants. Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

## PETITIONS

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant):** Madam Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 36 to present a petition signed by many citizens of Nova Scotia calling upon the government to axe the GST. The petitioners wish Parliament to cause the government to cease with a proposal which will shift the tax burden on to ordinary Canadians through a regressive consumption tax instead of through real tax reform.

[*Translation*]

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Madam Speaker, I have two petitions. The first one concerns the GST and was sent by Canadians in Quebec City—there are 183 signatures—and, according to a letter I received from Mr. Alfred Hunter, they are anxious to express to the House their objections to the government introducing a goods and services tax as of January 1991. Madam Speaker, your petitioners are basically repeating the same arguments we have used in this House for several months.

They maintain that this tax is not only regressive and unfair and will cause serious problems for low—middle-income Canadians; it also constitutes an attack, and I will read what it says here: "—an unprecedented attack on the incomes of Canadians and will force them not only to pay higher taxes but also to contend with higher inflation, higher interest rates and higher unemployment".

Madam Speaker, with these 183 Canadians who I represent, and there are many others, I ask the government to refrain from imposing a goods and services tax on Canadians.

THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Madam Speaker, my second petition deals with a more local issue, since it is in my riding, and I am referring to the Rideau River. This is a very important environmental issue, and Parliament should be aware of the importance of this river, which is polluted.

Your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament and the federal government to become equal partners with provincial and municipal authorities in implementing an action plan for the clean-up and maintenance of the Rideau River.

[*English*]

CANADA POST CORPORATION

**Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Madam Speaker, I rise, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to add a petition of 51 names to the thousands of names included in previous petitions from residents of the city of Port Alberni in my riding. The petitioners are fed up with the

government's mismanagement of Canada Post and Canada Post's management which is ignoring its 1981 mandate to improve customer service and employee relations.

Specifically, my constituents object to the closing of the drive-through mail facility in Port Alberni, the long delays in local mail delivery as a result of the closing of the local sorting facility, and moving mail sorting to Nanaimo and Victoria.

My constituents request that Canada Post Corporation be instructed to keep existing outlets, operate longer hours, expand revenue generating services, stop privatizing, and start increasing services to raise revenues.

[*Translation*]

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour and the privilege of tabling petitions signed by voters in the beautiful riding of Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, who of course object to the Tory government's GST, and rightly so, I may add. They are residents of Alexandria, Dunvegan, Dalkeith, Alfred and Embrun, in the riding I have the honour and the privilege to represent, Madam Speaker.

[*English*]

GANNET ROCK LIGHTHOUSE

**Mr. Greg Thompson (Carleton—Charlotte):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present a petition from the residents of Grand Manan Island.

This is yet another petition protesting the destaffing of Gannet Rock Lighthouse. To let Canadian people know, this lighthouse is in the Bay of Fundy in a very strategic spot. We do not want that lighthouse de-manned.

The petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the current staffing of the Gannet Rock Lighthouse.

RADIO LICENCE FEES

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure today, under Standing Order 36, to present petitions collected by the members of the Trumanville Volunteer Fire Department in Amherst, the Shelburne Volunteer Fire Department in Shelburne, and the Pomquet Volunteer Fire Department in Nova Scotia.

In each of these cases, the petitioners are asking the government to review its policy of increasing the radio licence fees and having the radio licence fees apply to volunteer fire departments. They believe very strongly that the government is misguided in this endeavour and are asking the government to go back to the initial commitment given by the previous Minister of Communications not to tax volunteer fire departments with these licence fees.

The petitioners ask the government to review its current regulations and withdraw it so that they can get on with the business of protecting the lives and property of those communities that they serve.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the great pleasure to table a petition to this House on behalf of people from my riding of Ottawa Centre and people from the Ottawa-Carleton region who are opposed to the GST on books and magazines. They call upon the government to withdraw this tax.

• (1220)

[*English*]

**Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition in the House of Commons, pursuant to Standing Order 36. My colleagues and I have presented literally thousands of petitions on behalf of Canadians who are opposed to the tax on reading material.

These petitioners are from Toronto and just immediately north of Toronto. There are 100 names on this petition. These people would like the government to reaffirm the historic principles embodied in tax-free status for the printed word by retaining the zero rate in the GST legislation and regulations.

LOW-LEVEL FLIGHT TESTING

**Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina):** Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure and duty to present three petitions, pursuant to Standing Order 36.

The first is from a number of people from across Canada who are concerned about the low-level flights that the government orders and allows in Labrador and eastern Quebec. They ask this Parliament to join with the Assembly of First Nations, the Innu of Labrador, and other aboriginal peoples of northern Canada, in oppos-

ing use of their lands for this attack training. They demand that the low-level flights be ended and that the funding for the NATO-NORAD training there, as far as it comes from Canada, be redirected to the benefit of the aboriginal people and to promoting sustainable development for all Canadians.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina):** Madam Speaker, the second petition is signed by a number of Canadians, primarily from Toronto, who are concerned about the goods and services tax.

These petitioners ask Parliament, not only to reject that tax, but also to reduce the need for a sales tax by reducing the bank interest rate so as to improve the economy and by increasing employment in useful work, such as protection of the environment, restoration of needed roads, improvement of VIA service, and industrial research and development.

The final petition is signed by a number of residents of Gloucester, North York, Ottawa, Nepean, Kingston, Hull, Montreal, and other places in central Canada, who are concerned particularly that the goods and services tax hits books, music lessons, and live entertainment.

Therefore, the petitioners ask the government to scrap the tax and bring in taxation which will tax the people who have money, instead of those who have none.

RURAL POST OFFICES

**Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East):** Madam Speaker, I rise, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present a petition, certified as to form. These petitioners are mainly from Ta Ta Creek in my riding.

They state that the government's policy of closing rural post offices discriminates against people living in non-urban centres and thus violates the established principles of fairness, and that the government's policy has hurt seniors, farmers, and low-income Canadians the hardest.

The petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to stop immediately the policy of closing rural post offices and direct Canada Post to put service ahead of profits.

The community of Ta Ta Creek is a small farming community and its post office is the most viable centre within their community

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

**Mr. Rod Laporte (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre):** Madam Speaker, I rise today to present a petition given to me by farmers from the towns of Plunkett and Viscount in the province of Saskatchewan.

The petitioners call upon the government to replace oats under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board. They also call upon the government to give oats and barley the same protection that wheat now enjoys under the Canadian Wheat Board, meaning that those commodities could not be removed from the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board unless Parliament decided that they should be removed.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Madam Speaker, again I rise, day after day, month after month, to ask the government, particularly in the light of the decision taken by the province of Quebec, not to tax intellectual thought, reading, books, magazines, and literature.

I hope the government is giving serious consideration to the implications of taxing the kinds of information that will affect the literacy and the educational potential of our young people and our reading interests in Canada. I deposit such petitions from Quebec and British Columbia.

IMMIGRATION

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I would like to file a petition of nearly 100 names, mainly from my own riding of Surrey North, but also from Burnaby, Delta, and New Westminster.

These petitioners point out that in countries where visitors' visas are required, it is taking two to three years for spouses to be able to join their spouse in Canada. This creates a tremendous strain on the family and is rather cruel.

They are suggesting that Canada undertake to devise a system whereby spouses in bona fide marriages from countries where visitors' visas restrictions apply, particularly areas such as the Punjab in India, would be able to enter Canada immediately, pending the processing of their landed immigrant applications.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to present a total of seven petitions from individuals in Kingston, Napanee, Odessa, and in metropolitan Toronto, whereby the petitioners recognize the importance of the printed word for freedom of expression, and as a corner-stone of our economic prosperity.

These petitioners call on the government to delete its plan to tax books and periodicals under the goods and services tax.

* * *

## STARRED QUESTIONS

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Starred Question Nos. 381 and 382.

[*Text*]

"IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT CANADA'S ECONOMIC PLAN AND HOW IT AFFECTS YOU"—BUDGETED COSTS

*Questions No. 381—**Mr. Karpoff:**

Did the government publish a document entitled "Important information about Canada's economic plan and how it affects you" and, if so, what were the budgeted costs for (a) creative and editorial work (b) production (c) distribution (d) postage (e) entire project (f) any other costs?

**Hon. Michael Holcombe Wilson (Minister of Finance):** In response to the hundreds of thousand of requests from Canadians for information about its economic policies, the government published an information guide entitled "Important information about Canada's economic plan and how it affects you".

The budgeted cost for the (a) creative work, (b) production and (c) distribution (preparation for postage) was $765,000. The actual cost was $761,810 which breaks down as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| (a) Creative work and (b) Production | $486,874 |
| (c) Distribution | $ 84,046 |
| Agency Commision | $ 97,237 |
| Federal and provincial sales tax | $ 93,653 |

The budgeted cost for (d) postage was $625,000. The actual cost was $594,915.

The budgeted cost for (e) the entire project was $1.39 million. The actual cost was $1.35 million.

Additional money was budgeted for (f) advertising: $57,000 by the Department of Finance for print adds in daily newspapers and $350,000 by the Secretary of State for their Community/Ethnic/Aboriginal Newspaper Program.

The editorial work on the information guide was done by public servants in the Department of Finance.

"IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT CANADA'S ECONOMIC PLAN AND HOW IT AFFECTS YOU"—BUDGETED COSTS

*Question No. 382—**Mr. Karpoff:**

Did the government publish a document entitled "Important information about Canada's economic plan and how it affects you" and, if so, was any of the (a) creative and editorial (b) production (c) distribution (d) mailing work performed by individuals or groups not employed as public servants and, if so, how much were they paid?

**Hon. Michael Holcombe Wilson (Minister of Finance):** In response to the hundreds of thousands of requests from Canadians for information about its economic policies, the government published an information guide entitled "Important information about Canada's economic plan and how it affects you".

The production of this information guide, including the creative work, the distribution and preparation for postage, was performed by Publitel Communications of Montreal. For their services, they were paid $761,810. The mailing of the information guide was done by Canada Post for $594,915.

The editorial work on the information guide was done by public servants in the Department of Finance.

[*English*]

**Mr. Cooper:** Due to the length of these responses, I ask that they be printed in *Hansard* as if read.

I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[*Translation*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-79, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Special Committee on the Review of the Parliament of Canada Act.

SPEAKER'S RULING

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** There are 14 report stage motions set down on the Order Paper, in amendment to Bill C-79, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act.

[*Translation*]

Motions nos. 1 and 8 standing in the name of the hon. member for Ottawa-Vanier are in order. They will be grouped and the vote on Motion no. 1 will also apply to Motion no. 8.

Motions nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11 and 12, standing in the name of the hon. member for Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, are in order and will be grouped for debate and voted upon as follows: if Motions no. 5 is agreed to, no vote will be necessary on Motions nos. 3, 4 and 6. However, if Motions no. 5 is negatived, separate votes will be taken on Motions nos. 3, 4 and 6. If Motion no. 11 is agreed to, no vote will be necessary on Motions nos. 9, 10 and 12, and if Motion no. 11 is negatived, separate votes will be taken on Motions nos. 9, 10 and 12.

[*English*]

Motions Nos. 7, 13 and 14, standing in the names of the hon. members for Churchill and Ottawa—Vanier, are acceptable. They will be grouped for debate and voted upon as follows. The vote on Motion No. 7 will apply to Motion No. 13, and a separate vote will be taken on Motion No. 14.

• (1230)

Therefore, I will now put Motions Nos. 1 and 8 to the House.

[*Translation*]

MEASURE TO AMEND

**Mr. Gauthier** moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-79 be amended in the French version in Clause 1 by striking out lines 9 and 10 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor: "alors réputés avoir été déposés devant le Sénat."

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-79 be amended in Clause 1 by adding immediately after line 16 at page 2 the following: "(5) Where a member of the Board participates in the exercice of the powers or the carrying out of the functions of the Board, the member shall not be held personally liable for the actions of the Board."

He said: Madam Speaker, the members of the Special Committee on the Review of Parliament have spent nearly a year examining the problems referred to them by the House of Commons. I must say I am very glad today that we are nearing the end. We are at the report stage, that is after the stage when amendments to the bill have been studied in committee. I hope the bill will finally be given third reading by the House so we may complete that important aspect of our work and, I imagine, go on to something else under the expert chairmanship of the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport, Marcel Danis, whom I commend for a job well done.

Madam Speaker, Motion No. 1 is a simple amendment to make the French and English versions the same.

[*English*]

In English, Madam Speaker, the text is quite correct. It says that any bylaws adopted by the board, or made under the section, will be deposited by the Clerk and they shall be deemed to have been tabled.

In the English text, it says "before the Senate". In the French text, it says "before the board". We are just trying here to correct the French text to make it of equal importance and to make it exact.

[*Translation*]

This is a very simple motion, Madam Speaker. It will amend part (3) of subclause 20.2 so that the wording will be the same. That is all I have to say about it, except that I hope members— I see the minister is leaving. I must not bore him, but this is an important stage of the debate

and this matter concerns us all, even senior members and senior ministers.

[*English*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

Motion No. 1 agreed to.

[*Translation*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** On to Motion No. 8. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Madam Speaker, just a word to say that this amendment will make the French version the same as the English.

[*English*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

Motion No. 8 agreed to.

[*Translation*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** We will now call Motions Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 11. Motion No. 2 will be voted on separately.

**Mr. François Gérin (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead):** Motions Nos. 5 and 11 will not be presented.

**Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of State (Youth), Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The hon. minister, on a point of order.

**Mr. Danis:** Madam Speaker, I understand that motions Nos. 5 and 11 will not be presented. I also understand, Madam Speaker, that the hon. member for Mégantic—Compton-Stanstead wishes to replace motions Nos. 3 and 9. Perhaps it would be appropriate at this time to ask the unanimous consent of the House for the hon. member to replace these motions, so that you will not have to read the original motions which are not to be moved in the House.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I believe all members heard what the minister suggested. The Chair agrees to let the hon. member present these motions, and I would ask him to lay copies on the Table as soon as possible so that I can substitute those for the copies I have here. The hon. member has the floor.

**Mr. François Gérin (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead):** After discussions among members of the Legislative Committee on Bill C-79 and after consultations with the experts, Motion No. 3 and the same applies to Motion No. 9, except that one applies to the House of Commons and the other applies to the Senate—reads as follows and I move:

That Bill C-79 be amended in Clause 1:

a) by striking out line 37 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"peace officer may apply to the Board for, *or the Board may, on its own initiative, provide the peace officer with*"

b) by striking out lines 46 and 47 at page 3 and lines 1 to 3 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"20.4(1), the Board may, if it considers it appropriate to do so, make any of its opinions, *including opinions issued under section 20.3*, available to the *peace officer.*"

Madam Speaker, I have a copy here for the Clerk's office. Basically, this amendment is intended to cover a situation where, if a peace officer conducts an investigation which concerns the manner in which the member's or senator's budget was spent, he decides to go to the Board of Internal Economy and ask whether, in the opinion of the Board, the expenditure made by the member is in order or lawful or proper. By this amendment we want to add that the Board of Internal Economy may make available, to the peace officer who so requests, any of its opinions, so that the peace officer may know the Board's opinion on the use of a budget item by a member or senator. Once he has this information, the peace officer can decide whether he intends to pursue his investigation or perhaps initiate proceedings. If he decides to initiate proceedings, however, he will have to make available, to the judge who will rule on the case, the opinion of the Board of Internal Economy. I believe that is a compromise everyone is prepared to accept. So this is the proposed amendment.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I will now put all motions before the House and we can then proceed with debate.

[*English*]

**Mr. Danis:** Madam Speaker, with regard to Motion No. 6, I would seek the unanimous consent of the House to change the last word in English. It says: "authorized by a judge of a provincial court within the". It should be "meaning" instead of "remaining".

If I could get unanimous consent to that, it would allow the Chair to put the motion.

• (1240)

[*Translation*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. François Gérin (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)** moved:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-79 be amended in Clause 1 by adding immediately after line 16 at page 2 the following:

"(5) Where a member of the Board participates in the exercise of the powers or the carrying out of the functions of the Boards, the member shall not be help personaly liable for the actions of the Board."

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-79 be amended in clause:

a) by striking out line 37 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"peace officer may apply to the Board for, or the Board may, on its own initiative, provide the peace officer with,"

b) by striking out lines 46 and 47 at page 3 and lines 1 to 3 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"20.4(1), the Board may, if it considers it appropriate to do so, make any of its opinions, including opinions issued under section 20.3, available to the peace officer."

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-79, be amended in Clause 1 by striking out line 42 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"or the peace officer has been advised by the Board that an application under subsection 20.3(2) has been made by the senator to whom the investigation relates and where an application for a process is".

[*English*]

**Mr. François Gérin (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)** moved:

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-79 be amended in Clause 1 by striking out line 25 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"authorized by a judge of a provincial court within the meaning".

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gérin** moved:

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-79 be amended in Clause 2:

a) By striking out line 41 at page 7 and substituting the following:

"may apply to the Board for, or the Board may, on its own initiative, provide the peace officer with, an opinion

b) By striking out lines 4 to 8 at page 9 and substituting the following:

"52.7(1), the Board may, if it considers it appropriate to do so, make any of its opinons, *including opinions issued under section 52.6*, available to the *peace officer*."

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-79 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out line 45 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"or the peace officer has been advised by the Board that an application under subsection 52.6(2) has been made by the member of the House of Commons to whom the investigation relates and where an application for a process is".

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-79 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out line 29 at page 8 and substituting the following therefor:

"judge of a provincial court within the meaning of section 2 of".

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Madam Speaker, I am prepared to yield to the mover of Motion No. 2, but I also intend to take part in the debate on these amendments.

Perhaps we should consider the historical context, Madam Speaker, to have a better understanding of the scope of the amendments before the House.

[*English*]

On December 12, 1989, members of the House will remember that many of us were surprised, to use the term mildly, to hear from RCMP Commissioner Norman Inkster that 15 parliamentarians were currently being investigated by the RCMP: 11 were being investigated for alleged Criminal Code infractions and 4 others for

alleged election law violations. The revelation broke with traditional RCMP policy of not commenting on investigations while they were under process and before charges were laid. It many of us, to say the least.

The press coverage at the time reflected the reaction of many parliamentarians, including myself. It is no exaggeration to say that we were somewhat angered by the news, given that the conduct of police investigations, whether or not a conviction results, can hinder and, we can appreciate, can ruin a parliamentary career. Just the fact that one is under investigation by the police leaves a bad taste out there. We always believe that elected officials should be open to scrutiny and should be available to answer questions, but we never suspected that the police forces would reveal to the public of Canada that indeed they were investigating 15 Canadians. That kind of created a situation in this House that was requiring of some actions. The House felt it was in its good judgment to strike the committee. The committee looked at this whole situation and the possibility of reforming or amending the laws dealing with this House and the Senate in a way to make them more possibly adaptable to modern circumstances.

We also appreciate—and I am sure, Madam Speaker, you will understand—the changing times and the reform of the House following the McGrath commission report. The McGrath commission suggested in-depth reform of our procedures and our practices here. It gave the Board of Internal Economy, which is the administrative body of the House of Commons composed in the old days of strictly ministers of the Crown, an enlarged composition. It included members of the opposition on the new board, gave it new powers, and changed the whole way it operated.

Members of the House were surprised to hear all of a sudden that the rules of the game we had changed here were being interpreted by way of a manual of instructions as to what members interpreted in terms of the expenditures that they were allowed to administer their offices and render their services as elected representatives to the people of Canada. Therefore, the manual was becoming some kind of bible for the police, and the interpretation of some of those sections was indeed difficult and possibly misleading to many people.

Therefore we took it upon ourselves that we should amend the Parliament of Canada Act. One of the important subjects that we had to deal with was the role of the board in determining what expenditures would be allowed under the budgetary expenditures of members of Parliament authority. Another important factor was how we could make sure that police forces and the justice system operate in an open, fair and just manner.

We recognize the duty of the police to investigate possible charges of misuse of public funds by MPs. Unfortunately some members of Parliament have abused the system. We recognize that this is far from being a perfect world and that the House of Commons is a reflection of Canada as a whole. The system is there, and sometimes people abuse it. We must have checks and balances. We did not want to impede in any way the justice system and how it operates.

• (1250)

We also had to balance the privileges we claim as members of Parliament to decide how to use the funds allocated to the members to represent their constituencies in an open and fair manner.

The committee looked at many things. We narrowed in on the authority of the board's rulings and opinions as to why or how the members should be expending public funds. We had to deal with a very difficult subject. I must admit that it took some time for many of us to make clear to our colleagues in the committee that we were not trying to impede police work but that we were trying to make it possible for members of the House of Commons and the Senate to obtain from the board clear and written opinions, directives that are easy to interpret, as to how we could expend the moneys in trust to us for administering our offices on the Hill and in the constituencies.

We dealt with a very contentious article at the time, which indeed many of us felt could be improved and was improved eventually. The motions and amendments before us today, as well as the bill as amended in committee, reflect an awful lot of understanding by all members in relation to the important matters as to how

the funds will be expended, who has jurisdiction over the expenditures, how members of Parliament are to behave in terms of getting instructions from the board as to what is available, and how such things should be done.

Motion No. 2 indicates that members of the board who participate in the exercise and the powers of the board shall not be held personally liable for the actions of the board. The rest of the amendments all deal with the specific exclusive authority of the board to determine exactly how members of Parliament spend the funds made available to them.

We have reached a fair compromise. We have reached a good balance in terms of allowing police forces to ask the board—it is permissive, I admit; they do not have to, but if they want to have a good case I think they should—for an opinion if it is alleged that a member of Parliament has misused the funds that he or she has to administer his or her offices. In turn, if the police force gets an opinion from the board, that officer must make it available to the judge when in the process it has asked for either a warrant or the police force believes that it has reasons to require more information and wants a search warrant or something else. That opinion must be made available because it is essential to the process. We want it to be open. We want it to be as clear and limpid, if I may use that word, as possible. We also want to make sure that it is fair. To be fair, I think police forces now have the facility to ask the Board of Internal Economy for an opinion as to the expenditures of funds.

I hope all members of the House would take very seriously that members of Parliament who have doubt, who want a directive or need to be told more clearly how to interpret a certain rule or a certain disposition, should in turn ask the board for an opinion before they dispense public funds. Possibly we have allowed for a little more largess, if I may use that word. We have allowed for past expenditures to be included in that. Sometimes things change and sometimes there are oversights; members did not think about it or did not know about it. The amendments would allow that members to ask for an opinion from the board on past expenditures, on present expenditures, and on future expenditures.

If members ask the board for its advice, I am sure we will have little difficulty in keeping this place open and clearly in public view. I do not think that anything in these amendments could be seen or could be taken as an effort of the House of Commons and the Senate to put themselves above the law.

We are trying to maintain a system here of *transparence*.

[*Translation*]

We are not here to draft special legislation for members. We are here to try and clarify the situation, and the amendments we have before us do just that.

**Mr. François Gérin (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead):** Madam Speaker, the Special Committee on the Parliament of Canada Act, which subsequently became the Legislative Committee on Bill C-79, met about fifty times, with some sittings lasting two or three days. During that time we saw committee members make a special point of being present themselves, despite changes in their duties. For instance, I went from being a Conservative Member to sitting as an independent member, and I am now with the Bloc québécois, but I am still a member of the committee.

The Deputy Speaker of the House chaired the committee, and this was an honour for the committee. He was appointed minister, but continued to chair the committee nevertheless. The Government Chief Whip, the House Leader and the opposition's Chief Whip, people with extremely important duties here in the House, decided to spend an enormous amount of time—over 50 meetings—on this committee, to deal with an extremely difficult problem that arose last year. It does not make life easy for members when they are told by the Chief Commissioner of the RCMP that 15 members of Parliament are under investigation. Fifteen members means 5 per cent. If we apply this percentage to the population of Canada, it would mean that about one million people are under investigation. There is something disproportionate about all this.

We asked ourselves: Where is the problem? And throughout the proceedings of the committee, for one year, we enjoyed the extraordinary co-operation of the Clerk of the House and his staff—especially Mr. Kirby—and also the co-operation of the Chief Administrator of the House, Mr. Riedel and our Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel, Mr. Pelletier, with their respective teams. Without them it would have been impossible to finish the job.

Fifteen members of Parliament under investigation, and a year later, I don't think a single one has been convicted—maybe one. In most cases, investigations did not lead to charges being laid. In some case, charges were laid but were ultimately dismissed by the court. In some cases, there were searches, but the court subsequently decided that there had been no grounds for authorizing a search. In all cases, however, irreparable harm was done, not to the member personally, because

there is always the possibility that compensation might be discussed, but irreparable harm was done to the voters who gave this person a specific mandate, because his ability to represent his riding, his constituents, in the House of Commons has been diminished.

We must consider, Madam Speaker, that a member, who suddenly is the subject of a public inquiry or allegations by the RCMP, can hardly be expected to be able to perform his duties as well as any other member. Obviously, it hampers the member in his ability to act as a member here in the Parliament of Canada as well as in his own riding. Fifteen of our colleagues were in this kind of situation. For most of them, it was like being the subject of a public inquiry. Their names were all over the newspapers.

• (1300)

This means that hundreds of thousands of Canadians were represented by members whose powers had been diminished because a police officer happened to decide to conduct an investigation, often as a result of allegations by a political enemy or whoever. However in most cases, absolutely nothing was found. However, reputations had been sullied, constituents had not been well represented, or not as well as they would have wished, and we definitely had an abnormal situation.

Where is the problem? Madam Speaker, I think there are two sides to this question. Members of the House of Commons, as represented by the Board of Internal Economy, have not done a good job of being absolutely open about their activities. The Board of Internal Economy, which is supposed to represent them, has operated like a private, exclusive club that does not have to act with the openness that we tend to demand of this type of organization today.

The Board of Internal Economy revealed its decisions to no one. They did not become public until they were tabled in the first ten days of the following session, and in some cases this meant three years later. How could a member have personal knowledge of a decision of the Board of Internal Economy if it was not made public until three years later? And how was a Canadian citizen, an officer of the peace or an RCMP officer supposed to know about the decision? He did not, through no fault of the RCMP. It wasn't the fault of the average member of this House but of the Board of Internal Economy which had not done its job. The bill will remedy this.

Perhaps some background information would be in order. Formerly, the Board of Internal Economy consisted only of members of the government in power. It consisted of the Speaker of the House and four government ministers. However, as part of the 1985 parliamentry reform, it was decided to make the Board less partisan, and membership was changed to include two members of the Official Opposition and one member of the third party in the House of Commons, so that today, we can say that the Board fairly adequately represents the members of this House. There is good representation, Madam Speaker, but the Board neglected to change its rules of procedure and create a secretariat, for instance. It forgot to appoint someone to act on behalf of the Board. It did not have the power to adopt by–laws and it did not publish them.

We had police officers who argued, showning their complete ignorance of the role of a member of Parliament, that a member was like a public servant. That is false, Madam Speaker. A member is not a public servant. A public servant can ask permission from his superior. But as a member of Parliament, whom do I ask for permission? I have said repeatedly, and I still say, that I take orders from no one except from the people in my riding. I have no superior. There is not a single member in this House who can claim to be my boss, certainly not! I am here on behalf of the people of my riding, in a very special situation. No other Canadian citizen has those duties.

So we are not public servants, as RCMP officers and peace officers in general say we are. Madam Speaker, even the Chief Commissioner told the Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General on December 12, 1989, that he did not know the Parliament of Canada Act.

He did not know what the Parliament of Canada Act was all about. On the other hand, he said that there were 15 members of Parliament being investigated because of expenses made under the Parliament of Canada Act. You can imagine that we ended up in a real mess: the Board of Internal Economy, which has rules which are not published; a RCMP officer who thinks that a member of the House is a civil servant; a RCMP officer who refers to the explanation manual, which is neither the Act nor the Regulations, and who decides to institute proceedings against 15 members of the House and the

Senate. That was quite a mess. That is why we ended up with so many people. That is also the reason why I moved all these amendments which are not mine alone. I discussed these amendments with the other committee members and they were in agreement.

To summarize, if I may, the whole legislation that we wanted to introduce would try to solve the problem in two ways. On the one hand, in the future, the Board of Internal Economy would have a secretary under the Head Clerk of the House of Commons. It would get a sort of a head office. There would be a person there to whom people could address their complaints and where members could direct questions. There would be someone there. There would be an office.

Second, the Board of Internal Economy would have the power to draft its own administrative regulations. That was necessary.

Third, the Board of Internal Economy would have to publish its decisions within thirty days whether the House is sitting or not. People would no longer have to wait as long as three years. If its members agreed, the Board of Internal Economy would have the power to straighten out a situation which it should not have allowed to deteriorate that much.

On the other hand, the RCMP will of course continue its investigations of members of Parliament, except that, before starting one it should begin by looking into the Act, and I will make sure that it does by personally sending a copy of it to Mr. Inkster, for I should like him to read section 52.6 which reads as follows:

The Board –

—meaning, the Board of Internal Economy—

—has the exclusive authority to determine whether any previous, current or proposed use by a member of the House of Commons of any funds, goods, services or premises made available to that member for the carrying out of parliamentary functions is or was proper, given the discharge of the parliamentary functions of members of the House of Commons, including whether any such use is or was proper having regard to the intent and purpose of the by-laws made under subsection *52.5(1)*.

(2) Any member of the House of Commons may apply to the Board for an opinion with respect to any use by that member of funds, goods, services or premises referred to in—

—a previous sub-section.

The Board of Internal Economy, therefore, has the power. Will it exercise it? As members of this House, we will deal with this issue later on. I hope so. It has to. It has the legal and moral obligation to do so, not only in the interest of the members of this House, but of all Canadians. So the police officer who is informed by a citizen—in bad faith in those cases, but often in good faith—that the member has committed an infraction concerning his budget will now be able to go the Board of Internal Economy and seek an opinion on the matter. If the officer is acting in bad faith and wants to act without going through the Board of Internal Economy, then the board will send him the opinion if he does not have the courage to seek it himself. But once the police officer has the opinion, served by whoever, he will be legally obliged to send it to the judge to whom he will submit any kind of legal request—search warrant, wiretapping, accusation, another warrant—and that is spelled out in the legislation. And not a justice of the peace but a judge so that members of Parliament will not be above the law. But members will be protected in the sense that the judge will have to take into account the opinion of the Board of Internal Economy which authorizes our expenses. If it authorizes our expenses, it will say whether the expense was correct or not.

Madam Speaker, that was the object of the amendments, most of them presented on behalf of the members of the committee, and I thank them all. In conclusion, I would say to my colleagues that what is being proposed today is probably the best piece of legislation we could have. It had been suggested to include something like "notwithstanding any section of the Criminal Code". That did not respect the principles which must guide us here in the House of Commons. But this bill provides enough guarantees for members, if the Board of Internal Economy does its job and if the RCMP act in good faith in their investigation by calling upon the Board of Internal Economy.

• (1310)

[*English*]

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Madam Speaker, I too wish to speak to the bill. At the end of June when this bill received second reading I, on behalf of the New Democratic Party caucus, rose to explain that we could not accept the bill as it was worded at that time.

The wording at second reading certainly gave a different situation from the bill than is before us in its amended form today. At that time the bill required an investigating officer to go before the Board of Internal Economy to get the opinion of the board before that officer received a search warrant or took any of the actions among those listed in the bill.

It did not stop an investigation, but if that officer did want a search warrant, did want a wiretap, or did want to take some other action, he or she was required to go before the Board of Internal Economy. The board then had 30 days in which to respond. That created, quite legitimately in my mind, a number of concerns. First, that we were being treated differently from other citizens in Canada and, second, that there was every opportunity, if an investigation was going on and an officer had to come to the Board of Internal Economy, there might be a leak and an investigation could be interfered with in that manner.

I do not think it was ever the intent of members of the House to tamper with a legitimate RCMP investigation. What we wanted was to cover some of the problems that had occurred as a result of the investigations which have gone on in the past and were referred to earlier.

Also, as a result of having the Commissioner of the RCMP appear before us a number of times, we heard that he and his officers had a number of problems when it came to dealing with members of Parliament. For example, if a complaint was made against a Canadian citizen with regard to a possible fraud or misuse of funds, then it would be normal for the investigating officer to go to the department concerned or the employer of that person. Through that means, the RCMP would probably receive the information it needed to determine whether an investigation should go forward.

The RCMP and the Commissioner appearing before our committee indicated that when it was a member of Parliament, and with our perceived parliamentary immunity in a number of areas, the RCMP believed it was necessary to get a search warrant in order to get any information with regard to what was going on within the budgetary controls or in the offices of a member of Parliament.

They themselves suggested that we look for some other mechanism which would enable the RCMP to do its duties and at the same time respect the traditional rights of members of Parliament to do their work, not only as members of Parliament, but on behalf of their constituents. Often, we have very confidential information in the same way as a lawyer or a doctor would, because people have come to us expecting us to act on their behalf on issues which are very important and confidential to them. They are often in areas of complaints against the RCMP and certain government officials.

Often, as members of Parliament, we act as ombudsman for our constituents. If those files can be opened, without any protection, then it is not just members of Parliament who would feel threatened, but, obviously, any constituent or citizen of Canada who was working through a member of Parliament who could find that those files would be in the public domain.

There was a need to balance our rights on behalf of ourselves and on behalf of our constituents and other Canadians, and at the same time, to allow the RCMP and other investigating authorities the information they require in order to conduct an investigation or even to discover whether or not an investigation is required.

As a result of the very long and often repeated committee discussions and deliberations, the bill we have now balances those two concerns. Our constituents are protected, but at the same time the RCMP is able to go forward, just like any other law enforcement agency, and get the information it requires. There is no way, with the wording of the amendments that have come forward today as a result of the most recent committee deliberations, that we are inhibiting an investigation.

Now an RCMP officer or another investigator has the right, if he or she chooses, to go to the board and get information that they may require. That is their option. It is not a decision that is imposed upon them.

I know, Madam Speaker, that my time has lapsed for this particular part of the debate. I will explain later some of the other ramifications of the legislation at the appropriate time.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** There are questions to be put on Motions Nos. 2, 3, as amended, 4, 6, as amended, 9, as amended, 10 and 12.

Motion No. 2 agreed to.

Motion No. 3, as amended, agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 4 agreed to.

Motion No. 6, as amended, agreed to.

Motion No. 9, as amended, agreed to.

Motion No. 10 agreed to.

Motion No. 12 agreed to.

• (1320 )

[*English*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** We will proceed now to Motions Nos. 7, 13, and 14. I remind hon. members that a vote on Motion No. 7 will apply to Motion No. 13, and a separate vote will be taken on Motion No. 14.

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill)** moved:

Motion No. 7

That Bill C–79 be amended in Clause 2 by adding immediately after line 19 at page 5 the following:

"(6) For greater certainty, the oath or affirmation referred to in subsection (5) only relates to matters of security, employment and staff relations, tenders and investigations in relation to a member of the House of Commons and nothing in subsection (5) shall be construed as preventing the communication of any information relating to other matters to a party caucus."

Motion No. 13

That Bill C–79 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 9 and 10 at page 10 and substituting the following therefor:

"matters of employment and staff relations, tenders, security, and investigations in relation to a member of the House of Commons, nor will I allow".

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)** moved:

Motion No. 14

That Bill C–79 be amended in the French version in Clause 3 by striking out lines 10 and 11 at page 10 and substituting the following therefor:

"Chambre des communes, ni de lui permettre (ni ne lui".

[*English*]

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Madam Speaker, the House will be aware that in committee review of the legislation a new clause was added to the bill, which is an unusual procedure. Normally, it would not be allowed in this manner. However, as a result of events that have occurred over the last little while, there is a feeling that members of the board often dealt with matters that should remain in private.

There is, I think, in the case of any board of directors or any management group, a need to have some matters dealt with in private and in confidence. However, the wording that came down from committee was not acceptable to our caucus. I had indicated so during the meetings of the committee. Therefore, we have put forward this amendment, which I understand will be agreed to later on today, which helps to clarify and restrict those areas in which the Board of Internal Economy would have the right to expect its members to keep confidences.

To be more clear on that matter, I will refer to some of the areas. The amendment states:

—The oath or affirmation—relates to matters of security, employment and staff relations, tenders and investigations in relation to a member of the House of Commons and nothing in subsection (5) shall be construed as preventing the communication of any information relating to other matters to a party caucus."

The Board of Internal Economy has a right and obligation to make certain decisions behind closed doors. It cannot discuss the relations of an employee in public. That is not fair to the board, but more importantly, it is not fair to the employee. In terms of matters of security of the House of Commons and the people working in the House of Commons, again, it would not do much for security matters to have them discussed in public. However, I do remind people that it would have to be real security matters and not just perceived security matters or matters of inconveniences which often occur in the House of Commons or on the grounds of Parliament. They have to be matters of real security before the oath could bind members of the Board of Internal Economy.

For those areas, and for the purposes of collective bargaining, the board does need the right to expect that its members will not break confidences.

However, there are a number of other areas in which the board is the servant of the individual members of the House and the members of the various caucuses. We have to expect as members of Parliament that we have a right to go to our board members and ask what is happening on areas that we have raised with the Board of Internal Economy. As mangers of our own offices, we have been asking for computers and we have been asking for clarifications of travel rights and privileges within our own riding. We have the right to go to our board members and get that type of information.

We have, I think, through the amendment put forward, guaranteed the right of the board to deal with those matters that they must deal with behind closed doors. However, we have made sure that the oath is not so encompassing that it binds members of the Board of Internal Economy to perpetual silence on matters that should be in the public domain. In addition to that, it prevents the board members from becoming so isolated from the other members of the House of Commons that they no longer work on their behalf, serve them, and communicate with other members of the House of Commons.

I hope that the wording proposed here will resolve that problem. I hope it will receive the support of all members of the House.

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Madam Speaker, I have but a few comments to make. I agree with my friend with regard to the oath of allegiance. Responsible administrators would not want to prejudice discussions by going out after every meeting and revealing certain information to the public. An example, would be the mandate that is used to negotiate salaries. One would certainly not want to go out and reveal its strategy.

There are other circumstances where there are situations requesting a certain amount of discretion. I agree with the member that the oath of affirmation referred to in the bill is essential. I agree also with the amendment, although I would have preferred that the wording be a little more related to the actual subject matter.

Instead of saying, for example:

> For greater certainty, the oath or affirmation referred to in subsection (5) only relates to matters of security, employment and staff relations—

—which I agree with. It continues:

> —investigations in relation to a member of the House of Commons—

—or the Senate for that matter, in the section dealing with the Senate. I would have preferred that it deal with matters relating to the operational budgets of specific members. That would have been more in keeping with the intent that I see in this oath.

I do not think that it is appropriate for us to be involved in investigations in relation to a member of the House of Commons. Investigations is a term that is used for many purposes. It could be investigations from outside sources, police, for example, or auditors, or something. Or, it could be investigations by the board itself into circumstances in the administration of the board.

A responsible board would want to pay very serious and close attention to how members are disposing and dispensing the public funds. Therefore, I would take it that the board would sometimes have reasons to call in members and say: "We are not so sure of what you are doing or what is being done is correct" without bringing in police or any other outside element. I do think that the word "investigations" is a wide word, but nevertheless I am willing to accept that.

I also would like to make sure that anything that is related to the operational budgets of members of Parliament is what we are talking about here, and not anything else. We are not talking about anything outside of matters relating to the expenditures now, past, or future of members of Parliament.

• (1330)

Motion No. 7 agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Motion No. 13 agreed to.

Motion No. 14 agreed to.

**Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of State (Youth), Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Point of order, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The hon. minister, on a point of order.

**Mr. Danis:** Madam Speaker, if the representatives of the Bloc québécois, either Mr. Rocheleau or Mr. Gérin, and the members of the New Democratic Party and of the Official Opposition agree, I suggest, if there is unanimous consent, that this bill be now read the third time.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The House has heard the suggestion of the hon. minister. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Hon. Shirley Martin (Minister of State (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)) (for Mr. Andre)** moved that Bill C-79, An Act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act, as amended, be concurred in at the report stage with further amendments.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

Bill, as amended, concurred in.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** When shall the Bill be read the third time? Now?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Hon. Monique Landry (Minister for External Relations) (for Mr. Andre)** moved that Bill C-79, An Act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act, be now read the third time and passed.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Debate. The hon. Minister of State (Youth), Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House has the floor.

**Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of State (Youth), Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to move for third reading of a bill that has been discussed on more than 50 occasions by the Special Committee on the Review of the Parliament of Canada Act. At this time, I would like to thank committee members, especially the Whips of all three parties, the hon. member for Churchill who was whip at the time, the Official Opposition Whip who was subsequently promoted and is now Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons, the government's Chief Whip, and also another member who has done an extraordinary job since the committee started its proceedings, the hon. member for Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead.

Madam Speaker, I also wish to thank the committee's research staff, especially Margaret Young and Jimmy Robertson, who did an excellent job for us for many months; the principal Clerk of the Committee, Mr. Kirby; and Mr. Sandy Birch, and also the many lawyers on Mr. Pelletier's team whom we consulted since we started our proceedings; Diane Davidson, and Gabriel Lapointe, who was hired by the committee.

As we all know, this bill represents a consensus formed by all members of this House and of the witnesses who appeared before the committee. I think we seldom have before us a bill as important as this one, and, as we saw in *Hansard*, a bill that was debated in this House with a complete absence of political partisanship.

I would like to thank all members who participated as well as the witnesses who appeared before the committee, and I would also like to say, Madam Speaker, that although today we are discussing Bill C-79, that does not mean the committee's work is finished. The committee still has a number of questions to consider, and we will continue to hold our meetings. In fact, the next item on the agenda is the matter of disclosure of funds made available to members.

We still have a lot of work to do, and I hope that my colleagues and I will be able to table many more reports and that these, like our first five reports, will receive the unanimous consent of this House.

I would also like to tell my honourable colleagues in this House that, when I say the bill was obtained by an exceptional consensus, I tell the truth. I would like especially to quote the words of the RCMP commissioner. We all know, as the member from Ottawa—Vanier said before, as well as the member from Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead and the member from Churchill, that this committee was established after the RCMP commissioner said a number of members of Parliament were under investigation. After studying the bill, the commissioner appeared twice before our committee. I would like to quote the words he used during his testimony on September 25th:

[*English*]

—where the commissioner says: "On a closing comment, Mr. Chairman, that, as the commissioner of the RCMP, I am absolutely delighted with all the work that has been done, with all of the attempts towards self-regulation, with all of the attempts to clarify the privileges and the disbursements to which members of Parliament have entitlement. I think all of that will go a long way to clarifying the issues of concern."

[*Translation*]

So, I would also like to thank the RCMP and its commissioner for their co-operation with the committee.

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Madam Speaker, I would like to join the minister in thanking all of those who helped us and who worked hard to try to keep the committee productive. I think that, inadvertently, the minister may have forgotten to mention some members who worked with us for several months. I simply wanted to mention my good friend, and his good friend, Marcel Prud'homme, the member for Saint-Denis, Howard Crosby, the member for Halifax West, and Dorothy Dobbie, the member for Winnipeg South. There is also Mr. Iain Angus who, from time to time, was standing in for Mr. Murphy. To all these people, to all these colleagues of the House, I would like to extend my many thanks, because they helped me to perhaps understand a little better the solutions to the problems that seemed to be of concern to us all around this time last year.

Madam Speaker, I would have some comments to make. First of all, I want to make things clear. The situation is not the same anymore. Once the bill is passed, Madam Speaker, the Board of Internal Economy will have some work to do, some challenges to meet. And I want to put on the record right now in the House that, as a member of the Board of Internal Economy, I will take my responsabilities. We will do all we can to try to respond to the expectations in the bill and to give members the views that they will ask for. We will also give them the support that they need to make sure that, in all cases, we are straightforward and totally capable of meeting the challenge, that is, that the Canadian public must be satisfied that their representatives work openly and do not hide behind systems, laws or measures that could perhaps protect them.

Madam Speaker, nowadays people have a very cynical attitude towards politics, and that is unfortunate. But there is one thing I know for sure, we are going to work very hard in this House, on both sides of the House, to correct that, to restore confidence and to change the atmosphere, so that people will not see politics as something dirty. In politics, the citizens chose some people to represent them to the best of their ability. We are not perfect, but we do our best. As far as I am concerned, I want to say, on behalf of our caucus, that we will do our best to try and be as open as we can, Madam Speaker, so that Canadians know there is no partisanship on either side of the House, that we are open, that we can all say:

We are not here to get rich, or to abuse the system, we are here to serve the Canadian people and this is the way we want to be seen. We want to put an end to the cynicism so apparent in the media and in the public towards politics. That has to stop, Madam Speaker, and that is why this bill is so important. The bill will give hon. members a well-known, easy-to-manage system, as well as the transparency and responsibility all of us have been looking for.

• (1340)

Having said that, I am sorry I got carried away a little, but it is so very important that this bill be considered as a major piece of legislation, quite essential for the proper management of our country.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[*English*]

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** Madam Speaker, throughout the entire exercise, I think this is the first time I have stood in the House relating to Bill C-79, but I spent many hours in committee. I am going to spend just a few minutes with my colleagues in the Chamber today.

In many ways in my eleven and a half years in the Parliament of Canada, this has been the most difficult assignment that I have accepted on behalf of the Chamber itself because you cannot move a word, comma or whatever in relationship to this bill without dealing with a conflict of interest. It is the bill which guides our lives as members of Parliament and members of the Senate.

It is a statute that deals with the House of Commons and our responsibilities within it. In particular, the amendments that are proposed in Bill C–79 deal with our utilization of public funds on behalf of what we hope is a strengthening of the democratic process rather than a weakening.

It has been an exercise for me. There is a tendency to want to speak about the bill and all the marvellous things that it will do, including providing greater clarity to members and society, things that my colleague has mentioned. I am going to spend most of my time today talking about this experience in relation to the press and the role of journalists in our society related to an institution this important in our society.

I would like to say to journalists' schools around the country that this may be a case study. Material in the last 12 months related to this issue would constitute case material for a university class. I say that somewhat knowingly because my career prior to coming here was as a university teacher and a full professor.

Out of the real world, Madam Speaker, you sometimes get your best learning material. I would challenge every editorial writer in the country to review their own conscience. When they write an editorial and say that Parliament is trying to pass a law that will stop the RCMP from investigating members of Parliament, I simply say to them: "Find something in the law that we are passing today or in the previous versions or in the June report of the committee, that was designed to stop the RCMP from investigating members."

They will not find it, because it does not exist.

That does not stop senior editorial writers and editors of newspapers and journalists in broadcast from telling Canadian people that is what we are about.

It makes me angry, but it also makes me sad.

I arrived in this place in May 1979, like most Canadians a believer in democracy and with a feel for the importance of democracy. In 1984 I went to the United Nations for three months during the fall sitting of the General Assembly. I discovered that I knew nothing about the importance of democracy when I arrived.

By the end of three months, looking at a world body where most are not democracies and really getting a feel for what it would be like to live in a place that is not democratically run, I came back to this country with a different and, I hope, a better appreciation of the importance of democracy.

When you look at the way journalists have treated this issue, you see they are eroding and destroying the confidence of Canadians in their democratic institution. This Chamber in which I speak today is more important than any one of us is or could ever be, because it represents the hopes and aspirations and the dreams of Canadians.

It is the place where we try to resolve the very serious problems of the nation to provide a better future for our children and their children. When our character is attacked collectively or individually by people who do not know what they are talking about but who have absolutely no difficulty in writing or reporting the most nefarious kinds of things about members of Parliament, my blood boils and my democracy is weakened.

I do not know what we are going to do about that over time, but my natural inclination as a Conservative is always self–regulation. The journalists of this country and the journalism schools had better get off the mark and do something about the accuracy of reporting and editorial writing in this country.

Just because we choose to put our names forward in our communities, with a willingness to sit in public office, does not mean that our characters can be assassinated at will by the public press in this country. Throughout this exercise, that was done. Some of us in this Chamber aid and abet that from time to time in the heat of the moment, and that is wrong too. That is simply wrong. Democracy and the institution are far too important for us collectively to tolerate this *ad infinitum*.

This bill deals with a problem and I will say it as clearly as I can. The RCMP, without the passage of this bill, has to go through a court process with a judge and everything else and put all kinds of allegations in writing to be able to get the simplest piece of information from this democratic institution. That is nothing that anybody in this Chamber decided on; it is required by 100, 200 and 300 years of history. The publication of those allegations that go about behind the scenes in a search warrant is

destroying people's lives: families, kids, children, MPs—all kinds of people. They make a laughing stock of the RCMP itself sometimes, with the absurdity of what is alleged.

This bill and the motivation of every single member of the committee from the start was to provide a simpler, cleaner way for an investigator in our society to get information about the people in this institution. That will save the RCMP embarrassment, that will save the members' embarrassment, that will save the members' families embarrassment, and that will save the institution embarrassment in the final analysis. That is what it has been about. Anybody who tells you anything different, Madam Speaker, simply does not understand or has some other goal or motivation in life such as to sell a newspaper.

Some people believe to sell a newspaper is the finest goal they can have in life. Well, it isn't. A newspaper should be accurate. The journalists have a responsibility to discipline themselves in the name of accuracy.

That is in another sense what the bill is about. There is no way that police forces in this country can ignore an allegation made against a member of Parliament. They have an obligation to investigate. What this bill is about is giving them accurate information so that there is no misunderstanding that can arise and no damage that can be done.

I will end in just a few moments so that my colleagues can have their chance to say something, but I stand here with pride because I know how hard the members of the committee worked and under what difficult circumstances. The biggest sense of pride is the sense that we have almost unanimous approval of 293 very special people: leaders in their home communities who were selected by the voters of this country and sent here. To say that members of Parliament are like everybody else is nonsense. They are special. They were elected to be special. They are handed special responsibilities, and there is no greater responsibility than the protection of the democratic institution itself so that it can function and it can be self–correcting.

• (1350)

The bill we pass today is a contribution to that activity, to that goal and that end. I am pleased to have been able to be part of that process.

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Madam Speaker, I was almost ready to get up and accuse the chief government Whip of filibustering the legislation.

I also wish to rise, at this time, to speak about the proposed legislation. I decided, more than a year and a half ago, that I was no longer going to serve as Whip of this caucus. Last December, a month before my term of office ended, I agreed to be on this committee for a few short weeks to clean up some problems that existed with the present legislation.

Here we are, one year later, and we are finally having the proposed legislation put through the House of Commons. I am glad to see that it has happened. I think it helps to clarify the role of the Board of Internal Economy and, more important, it helps to make sure that there are open investigations of members of Parliament that we as a House can provide information where it is required and we are not perceived to be impeding any investigation. I think that is very important.

I also think it is important that other parts of this legislation, which have received a lot less public scrutiny, have been put into place. It is important that the role of the board is clarified. It is important that the by–laws that the board enacts be tabled in the House of Commons, so that not only members of Parliament are aware of what the rules are but, in addition, the public is aware of them.

This committee was established with the intention of doing a few short weeks of work, but it has taken a long time. I would also like to point out, in the very few minutes I have left, that other things have to be done as well. The committee, in its deliberations, has dealt with some of the problems that we face. It has helped to ensure that the Standing Committee on Management and Members' Services is revising the manual, which more or less sets the ground rules for how we spend money and what are legitimate usages of the public purse by members of parliament, and that is important.

That is very important ongoing work by members of that committee, because our bible, if one wants to call it that, had become archaic and had a number of clauses which were not only unenforceable but which denied the reality all of us faced. I always cringed when I saw lines in it which said that we should not use our printing privileges for partisan purposes, that we should not be using any of our privileges for partisan purposes. When I rise in the House, I quite often have some partisan purpose for doing so. I was elected as a member of one political party. I expect to get up and speak, on behalf of that particular, partisan viewpoint. If I do so, I also

expect that I will perhaps mail out literature stating that I am a New Democrat, that this is what I stand for, that this is what I believe, and that this is what I have said in the House of Commons on those very issues. We have helped to clarify some of the silly rules that we had in place. We have recognized that within limitations we are here as partisans and that we use our resources for legitimate communication of those partisan opinions to the public.

We also have other things which have to be done. The committee has recognized that it is important that we have disclosure of what we spend from the public purse and how that money has been spent. A lot of the problems we have faced result from the fact that the public does not have access to our information. Other legislatures around the world have a form of disclosure which enables the public to know what has been spent from public funds. It is only reasonable that happened for this House of Commons as well. I hope that the committee has the opportunity to finish its work in that area.

In addition, it is time that the government forced through tough, enforceable conflict of interest legislation. That should be in place. It is one of the things that will help to make sure the public understands that what we do is on behalf of the public, not for any personal benefit or gain.

There are things yet to be done, but I am proud of the work of the committee in the end. I also would like, in the very few seconds I have left, to thank the people who have worked on behalf of the committee, the researchers and others. I hope we will take a look at this legislation in a year's time. I hope we will not say that was the end of the process but that it was only the beginning of the process of helping to make sure that what we do in Parliament, how we spend money and we do on behalf of the public, is open to real and complete public scrutiny.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. François Gérin (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead):** Madam Speaker, as we are coming to the end of this debate, I will make a wish, a very important wish for democracy. I wish that policemen thoughout this country do their duty so that we never have to intervene into their role which is extremely important for democracy. But I also wish that members of Parliament, the House of Commons and the Senate, and the Parliament of Canada as a whole could do their duty without the improper interventions of the police or of a policeman in particular. However, the House of Commons as much as its members or the policemen will have to understand that this bill must take a little while to get over its teething troubles. I wish that policemen co–operate very closely with the Board of Internal Economy. I also want members to realize that self–discipline in any constituted body, including the House of Commons, is absolutely necessary and often convinces people who are watching us and all Canadians that it is as such the best guarantee.

I also ask that the Board of Internal Economy not seek unanimity all the time, but rather consensus. With the self–discipline we will all exercise together, I am convinced we will never again experience the problems we have been through lately.

I wish the Special Committee on the Parliament of Canada Act will immediately consider the whole question of total and complete disclosure of members of Parliament budget expenditures.

[*English*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** 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.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** It being two o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

# PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—PRIVATE BILLS

[*Translation*]

## PLACE DU PORTAGE BUILDINGS DESIGNATIONS ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

**Mr. Gilles Rocheleau (Hull—Aylmer)** moved that Bill C-315, an Act to change the designations of the buildings known as Place du Portage, Phase I, II, III and IV, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

He said: Madam Speaker, I have the pleasure today to present this legislation to give a new designation to the buildings known as Place du Portage, Phase I, II, III and IV, located in the City of Hull.

I have accepted to present this private bill at the request of the City of Hull. This is an initiative led by city councillor Pierre Chénier and you are seeing today the outcome of a long process to change the present designation of Place du Portage because it does not reflect the specific nature of the buildings, but merely the construction stages of the complex. I must point out that, contrary to what some might be tempted to think, the names chosen by the City have nothing to do with political partisanship.

Representatives from the city of Hull wish that these buildings be now named after famous persons of national significance. So, it is with this in mind that they directed their research in order to submit the names of two famous persons who were involved in national politics and whose names would be consistent with the francophone reality of that city's territory. That is why they decided to choose Mr. Jean Marchand and Mrs. Thérèse Casgrain. The city council referred the matter to the Hull Identity Committee, a committee made up of elected representatives and citizens, which unanimously recommended the names of Jean Marchand and Therese Casgrain. The City of Hull received a lot of support for its choices, notably from the children of Mr. Marchand and Mrs. Casgrain.

Why Jean Marchand? People will remember that Jean Marchand, when he was the first Minister of Regional Economic Development, worked relentlessly to make sure that the Quebec side of the National Capital would get some federal buildings. Jean Marchand was, indeed, the key architect of the decision of the Ottawa government to move to Hull one fourth of the federal Civil Service in spite of the indignation that you remember. It is even more important now to give this tribute to him because close to 21 000 federal civil servants work today on the Quebec side of the Ottawa valley. And, soon, when Quebec takes a decision concerning its political future, those jobs in the Outaouais will still be an important factor.

Why Thérèse Casgrain? Because she played an important role in our country by spending her life fighting in favor of women's right to vote and because she is considered a leader among 20th century Canadian women who advanced the cause of reform. Wouldn't it be a good occasion to pay homage to her also, particularly since we are celebrating this year the 50th anniversary of women's right to vote.

We must also take into account the fact that federal buildings in the National Capital Region are all identified with different names such as l'Esplanade Laurier, Louis Saint-Laurent, Jules Léger, Jean Talon, Vanier, etc. To keep up with that spirit the city of Hull has made that request and also to avoid any confusion, as is the case with Place du Portage Phase I, II, III and IV. The Information Services sometimes receive many calls from people wanting to know the location of one of them.

Phases I and II of Place du Portage will now be known as Jean Marchand Building, South Tower, and Jean Marchand Buiding, North Tower. As for Phases III and IV, they will be known as Thérèse Casgrain Building, West Tower, and Thérèse Casgrain Building, East Tower. For all these reasons, I dare wish that my colleagues in the House of Commons will agree to refer this bill to a legislative committee, so that, before long, we can name these buildings on the Quebec side of the Ottawa River after these two great Canadians.

**Mrs. Marie Gibeau (Bourassa):** Mr. Speaker, at the federal level, the designation of public buildings is the responsibility of Public Works. There is nothing wrong with that, since it owns most government buildings.

As a matter of fact, Public Works is not only responsible for a hundred or so federal office buildings, but also for cultural centres, employment centres, research laboratories, harbours, farms and others facilities. Public

Works is also responsible for the accomodations used by 135 departments and agencies. In fact, some 150,000 civil servants go to work everyday in buildings Public Works is responsible for. Finding an appropriate name for the buildings is an important task it carries out with great care.

The policy on the designation of federal facilities is the following: Choose a prestigious name that will be readily recognized and respected; give recognition to one person or a group of persons who contributed to the well–being of Canada, the community or the customer department; finally, remind a historical event to the community or the client department.

This policy includes a number of criteria Public Works used to determine the merit of the proposals. For instance, it goes without saying that the person it is suggested to name a building after must be deceased, but it can also be named after a place or an event of historical importance, if there is a connexion between the name and the building. The names proposed must also have some prominence in the region.

It seems clear to me that the name Place du Portage is quite appropriate. It reminds us of the days when explorers travelled our rivers in canoes discovering Canada. It reminds us not only of those courageous explorers but also of traders and missionaries who travelled those rivers during decades. Place du Portage brings back to mind not only certain events but also a historic site and a lot of people instead of only two.

According to our policy on the names of federal buildings, any individual or group can make suggestions. Department officials can recommend a name themselves or ask for suggestions. These consulted persons could be the public in general, historical societies, historians, universities, municipal councils or people who have lived in the community for a long time and know the subject well. In the case of property acquired through a lease–option agreement, the promoter also has his say concerning the proposed name.

It is then up to the region's chief manager, an official of Public Works Canada, to check the proposition. To that end, he can consult with the Secretary of State, the Privy Council or any other ressource group he sees fit. The regional chief manager then presents a report on the results of the study to the deputy minister, who in turn presents it to the minister.

Finally, it is the minister who decides if the name can be given to the facilities or building. At first sight, this system seems complicated or overly prudent. But the government believes that it is worth it, that it ensures that these assets are properly named. Once the name is chosen, it is extremeley difficult to backtrack. Also, a building's name should mean something and be appreciated not only by its tenants, but the community at large and all interested parties.

• (1410)

For years, Mr. Speaker, buildings have been named after distinguished Canadians. As mentioned by my colleague we have, in the National Capital Region, the Jules Léger Building and the Lester B. Pearson Building. I could mention the Champlain Maritime Terminal in Quebec City or the Guy Favreau Complex in Montreal, both named after famous Canadians. That does not mean that buildings are necessarily named after politicians. Many commemorate people who distinguished themselves in other fields of activity.

I suggest to my colleague who made some proposals here, today, Mr. Speaker, that he tells the group he represents—the City of Hull, that he mentioned a few times if I am not mistaken—that we could forget politicians and look for other names.

I am proposing that, Mr. Speaker, because as Mao said, women support half of the sky, but I noticed that in the political arena they are denied access to some fame which is justly theirs.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is high time that we recognize famous women and pay tribute to those who, in the end, contributed to the history of Canada and were part of it. It is clear that if we limit ourselves to politicians we would restrict the pool of names dramatically, since it is a well known fact that women gained access to this venerable institution only recently, when in reality women had a major role in the settlement and development of Canada.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I would like for my honorable colleague that he goes back to his constituents and suggests to them that they think about the role of women in our society, without restricting themselves to political roles, which would limit too much the pool of available names. And if he needs help finding names of

very important and distinguished women, I will personally assist him if his group can't. We have exceptional women in Canada as well as in Quebec.

In conclusion— I hear chauvinist comments, Mr. Speaker. I hope you did not hear them, because it is horrible to hear such things in 1990! I repeat, I find the name Place du Portage fully satisfactory. It is a very important historic site and, I repeat, I don't believe it is a good thing to change something just for the sake of it, especially according to the recommandations that have been made. I see no improvement whatsoever in it.

I would like to say finally that if the department wishes once more to change the building's name, I would hope it would choose something other than the name of a political figure. If my colleague would listen, I would suggest further that consultations be held not only in Hull, but elsewhere. Consultations should be held as well as studies made before a decision is taken on the matter.

I believe we should follow the process used previously, and succesfully, Mr. Speaker, under the supervision of different departments and several Public Works ministers.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, not only will I not support the motion, I say that the bill should be withdrawn.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ferland):** I thank the Hon. Member for Bourassa. I will now hear the hon. member for Gatineau—La Lièvre.

**Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau—La Lièvre):** Mr. Speaker, first I would like to commend the Hull City Council for the initiative it has taken through their servant, the hon. member for Hull—Aylmer. After hearing the explanations of the hon. member for Hull—Aylmer, one can only support that intitiative.

First, I would like to say to the hon. member for Bourassa that there is much ado about nothing. The city of Hull, which represents the people of the region, has taken the initiative to have the Place du Portage complex built—that place has a historical meaning since it is indeed there that portages were made for hundreds of years—and to have the towers of Phases I, II, III and IV erected. What we wanted to do was simply to give these buildings a proper name. There is nothing wrong with that as far as I am concerned.

The City of Hull should be congratulated for its choice of names because a simple glance at Mrs. Thérèse Casgrain's career shows her exceptionnal involment in various movements in Canada, particularly in the province of Quebec. Nobody can deny that she has played an important role. Many of us here have witnessed the work she has done and they know her for her sense of moderation, her kindness and her great skill. Therefore, I suggest that the Hull City Council has displayed good taste in choosing her name and I congratulate them.

I come now to Jean Marchand, the other proposed name. I believe the hon. member for Hull–Aylmer is more aware than I am of Mr. Marchand's role in the region as a former mayor of Hull, he knows Mr. Marchand was paramount to the expansion of the federal presence in Hull during the construction of the various phases of those buildings.

Now the City of Hull wants to complete this effort by giving those buildings a name that will identify them with a significant person. The names it has proposed are excellent and I need not repeat what the hon. member for Hull–Aylmer has already said on the subject. We support him, Madam Speaker, but if I may, I would have a suggestion that I am sure he could convey to the city council in Hull. Since the site bears a historic significance as a place of portaging—in fact, for hundreds of years, our first settlers who came from France to establish themselves here, in Nouvelle-France, have used this place as such—I was wondering if we could this is only a suggestion, mind you, because I don't have any advice to give to Hull city council—could we not call the whole structure "Complexe Place du Portage", and rename the Phases I and II as the Jean Marchand Building, North and South Towers respectively, phases III and IV being renamed Thérèse Casgrain Building, North and South Towers—or East and West, if such is the wish of the member for Hull—Aylmer.

That is my suggestion to the hon. member, and I ask him to give it to the city administration. In this way, we could recognize the historical aspect of the site, considering it as a whole, called Place du Portage, and nevertheless improving it with the names suggested by Hull, that is Thérèse Casgrain and Jean Marchand.

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Madam Speaker, the suggestion made today by the hon. member for Hull—Aylmer is very interesting. I think the Conservative member, who recommended that we should turn down this suggestion, call it a bill or a motion, based her remarks on a very simple argument. As far as I am concerned, I think it best to provide a building with a specific designation, in order to show the respect we have for people who have served this country. For all these reasons, this suggestion seems to me like a good idea.

• (1420)

And there is another reason for that as well, Madam Speaker. The Hull residents have themselves expressed the wish to change the designations of the Place du Portage buildings to honour the memory of Jean Marchand and Thérèse Casgrain. I do think personally that it is very fitting to honour these two key figures in this way.

[*English*]

For all of us, Madam Speaker, there is a concern to serve our community's needs and expressed concerns. In the case of this particular Private Members' Bill before us, if I understand the argument correctly, that is precisely what the member for Hull—Aylmer is attempting to do.

He is attempting to bring before the House something that will reflect the wishes of his community to see the two individuals of whom he has spoken, Jean Marchand and Thérèse Casgrain, showing the honour of which I think they are quite deserving for many reasons. They are reasons that have to do with the risks which they took in the fight for social justice in the Province of Quebec and with the contribution which both have made in the Parliament of Canada.

From my personal point of view, I am particularly pleased to see the suggestion that Thérèse Casgrain be given a sign of honour and respect here in the National Capital Region. Her work as a leader in the fight for women's rights in Quebec was, of course, extremely important. But her work as leader of the party which was the predecessor to our party, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, is also something which certainly I respect considerably, and which I think should be respected by people across the country. She was one of the very first women leaders of a political party anywhere in the country and that was not a very easy task. It was not an easy task to be a path breaker.

The names that have been suggested by the community of Hull are appropriate names and names that deserve to be honoured. As a House of Commons, we should respect the expressed wishes of the community of Hull and accept the motion which has been put forward by the member for Hull—Aylmer, to have it pass to a legislative committee, and have representatives from the community of Hull come to speak to us about their reasons for this particular choice of names. In other words, we should not stand in the way of the expressed concern and desire which has come from the city of Hull to honour two important Canadians.

**Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot):** Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today to speak in the House on behalf of the motion brought forward by the hon. member for Hull—Aylmer.

I understand very clearly the motives and rationale for placing before the House of Commons the legislation that he has placed before us today.

**Mr. Boudria:** But—

**Mr. Malone:** The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell says: "But", presuming for a moment that somehow I might automatically, as he would, be of the opposite of the view for no other reason than that I am on the other side of the House. I want to say to the hon. member for Hull—Aylmer, who is a reasoned and rational person, that he will know that is not automatically my position.

We look at the edifice that is across the river, a large structure of buildings, with that beautiful name. I am not sure what particular nuances it has for French-speaking Canadians, but I know that for English-speaking Canadians, names such as Portage la Prairie and Place du Portage have a very special ring for which we have a deep sense of our national history.

We know that the country was discovered from east to west along the highways of the rivers, the portages, and all that infers. It beckons back to the earliest days of the foundation of the country.

I would agree with the hon. member who spoke earlier, a member of the Liberal Party, who said that that whole complex should retain and contain that name, Place du Portage. But then we have these towers that I submit could only have been named after a national committee of accountants put together a thorough analysis and study and came up with the picturesque,

descriptive, and accurate titles of Tower I, II, III, and IV. I commend that presumed committee of accountants, wherever it might be, for its accuracy.

I submit that if there is anything that is in need in our country today, it is the need for national symbols that will make us hearken to and recognize the heritage and the great people who built the country. Names should be honoured and recognized.

I submit to you, Madam Speaker, that having looked at the names that have been put forward, I would want to make two comments. First, I would want the hon. member for Hull—Aylmer to know that in no way for either of those two names could I find any justifiable reason to say that those names ought not to be utilized. Second, if I could, it probably would be inappropriate for me to say no to those names to the hon. member who is the representative of that city, after his city council has said that these are the names that it wants. That would very much impinge on the local community from which he comes and which he represents.

I will, however, put forward this thought, because I think there is in the country a need to advance more symbols. There is a need to advance more recognition to our history. Instead of naming two towers for one person, here is a possibility to name all four towers after Canadians and for Canadians who have demonstrated purpose.

• (1430 )

I am an advantaged member of this House because I sit right down at this end. I do not know which camera is on me at the moment, but if it is the far one, the pages will be seen right beside me.

In preparing to speak today, I turned to the pages and asked them to name for me a famous Canadian. They did. They said Rick Hansen. I asked them to name another one and they said Terry Fox. I asked them to name another, and they said Lester Pearson, then Billy Bishop, Karen Kain, Brian Orser, and Margaret Atwood. The civil service is going to go plum nuts when it hears this one. The hon. member for Prescott—Glengarry—Russell might even put the motion forward. They said Wayne and Shuster. How do you like that, Madam Speaker? 'Where do you work?" "I am over at the Wayne and Shuster Building".

What I found intriguing about the list given to me by the pages is that of the nine names, one is a politician. It is important that politicians be recognized, but that it is also important that we recognize this country was built to a very large and significant extent, not by what took place in this building, but what took place as a result of men and women from all parts of Canada who helped to make the country great.

I know everyone in this House is sensitive to the fact that we have come through a tumultuous summer in terms of native affairs in this country. When I look at the situation with native persons in Canada and when I put in balance the fact that I know so many native leaders of extraordinary quality, of extraordinary skill, with far above average capacity for articulation, I am perplexed at why North America, both Canada and the United States, has so few native heroes.

We have Buffy Sainte-Marie, a folk singer who is nationally and internationally known. I put that in the context of the black movement in the United States. I was a student at the University of Montana. One of the most moving days of my life was to be in San Francisco among a group of 22,000 blacks to listen to a speech by Martin Luther King. It will, as long as I live, be a highlight of my life.

The blacks advanced to a significant extent because of national heroes in their country. The first such person was probably Jackie Robinson, the first black to play professional baseball. Today television broadcasts of Bill Cosby warms the hearts of virtually every person around the world. With national heroes, we soon do what we ought to do in race relations. We fail to see that the person's skin is a different colour. That is important.

Across the river in the city of Hull is probably one of Canada's proudest buildings, the Museum of Civilization. It will probably live with that name forever. It may be all too soon forgotten that that building was designed by an Albertan from my home province, a full blood native Canadian and one of Canada's most exceptional architects.

It might well be in the community of Hull since we have four towers to name that there would be some appropriateness, especially in these times, to reach out and say to the native community: "We will place the name of one of your people on one of our national buildings". I submit that that consideration might be undertaken. I think of the name of the person who my constituency was named after, Crowfoot.

Chief Crowfoot was born a Blood. He migrated north with his grandfather at the age of five, walking from what is now Montana into what is now southern Alberta. He became chief of the Black Foot and he adopted a Cree son, the first test of multiculturalism. That person, who spoke only his native tongue, at the time of the signing of treaty seven, spoke in English. He said this as an elderly chief: "In a little while I will be gone from among you. Wither I come and wither I go, I do not know. What is life? It is like the flash of the firefly in the night. It is like the breath of the buffalo in the wintertime. It is like the little shadow that races across the grass and loses itself in the sunset." That, by a nomad, who travelled with the buffalo, who learned the language late in mid life, to give that kind of poetic expression, written by the Northwest Mounted Police, needs somewhere in this country his name on an edifice, a building, to signal his importance.

I commend the hon. member for Aylmer—Hull. I simply ask that we only take that time to do the job fully and completely so that all towers can be appropriately named and that we enhance in the process the naming of more places after good Canadians, wherever they may come from.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Madam Speaker, I did not intend to speak this afternoon. I simply wanted to support the bill presented by the hon. member for Hull—Aylmer, and I am delighted to do so.

But I feel compelled to take the floor because of comments by the hon. member for Bourassa. She said in this House earlier today that we should not recognize political figures only when it comes to naming our buildings.

That is what the hon. member for Bourassa said. She does not want a certain building to be named after Thérèse Casgrain. Madam Speaker, here is what the Canadian Encyclopedia says about her:

Thérèse Casgrain, née Forget, reformer, born at Montréal 10 July 1896. Best remembered for her leadership of the campaign for women's suffrage in Québec.

**An hon. member:** If it were not for her, you would not even be here!

**Mr. Boudria:** Still, the hon. member for Bourassa is against that appointment!

**An hon. member:** That is incredible. Really!

**Mr. Boudria:** It continues: "[—[ before WWII, she was a leading 20th-century Canadian reformer. [—[A founding member of the Provincial Franchise Committee for women's suffrage in 1921, [—[and hosted a popular Radio Canada program in the 1930s, "Fémina"." I am skipping a lot, Madam Speaker. "In 1961 she founded the Quebec branch—

**Mrs. Gibeau:** On a question of privilege, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Bourassa on a question of privilege.

**Mrs. Gibeau:** Madam Speaker, if I am to be quoted, I should be in context. What I said—

**Mr. Boudria:** That is not a question of privilege, Madam Speaker.

**Mrs. Gibeau:** I insist, Madam Speaker. If he is going to quote me, he should give the complete quote instead of being so selective. He is worse than a reporter. Honestly. That is disgusting.

• (1440)

**Mr. Boudria:** Madam Speaker, if I were the member for Bourassa I would also want to retract an earlier statement when she was saying things like that. I do not blame her for wanting to withdraw what she said earlier this afternoon because it was a shame, Madam Speaker!

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** This is Friday afternoon and I should think that everybody is anxious to leave these hallowed precincts. Still I think that, on either side, members would not be well advised to impute motives as a result of statements made by one colleague or another.

I would therefore ask the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell to continue his remarks but without making accusations which might not indeed be directly related to what the hon. member for Bourassa may have said.

**Mr. Boudria:** I shall address this point some other time, Madam Speaker. Just the same, I want to tell you that I am not at all satisfied with what we have just heard.

Madam Speaker, I want to talk about Hon. Jean Marchand. The Hon. Member opposite said that she was against designating a building in honour of Hon. Jean Marchand. I am not imputing motives; the reason she is against it does not matter. What matters is that she is against it and for that, she should be ashamed of herself! I have the rigth to say so in this House. I suggest she should be ashamed of herself for being against the designation of a building in honour of Thérèse Casgrain and Jean Marchand and I suggest that Hull—Aylmer constituents and all the other Canadians share my views, Madam Speaker. I am prepared to say so in front of anyone. The City of Hull has submitted an application through its elected representatives, and they are not just nobodies! They were people chosen by the Hull electorate both at the federal and municipal levels.

Here is part of the record of proceedings of a Hull Municipal Council meeting dealing deals with this issue. I should like to quote from a resolution adopted on March 20, 1990: "It is resolved that the council is asking the Government of Canada to designate Place du Portage, Phase I, as Jean Marchand Building, North Tower, Phase II as Jean Marchand Building, South Tower, Phase III, as Thérèse Casgrain Building, East Tower, and Phase IV, as the Thérèse Casgrain Building, West Tower".

The councillors of the city of Hull are the ones who asked for this, Madam Speaker. The federal representatives, more particularly the member for that riding, asked for this in the House and I had the privilege of seconding the motion in the House today.

If members opposite are against such a designation, let them say so. But in fifteen minutes, Madam Speaker, we will know for sure. If Conservative members decide not to allow us our right to vote on this motion today, that is their privilege. They can kill the bill, talk it out. They might do it; that is their privilege.

And I would dare say that they do, it will only be for political partisanship. It is not mere coincidence that Mrs. Casgrain was a New Democrat, and Mr. Marchand a Liberal. A few years ago, when the time came to erect a statue in honour of Mr. Diefenbaker, I gladly supported the motion here in Parliament, and it was done. Two years later, we tried to do the same for Mr. Pearson, and what took just a few months for Mr. Diefenbaker took two years for Mr. Pearson. But we got our wish although it took much more time. I did not blame the government then because we finally got what we were asking for.

But today, Madam Speaker, what the Conservatives are displaying is partisanship of the worse kind. When I see the hon. member for Bourassa act as she did today, Madam Speaker, I am outraged. I hope the constituents from Hull and all Canadians, but especially women, will remember what the hon. member for Bourassa said today and the decision this House is about to make.

[*English*]

**Mr. Ken James (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour and Minister of State (Transport)):** Madam Speaker, the name Place du Portage goes deep into the heart of the city of Hull as I understand, and for many people it invokes memories of the voyageurs who passed this way in quest of their furs and other riches as they moved westward and opened up this country.

The portage was, of course, the overland route taken to avoid the Chaudière Rapids as the tradesmen moved up and down the Ottawa River.

Writing of the trail which the Indians used to cut off the long way around the bend in the river, the hon. F. R. Latchman said: "In order to get ahead of the voyageurs as they came up the river in their canoes, the Indian runners took a trail across the country, leaving the river at a point where the city of Hull now stands".

They bore northwesterly until they reached the mountain this side of the Eardley Line and then followed by foot across Eardley and thence to the river again.

By this means they could let their tribe know of the approach of the voyageurs as they came up and down the river. At first it was to prepare their tribe for a hostile reception of the voyageurs and later to meet them for

barter and trade in furs and do commerce with the voyageurs.

The traditional portage paths that skirted the Chaudière Rapids were on the north shore. They first crossed the present day Eddy Company yards and at Little Chaudière Rapids, a short distance upstream, another carry was necessary.

Today in the Hull suburb of Val-Tetreau, beside the Ottawa River and a short walk downstream from the statue of the martyred priest, Saint Jean de Brébeuf, there is a monument showing the old path over which the missionaries, explorers and traders trod.

Before the great days of the timber industry, many fortunes in furs were floated up and down the River.

As the traders went, settlers appeared, things changed.

In 1800 the arrival of Philemon Wright marked the beginning of the lumber trade which was to bring growth, prosperity and many fortunes to the area in the century that followed.

I mention these historical events because this history is very important in our country, important to this area, and important to all of Canada. Certainly the name Place du Portage sticks out.

The name was selected with care when the buildings were built. It preserves the memory of a stretch of ground that was important in the building of this country. It is a reminder to citizens of Hull and all of us in the national capital region of our beginnings and our heritage.

It is important that we do not in any way dilute or obscure the name Place du Portage as it relates to the complex of buildings which have transformed the city of Hull over the past several years to be a thriving, growing and important part of the national capital region.

The proposal put forward by the hon. member for Aylmer in Bill C-315 merits consideration. It is the practice of the federal government to name some government buildings after distinguished Canadians when such action is deemed suitable and doable.

As other speakers have pointed out, M. Marchand and Mme Casgrain both served with some major distinction in Canadian public life.

But in the case of Place du Portage I think it is important that no precipitous action be taken that might detract from the eminently suitable and well-established name that the complex now bears.

The name is well established and well known. Maybe it has some simplicity to it, as the member for Crowfoot mentioned, that they just went "one, two, three, and four", but it does sit well over-all with the citizens of the national capital region.

It is also a rather simple nomenclature. Place du Portage' is a very large complex and houses a myriad of federal government departments and agencies.

Its tenants include Supply and Services Canada, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Employment and Immigration Canada. It houses all or parts of the National Capital Commission—

**Mr. Boudria:** We know that. Come on.

**Mr. James:** Well maybe some Canadians do not know that. The member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell is yelling out: "Come on". Maybe all Canadians watching do not know that. Maybe it is kind of important and interesting that they do. You do, we do, because we are all here. It is amazing what other people do not know, so maybe it will not hurt to tell them what departments are there. Canada Post Corporation is there and so is Labour Canada, Public Works Canada and other departments and agencies, including Health and Welfare Canada, Agriculture Canada, the Canadian Aviation Safety Board, and some of the offices of National Defence. In short, it is a microcosm of the federal government itself.

• (1450)

Over the past decade and a half, it has become a familiar address to thousands of Canadians who do business with the government and who receive services from the complex. Members of the public have a difficult enough time working out how and under what name they can reach a certain department or agency. All of us have problems now and again, and we work here every day.

We should be very careful to avoid making things even more complicated. I am not saying that changing the name is going to do that but I think we should think about all of this. The present nomenclature is quite clear, the complex is named Place du Portage and its main buildings are designated in a very simplistic way, I, II, III and IV. This is simply for mailing purposes and

facilitates giving directions to those wishing to visit a government office there.

**Mr. Boudria:** Oh, yes.

**Mr. James:** The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell keeps saying a lot of words. I think I always sit here very quietly. I do not interrupt him, I am a very quiet member of Parliament who does not yell across at anybody—

**Mr. Boudria:** I will resist.

**Mr. James:** So I will expect, on this Friday afternoon, that he gives me the same respect.

The proposal put forward in Bill C-315, would add another layer to the designations already in place. It would call one building the Jean Marchand building, north tower and another the Jean Marchand building, south tower and the same in connection with Thérèse Casgrain. Then we get into east towers, west towers and that sort of thing.

It has been a consistent policy of the government that when buildings are named after specific persons, it gives the name only to one physical structure. That is the way it has been done. No one is saying that these particular names should not be used. It was suggested by the city of Hull and by the member of Parliament for Hull—Aylmer. I do not think anyone is indicating that these people are not great Canadians. But I think that giving two separate and distinct edifices the name of the same person might invite confusion so maybe we should think about this. For this reason alone, it could be that we should reflect upon it.

However, it does not mean that the government rejects out of hand, as maybe it was indicated by some people across the way, the idea of giving names of the prominent Canadians to these buildings. I do not think there would be any disagreement from members opposite that there are other important Canadians, other than politicians, some names were mentioned, for instance, by the Pages to the member for Crowfoot. I am sure if we gave the question to the young people of Quebec, they would come up with another long list that would have a lot of other names on it and they would not all be politicians.

In fact, the Prime Minister received a similar proposal from *Le Conseil de la municipalité de la ville de Hull* earlier this year, as the hon. member probably knows, and he has referred it to the Minister of Public Works for his study and consideration. The minister, as members hopefully know, has the responsibility for the naming of federal buildings and structures and he will certainly do so.

This is not an undertaking that is entered into lightly by the government. I hope that we would all take that into consideration here today. It is normal for the matter to be thoroughly researched and that there be extensive consultation for the naming of buildings. Certainly the minister and the government will do that, taking into account the submission made by the city of Hull and the member of Parliament for that constituency and the discussions that were held here today.

A building is a thing of some permanence and it is important that all those directly affected have ample opportunity to express their views. For these reasons, and without precluding the possibility of assigning names to the structure at this point, the position of the government will be that we should take under advisement the names that have been put forward and look at naming all four buildings in the future.

Madam Speaker, I thank you very much for the opportunity to speak on this important bill put forward by the member from Hull.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Guy Hudon (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** Madam Speaker, I will be brief, because my colleague also wants to speak to this matter. I would like to make just one point. One of my first experiences in this field, when I was elected mayor of Beauharnois, was that people wanted to change the name of the Beauharnois Municipal Hall, which had been known as such since time immemorial, and it so happened that they wanted to name it after my political opponent who was the outgoing mayor of Beauharnois at the time. However, I had a good excuse which was that he wasn't dead yet and so they did not have the right to do that. However, I still felt somewhat guilty about possible political overtones, and that is what I have been feeling during the last fifteen or twenty minutes, and that is the point I wanted to make. Clearly, if someone had suggested that the four towers be named after four Indian chiefs and if we had opposed it, we would have been accused of being anti-Indians.

We have the names of two prominent Canadians, a man and a woman. I suppose that one can be accused of being "blue" and not "red", or of not willing to recognize the achievements of women. That is not true because I believe they both had a political career that I admire, and I would love, at some point, to have the political career they enjoyed.

Personally, I believe that we cannot make things simpler than they are now. Place du Portage, Phase I, II, III or IV, the name this complex has been carrying for 15 years now, might not be very poetic, but it seems easier to me than Jean Marchand North Tower, Jean Marchand South Tower, Thérèse Casgrain East Tower, Thérèse Casgrain West Tower. I used to be the Paliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Employment and Immigration, and each year we received thousands of letters. There is also Employment and Immigration and Consumer and Corporate Affairs. All addresses would have to be changed. I was impressed by my colleague's speech earlier. I also think we should keep things simple and maintain some continuity. It has been there for 15 years and it should be kept for future generations. I am not saying that the proposed names do not mean anything, but I still think that what is being suggested lacks in simplicity.

I would have had more to say, Madam Speaker, but I will yield to my colleague who has a few words to say about this bill.

[*English*]

**Mr. Greg Thompson (Carleton—Charlotte):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak on Bill C–315 as put forward by the member from Hull. I can understand why he did this. It is his home constituency. He is an individual who has very strong feelings about the designation of names for the particular buildings in question. The two people mentioned are without doubt two famous Canadians, Thérèse Casgrain and Jean Marchand.

I think all of us in this House are very familiar with their careers and particularly myself—

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell on a point of order.

**Mr. Boudria:** Madam Speaker, I wonder if there would be unanimous consent of the House to sit for an extra half an hour to make sure we can vote today.

[*English*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member is asking for unanimous consent to carry on with the debate.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** There is not unanimous consent. I am sorry, the time has expired.

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.

[*Translation*]

It being three o'clock p.m., this House stands adjourned until Monday next at one o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 3 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Monday, December 3, 1990**

The House met at 1 p.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** 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—BILLS

[*English*]

### CRIMINAL RECORDS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

**Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South)** moved that Bill C-314, an act to amend the Criminal Records Act and the Criminal Code in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is brought before the House today to remedy a situation that should have been corrected, but unfortunately was not, when the concurrent provisions of the Criminal Code were created in 1972.

• (1310 )

In 1972, it was decided, after a long series of hearings before the Law Reform Commission, that under certain circumstances a judge, instead of convicting an accused, should be able to order and direct that the accused be discharged absolutely or on conditions prescribed in a probation order. The result of that discharge in effect was that there was to be no conviction at all.

Unfortunately, under the criminal records provision, we like keeping records on people. When we keep records, we can keep the record that they were discharged from their criminal charge. The judge ordered that they not be convicted, yet we keep a record that they were not convicted.

As a consequence, in order to get a clean criminal record, these people are now required, after five years—because they cannot do anything without a five-year wait—to proceed to the National Parole Board to make an application. Because the Parole Board is overstuffed with work and cannot get at its work, it takes a year and a half longer to get absolved of a conviction that the act says they were not convicted of.

So, we have the absolute stupidity of it all in the way the criminal record system operates. We have all sorts of people in our constituency, Sir, carrying with them a record that makes it difficult sometimes for them to get employment because they have a criminal record, or at least there is a record of their activities. Sometimes they have a difficult time with immigration. They have a difficult time generally because they have this record and we keep records of people who were not convicted, because the act says that the judge can discharge them and the judge has discharged them.

Let me read some of the debates that took place when this matter was proposed by the Hon. Otto Lang. I am reading from the Commons Debate of April 27, 1972, at page 1700.

> First of all, we propose to put into the hands of judges and magistrates the power to give an absolute or conditional discharge to persons who either plead guilty or are found guilty by them. This, of course, means that the offender will not be convicted. This means that in certain cases, particularly of young offenders who have transgressed in a technical way without in any malicious sense having attempted to injure society, the judge or magistrate is given the power to use this approach instead of rendering a suspended sentence which might otherwise have been the next least severe penalty available to him.

That was the whole intent of the statute. I can go on further and tell you what the critic for the New Democratic Party said. Having analysed the bill, I found that no one from the Progressive Conservative Party spoke on this section. In the usual course, this was an omnibus bill

that covered a whole lot of other matters, including airline hijacking, and most of the attention of the debate was, of course, focused on airline hijacking.

I will read to you from page 1705 of *Hansard* of April 27, 1972 as to what the New Democratic Party said. Mr. Gilbert is, of course, now a judge of a court and he certainly was pretty interested in this particular matter. He said:

> The Minister of Justice waxed eloquent with regard to the changes concerning conditional and absolute discharge, and I thought he was right in doing so, and taking a great step forward from the approach of suspended sentence to that of conditional or absolute discharge. This is a giant step forward. I was happy to see that not only if a person pleads guilty, but when a person is found guilty and a conviction is registered we will give the judge discretion to grant an absolute or a conditional discharge if it is in the best interest of the accused and is not contrary to the public interest. The result will be that in time the offence will be deemed not to have been committed.

We have here a situation where it was intended that there be no conviction and, clearly, no conviction registered. The matter came before committee. I will read from the meeting of the justice and legal affairs committee of this House on May 11, 1972. Mr. Lang appeared before the committee to explain the bill. He said:

> These clauses allow the judge additional latitude where a person pleads guilty or is found guilty to discharge conditionally or absolutely. The person then is deemed not to be convicted with consequences which follow both for, say, the immigration law and sometimes perhaps for motor vehicle law in the provinces and in other places.

Mr. Gilbert replied:

> Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the minister for introducing these sections. It is a great step forward and I think he should be recognized for having the courage and the progressive attitude that applies to these sections. I hope they work. I think he is very familiar with what has happened in the past even though the judge had the power to impose suspended sentence it still carried grave consequences with regard to a person's job or travel or bonding. This may alleviate some of those problems.

That is exactly what ought to happen.

It seems to me a travesty of all justice that a person goes before a court and that court says: "You may have sinned young man but go, there is no conviction against you. You are absolutely discharged or you are discharged conditionally on certain things happening." He walks out of the courtroom relieved. He may apply to become a police officer two or three years later. He cannot, because he has a conviction registered against him, even though the statute says no conviction. He applies for a job where a bond is required. They draw a criminal record. There it is, large as life. Even though the judge intended no conviction, even though the Criminal Code says no conviction on those circumstances, there is no job and no future. That was exactly what this provision was intended to remedy.

If you could somehow clean up a matter like this easily, it would be fine. Our criminal record system requires you to appear before or make an application to the National Parole Board. That board is busy. It is overloaded with these kinds of cases. There has not been a single case since conditional or absolute discharges were imposed where the board has refused to remove the record of these convictions. The board treats them as non-existent. They were not intended to be there. The judge treated them as non-existent, yet our statute carries them on because somewhere along the line police departments and others in law enforcement like to keep records. It is time we stopped keeping these records. It is time the judge who is in charge of the case says that there be an absolute or conditional discharge and that should be the end of it.

This bill goes on to declare that there should be a record kept while the appeal is pending, if there is an appeal from the Crown. Of course, that should be there. After the period for appeal is expired, there should be no further blotch on the person's career. That was the intention of the statute and that is what ought to occur. One does not get an absolute discharge or a conditional discharge easily. You only get it under very rare circumstances. It is not the kind of thing that judges hand out willy-nilly .The judge wants to make sure, if there is a record, he can give a suspended sentence or a minor fine. They can handle it in all sorts of other ways. The intent of an absolute or conditional discharge is that people not be deemed convicted. That is the kind of thing this bill is trying to remedy.

• (1320)

This matter has caused me, as a member of Parliament, a lot of problems with my constituents.

When I spoke to the committee in terms of what bills should come up for voting, other members of Parliament on the committee, in looking at the matter, declared that

they had the same problem as I had. We are solving problems for our constituents who, somewhere along the line in their young lives, committed an offence against society and the judge gave an absolute discharge. They come into our office wondering why the system is destroying them. It was not intended to do so, and we ought to remedy that.

If the government wants to oppose this or delay the vote, we ought to look at that. I ask government members, why mouth speeches opposed to this, why not support it and get on with it, and solve the problem that we all face when people come to our offices in need of help?

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to speak today to this Private Members' Bill C-314.

This particular bill directs its attention to an area of criminal law that very much deserves our attention. The government has already introduced one bill in this session to deal with an aspect of the Criminal Records Act and with the period of time that a person must wait before he or she can apply for a pardon for a drug offence.

The intent of the member's bill is pretty clear. Where there is an absolute discharge or conditional discharge granted by a court, where the record of conviction or non-conviction would be destroyed so that that record does not dog the balance of the life of the person who went through the court process, it just means simple destruction and non-reference to it in the years to come. While I respect that intent, I can see some practical problems in implementation. I would like to touch on a few of those without in any way detracting from the integrity of the intention of the bill, and I believe it should be dealt with by the justice minister in this Parliament.

The first item is that the Criminal Records Act styles itself as an act to provide for the relief of persons who have been convicted of offences and have subsequently rehabilitated, et cetera. That is a bit of an illusion because the short name for the act is the Criminal Records Act. In real life, I suppose, it should have been called the criminal pardons act. When you look closely at this act, it really does not deal very well with criminal records. It should not be called the Criminal Records Act. In fact, it does not even have a definition of the term criminal record. That is a very serious problem in an act purporting to deal with criminal records when it deals with pardons.

The result is that when you deal with criminal records in that act, or under the Criminal Code, you do not really have an idea of what the criminal record is. Is it the certificate in the original court file? Is it a secondary record that merely states the existence of a record? Is it a notation in an electronic file? Is it a statement in a police file? A statement in a police force's correspondence? Is it a computer record? Is it a secondary record that has been transmitted to a third party? How far down the line does it reach?

We have never taken the time to define that. It is an area that does cry out for our attention. We just do not know what we are dealing with here in terms of these records.

Not only do we not know exactly how that criminal record is constituted, but we do not have a comprehensive statute governed registry of criminal records in this country. We do have CPIC run by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, that does provide pretty reasonable information for police forces, but it is not the comprehensive registry I have just referred to.

I remember in my previous incarnation as a practising lawyer trying to get a record of a criminal record from a court in another part of Canada. I believe it was the province of New Brunswick. Eventually I found the record in a court in a small town in New Brunswick. I was fortunate in having a bit of an indication from the parties involved as to where I might locate the record, but it did not seem like much of a national system of criminal records to me.

How can we have a national system of justice when it is broken into 11 separate parts, and we do not have this comprehensive system or procedure for dealing with records? I submit there is a burden on the federal government to deal with that. It is an omission of ours as a country.

Two of the more dramatic manifestations of that lack of leadership and problems in the judicial system are the recent Askov decision where the Supreme Court of

Canada decision is causing indirectly, or even directly, the dismissal of thousands of criminal charges in the province of Ontario. There has been no action or response on the part of the justice minister here in this Parliament. The other one is the Charles Ng case, and it is not the only one, where after the expiry of two-thirds of the man's sentence under a section in the Immigration Act, the man could easily have been deported. But no, that was too easy for us. We let the man serve his whole sentence. Even now, his sentence is complete and we keep him in protective custody while we try to figure out if he can be extradited.

There is a clear abdication of responsibility and leadership here in the justice field in governing the interplay of the Extradition Act, the Immigration Act and the Corrections Act.

Going back to the member's bill, as to the issue of destruction of criminal records, aside from the absence of a definition of what a criminal record is, the member's bill provides a right to an individual to be present when the record is destroyed. I would submit if that is an absolute right, then the bill should be dealing with how we go about contacting the individual. If you cannot get the individual there to view the destruction, do you delay the destruction until you find him or her? I submit that some people in this country who do have criminal records can be very difficult to locate. They have learned to do that. That is another minor problem with this bill.

Last, the reference in the bill to section 736(3)(c) of the Criminal Code dealing with *autre fois convict* produces an odd result with the way this bill deals with that section. The purpose of that plea of *autre fois convict* is to provide to an accused a package plea to show the court that he or she has already been convicted of an offence arising out of the same facts, in fact the same offence. If one is discharged of that conviction, the act deems you not to have been ever convicted. The section proposed by the hon. member would prevent one from pleading *autre fois convict* later. That takes away the benefit of the plea which should be there for all of us. I do not think that was the intended result. Whether or not one has actually been convicted or discharged, one still has to have the right to plead *autre fois convict*. That is another minor problem.

• (1330)

In summation, I thank the member for his obvious caring about this issue and for his constructive approach to rectifying an area of omission in our criminal records and criminal justice system.

**Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant):** Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief. I have to assume that government members are prepared to allow this private member's bill to pass at second reading and to go to a legislative committee, as I think it should. First of all, I commend the hon. member for Mississauga South for bringing forward Bill C-314.

The purpose of this bill, according to a notation in the bill itself, is to provide where a person is discharged under the Criminal Code in respect of an offence that all records relating to that offence must be destroyed. I also agree with the member who brought the bill forward that it is long overdue. This kind of rectifying legislation should have been brought forward by governments back in the 1970s, let alone the 1980s and now here we are in 1990, the beginning of a whole new decade.

I too have had some experience as a member of Parliament in trying to assist constituents to get pardons for a non-crime, as it were, as the hon. member so ably described in his opening remarks. It struck me at that time that what I was doing was not only a waste of time for me, but it was an unnecessary worry and burden for the constituent. That constituent had already been discharged from any criminal liability at the time by the presiding judge, and yet his or her record or non-record in the criminal records files had continued for years. We in the New Democratic Party welcome this bill this afternoon. We sincerely hope that it will pass. Obviously no vote is necessary. We are not going to talk it out, because there is no point in talking it out if we want it to pass.

I am still very concerned—and I know this is not totally relevant to this bill—about the length of time it takes to achieve pardons from the National Parole Board for relatively minor offences that took place many years in the past. It is an absolute shame that for a minor offence a citizen of this country, even if convicted, has to wait a minimum of five years before he or she can initiate this time consuming procedure to obtain that pardon.

We support Bill C-314 at second reading. We hope there are no hitches or glitches when it goes to a legislative committee, and we look forward to this bill becoming law as expeditiously as is humanly possible.

**Mr. Greg Thompson (Carleton—Charlotte):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the hon. member for Mississauga South. I commend him for the time and effort he has put into preparing his bill for our consideration.

Before proceeding to the specifics of amending the Criminal Records Act, I believe members of the House would welcome some further background information as a basis for discussion. In Canada federal clemency powers are exercised by means of three distinct yet interrelated mechanisms: the royal prerogative of mercy, section 683 and section 686 of the Criminal Code, and the Criminal Records Act. Both the royal prerogative, which is exercised by the Governor General, and the Criminal Code provisions, which are exercised by the Governor in Council, are largely unfettered, discretionary powers which permit the application of exceptional remedies, pardons, remissions, or respite in extraordinary circumstances. Stemming from the ancient privilege of monarchs to dispense mercy in deserving cases, these mechanisms are used as a last resort to ensure that justice can be tempered with compassion.

By comparison, the Criminal Records Act formally recognizes that an offender has satisfied the sentence imposed by the court and has demonstrated substantially that he or she is a responsible citizen. As such, the pardon granted by virtue of this legislation seeks to remove the social and legal disabilities which flow from conviction and, at the same time, to symbolize the ex-offender's successful social reintegration.

An individual convicted of a federal offence may apply under the Criminal Records Act to the Solicitor General for a pardon after a waiting period following completion of sentence. The waiting periods are as follows for the various levels of offences. When an offender has been convicted of an indictable offence, he or she will not be eligible to apply for a pardon until five years have elapsed after sentence expiry. An individual convicted of a summary offence must wait three years before applying.

As the legislation now stands—and this is the object of the amendments today—those charged with summary or indictable offences, who upon being found guilty receive absolute or conditional discharges, are ineligible to apply for pardons until one or three years respectively have elapsed after the decision of the court.

I will be moving to these particulars a little later in my discourse. At the moment, after the application for pardon is received, inquiries into the behaviour of the applicant since the date of his or her conviction are made by officials of the National Parole Board, which as we all know is an agency of the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

The Governor in Council may grant the pardon acting on the recommendation received from the Solicitor General. A pardon has the effect of vacating the conviction. The applicant's criminal record is sealed, that is set apart, and cannot be divulged without the written approval of the Solicitor General. The pardon can be revoked, however, if the recipient is no longer of good conduct, is convicted of a subsequent federal offence, or obtained the pardon on the basis of knowingly concealed or fraudulent information.

To build on this background, I believe that we should have some concept of the significance of the legislation that the member for Mississauga South is proposing to amend. With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I will outline the impact of the Criminal Records Act through a brief statistical account, because many Canadians have availed themselves of its provisions and many more will in years to come.

The annual number of pardon applications referred to the National Parole Board has risen virtually without interruption since the Criminal Records Act was proclaimed in 1970: from 380 applications in 1970 to 8,010 in 1981 and to some 23,000 in 1988-89. While some of the forms must be returned to applicants because they are premature or lacking essential data and others are ultimately discontinued as in cases of ineligibility, for example, the vast majority of legitimate requests are granted. This may simply indicate that those who correctly anticipate refusal do not apply, but approximately 98 per cent of all applications are approved. Notwithstanding the rapid increase in applications and the high grant rate, the number of pardon requests submitted represents a very small portion of the total population of ex-offenders eligible for pardons. Although an exact number of potential pardoned candidates cannot be

determined precisely, the RCMP reported last year that 2.5 million Canadians—and that is almost one in every ten Canadians— have criminal records. More than one-half of these represents summary convictions and is usually indicative of lesser crimes and infractions.

• (1340)

By the way, I did want to mention that many of us are unaware that pardons are obtainable through a somewhat challenging but nonetheless straightforward process. There are no exorbitant fees to be paid, and it is not necessary that an applicant retain a lawyer. The number of applications might also rise considerably, should these facts gain wider recognition.

A sample of National Parole Board files covering the 1976-1980 period has been analysed to provide a more complete description of pardons. In this sample group of 17,700 applicants, employment was the major reason cited for submitting an application. Some 48 per cent of applicants stated that a pardon would improve their prospects of gaining employment, advancement or security in their current job. A desire to start literally with a clean slate is an obvious consideration. The desire to achieve peace of mind is another, as indicated by the 84 per cent of applicants who were employed when their request was submitted since, in a majority of these cases, the employers were unaware of the applicant's criminal conviction.

To summarize, rather than trying Your Honour's patience and the patience of this House with an endless stream of numbers, the typical offence for which a pardon was requested was a property offence and the typical penalty was a fine. Some 52 per cent of the applicants had only been convicted once and a further 17 per cent had been convicted twice. However, during the sample period more than 2,000 pardons were granted after extensive investigation to persons with six or more convictions.

Nonetheless, applicants with several convictions or who had received sentences that entailed imprisonment were more likely to have been denied a pardon. Almost one-half or 46 per cent of all denials were for attitudinal reasons; whereas a much smaller proportion, 6 per cent, was rejected because of a recent conviction. Outstanding or repeated charges amounted to a total of 5 per cent or suspicion of criminal involvement amounted to 4 per cent.

As I mentioned, the Solicitor General on the advice of the National Parole Board, which is the agency that makes recommendations regarding pardons, is equally empowered to execute revocation. Of the approximately 17,700 pardons granted from 1976 to 1980, only 2 per cent were considered for revocation and, of these, roughly half were ultimately recommended for revocation. Although pardons can be revoked because the recipient is no longer of good conduct, the board in practice has based its recommendations solely on the occurrence of subsequent criminal convictions or repeated charges.

We have before us a proposition to correct potential and current injustices. I again commend the member who has brought it forward. To deal expeditiously and more or less automatically to remove the class of applicant designated by Bill C-314 from the pardon granting process would ease the burden on the National Parole Board whose efforts would be more productively directed to the consideration of cases of greater gravity.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey (Chicoutimi):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by congratulating the hon. member for Mississauga South on the impressive job he did in another area, as chairman of the finance committee. I would like to draw the attention of Canadians to the impressive amount of work done by the hon. member for a number of years on this committee, working steadily on changes to the entire Canadian tax system, to make it an instrument that will help the neediest among us. The abolition of tax shelters, Bill C-23, for instance, on the minimum tax for the rich, which met with the opposition of the Liberals and the NDP, all this was achieved thanks to the perseverance of the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the Criminal Records Act, in 1969, the Ouimet Committee recognized the need for legislation that would ease the legal disabilities and social stigma of a criminal record for those ex-offenders who had demonstrated over an appropriate number of years that they could lead crime-free lives. The committee's recommendations were largely responsible for the enactment of the *Criminal Records Act* in 1970. This

legislation was subsequently revisited when examined in conjunction with the Criminal Law Review, approved by cabinet in 1981. Two important principles contained in the policy statement produced by this review were that the criminal justice system should be governed by economy, necessity and restraint, and that whenever appropriate, the criminal law should provide for opportunities aimed at the personal reformation of the offender and his reintegration into the community.

In the period following the promulgation of the Criminal Records Act, deficiencies in the system for granting pardons had been identified by the government officials responsible for the implementation of the legislation. It had become evident that not enough eligible ex-offenders were receiving pardons and that the system of application, review and decision was too complicated. Law enforcement officials, for example, were unhappy with the complicated system of having to apply for access to "sealed" pardoned criminal records. More recently, the Nielsen Task Force Report characterized the current system as "costly, cumbersome and counterproductive".

Reform undertaken in light of these criticisms would require balancing of the three competing objectives of providing relief from a criminal record to increased numbers of eligible ex-offenders, ensuring that the public is protected and creating a more efficient criminal records system. Moreover, the affected constituencies are varied and their interests conflict to a certain extent. These factors suggest that simple solutions are unlikely.

Most opinion expressed in consultations to date supports the view that the primary aim of the pardon should be the removal, as completely as possible, of all the negative consequences of conviction once the offender has paid the debt owed society and enough time has elapsed to establish, with some degree of certainty, his law-abiding behaviour.

It should be noted that the bill drafted by the hon. member for Mississauga South calls for the "destruction" of pardoned records whereas the existing legislation provides for "sealing" this information. This is a very important point, to which I intend to return. Consultations have also revealed support for increased granting of pardons in a more simplified process, as long as there is not undue leniency or increased risk to the public.

The Nielsen Task Force on Improved Program Delivery in the Justice System examined the functioning of the Criminal Records Act, and included the scrutiny of eligibility criteria, benefits provided to the pardoned individual and access to and destruction of records. The task force recognized in 1985, when their study was conducted, that the existing method was slow—an average of 13 months per application processed; costly—91 person-years distributed between the RCMP and the National Parole Board; cumbersome—requiring a decision by the Governor in Council; and sometimes counter productive—after the RCMP had completed the necessary community assessment, employers, neighbours and relatives may have been given the knowledge that the applicant has a criminal record.

• (1350)

The possibility of cost reductions and savings of person-years as a consequence of implementation of a more efficient system of pardoning motivated the Nielsen Task Force to propose a "records management" approach. The task force report predicted that a saving of $2.4 million and 57.5 p/y's could be achieved under a system where the initiation of the records management process became an internal government responsibility without the need for a formal application from the ex-offender and where the criteria for eligibility for pardon was restricted, in all cases, solely to a specified number of years of crime—free behaviour in the community. This allocation of money and person-years was the total amount which the Parole Board had available for the delivery of its responsibilities under the Criminal Records Act.

It is difficult to determine the exact nature of all assumptions which were used to arrive at this estimate of potential savings. An approximation of resource implications of this magnitude could only be achieved under a system which precluded all community investigations. It is important to analyse the savings which could be achieved under the various options for reform which have been proposed. It is also important to ascertain whether the savings are for the government as a whole or whether costs are simply being shifted to other agencies, departments or governments.

The Nielsen findings, Mr. Speaker, are most relevant to the bill put forward for our consideration today. The possibility of streamlining the present pardoning process then explored was contingent upon an integrated country-wide system of record management. The hon. member for Mississauga South is calling for the destruction of the criminal records of those individuals who have received conditional or absolute discharges. I fear that the realization of the intent of Bill C-314 will run into the same problems as the Nielsen proposal for economy had it been pursued. Neither clearly defined central record-keeping functions nor a central file registry exist to administer criminal records in Canada. To be sure, the RCMP maintains a data bank that contains the records of all convictions for indictable offences. However, no such centralized system contains records proceeding from summary convictions, and Bill C-314 would entail the search for even more nebulous entities: records of conditional and absolute discharges.

Ideally there would be a registry that would include records of convictions for both summary and indictable offences as well as the class of record to which the currently proposed reforms refer. The registry would integrate the overlapping responsibilities of local, municipal, provincial and national police forces and the courts for keeping documents which refer to the investigation, prosecution and conviction of offenders.

The passage of Bill C-314 would have the effect that records thereafter: created through the direction by the courts for conditional or absolute discharges would subsequently be destroyed. Under the provisions of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, however, it might well be mandatory that the force of the amendments be retroactive. There are two ways in which the objectives of amendments as applied to existing records might be realized. In the first case, the current procedure of application for pardon could be maintained, but relief would be granted automatically and swiftly to those who wished to erase their records of absolute or conditional discharge. A "hands-on" involvement of government officials would remain a necessary part of the pardoning process. The other method of implementation would be the erasure of all records that fall within the categories in question. While the decision-making process would be replaced by the mere identification of eligible individuals, to be fully effective, it would be necessary to create the complex centralized system I have mentioned because the records in question are not gathered within the confines of a single repository.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my time is almost up. I shall, of course, continue until you indicate that I have used up the entire period of time I am allowed.

It has been noted, Mr. Speaker, that the lack of public awareness of the pardon process and the very small percentage of potential beneficiaries who now use the provisions of the *Criminal Records Act* raise questions about the utility of the current law. If either procedure that I have mentioned was pursued to implement retroactively the amendments brought about by Bill C-314, the intent of the legislation could only be achieved through publicity campaigns: in one case, to educate the sizable number of Canadians that speedy relief had become available; and in the other, to notify those who might even be unaware of the existence of a negative record, that all had been forgiven.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sure I will have an opportunity to get back to this subject again, and I should be glad to lay the last part of my speech on the table as an addition to this debate.

**Mrs. Gabrielle Bertrand (Brome—Missisquoi):** Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in participating in this debate. I must tell you that, when the Criminal Records Act was passed, about 20 years ago, it was felt that the consequences of a verdict of guilty which resulted in an absolute or conditional discharge should be dealt with as if a criminal record had been created, although no conviction was registered.

At the time, this process was considered necessary to ensure that information pertaining to conditional or absolute discharges could be identified and sealed in those cases where pardons were requested and subsequently granted. It is realized today, however, that the purpose of a discharge is to be less detrimental to the offender than if no discharge was granted. This decision is made by a judge having regard for the nature of the offence, the circumstances surrounding its commission and whether the offender deserves this special treatment.

One can argue that the provisions of the current legislation that create the necessity of applying for a pardon for a crime that has not resulted in a conviction, have also created an anomaly which should be rectified. And this position, Mr. Speaker, is ably put forward by the Member for Mississauga South through the Bill before us to-day for second reading.

It is my belief that in the absence of demonstrable harm to public safety, a pardon should be considered as a common procedure which follows a specified amount of time after a discharge has been granted. That this relief would be of direct benefit to those individuals whose reputations would otherwise be compromised is beyond question, Mr. Speaker. In addition, this procedure could result in a saving of resources for the National Parole Board which is responsible for advising the Solicitor General in regard to granting pardons.

It must be noted, however, that 80 per cent of applicants for pardons have more than one entry on their criminal record, which might, therefore, include a summary conviction, for example, as well as a discharge. The separation of the charges and identification of relevant offences to be dealt with would involve considerable time and a sophisticated records retrieval system. It might be anticipated that greater demands on the officials charged with the investigations prompted by applications for pardon—the RCMP, for the most part—would be increased substantially.

This is but one example of the problems now being considered by a committee within the Ministry of the Solicitor General involving representatives of the RCMP, the National Parole Board and the Police and Security Branch of the ministry secretariat, in consultation with other relevant Ministries and meeting under the chairmanship of the Corrections Branch of the secretariat.

The work of this committee—more properly designated the Criminal Records Management Review—involves reviewing two separate yet interrelated reform options. It will review past achievements and suggest future options for administrative changes to achieve greater efficiencies and savings in the process of granting of pardons and record keeping. It will also consider possible options for future legislative and programming initiatives aimed at better achieving the objectives of the Criminal Records Act.

Before you call me to order, Mr. Speaker, I think I could table the rest of my speech and ask that it be put on the record.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** No, please carry on.

**Mrs. Bertrand:** If you tell me that I can carry on, Mr. Speaker, I will although I know that my time is limited.

However, I think that, before addressing the legislative changes which might be considered by the committee and those before us to-day, it would be relevant to review what has been achieved through positive changes in the administration of the Criminal Records Act. These reforms were prompted by earlier reviews of the Act, broad consultations and, in part, the recommendations of the Nielsen.

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

[*English*]

It being two o'clock, p.m., the House will now proceed to Statements by Members.

---

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*Translation*]

### PORK PRODUCERS

**Mr. Jean-Pierre Blackburn (Jonquière):** Mr. Speaker, Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean pork producers have recently been talking to members and ministers about the many problems they face when trying to maintain production. The fact that our region lacks slaughter houses and our remoteness from large centres does not help our pork producers whose production costs exceed sale prices.

The crisis is acute, Mr. Speaker, and the government should intervene immediately if we are to maintain a healthy sector in our region and save our pork producers. Mr. Speaker, since 170 jobs are on the line, allow me to draw your attention to an important point. There is no overproduction in our region, for we produce about 35,000 hogs a year and our consumption is up to 110,000.

Again I emphasize to my colleagues, the Minister of State for Agriculture and the minister responsible for regional development that urgent action is required.

* * *

## PAPER INDUSTRY

**Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau—La Lièvre):** Mr. Speaker, the closure of the James MacLaren saw mill in Thurso, Quebec, leaves us unable to deal with the impact of the recession, the overly high interest rates, and above all a surplus of sawn lumber.

How come the company was unable to predict such a disastrous situation for Thurso area workers? A company spokesman simply told me that unexpected rising interest rates, contrary to what the Minister of Finance told us eight months ago, were the main cause of their deficit and that the company could no longer operate under the repeated deficits incurred by the mill these past few years.

I hope the saw mill workers will have the support of Employment Canada and benefit from retraining programs to help them find new jobs.

* * *

[*English*]

## GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** Mr. Speaker, today the GATT talks are heating up in Brussels. The next few days are critical to the future of agriculture.

Canadian negotiators should work hard to reach a settlement, but not at the expense of Canadian farmers. Despite a difficult growing season, high transportation costs, Canadian farmers have been able to produce a world class agricultural system. However, because of predatory practices by other countries, many of our farm families are having a great difficulty surviving from harvest to harvest. We want our rural communities to flourish, we want to stop farm bankruptcies, and we want to be as self-sufficient as possible.

We wish our GATT negotiators well and we urge the Europeans and Americans to be more flexible. Nonetheless, there is a chance that the GATT talks will fail.

We therefore call upon the government to be prepared to act very quickly to put in place contingency plans, should the talks fail. The U.S. farm bill contains contingency plans for a GATT failure. Our farmers deserve nothing less.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

**Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound—Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, the 36th Annual North Atlantic Assembly was held in London, England, from November 26 to November 30. The conference was outstanding in that it was set in the atmosphere of the new openness which, in little over a year, has blossomed in Europe and around the world. In addition to the representatives from the 16 NATO member countries, there were delegations from five of the six Warsaw Pact countries, as well as from Japan and Australia, who had observer status.

Many frank discussions took place and major addresses were given by the Secretary of NATO, Manfred Worner, and also the foreign minister of Poland, Krzysztof Skubiszewski, the former President of Czechoslovakia, Alexander Dubcek, the Hon. Neil Kinnock, leader of the British Labour Party, as well as the Right Hon. Tom King, Secretary of Defence for the United Kingdom.

The assembly was the most successful ever held, and I believe reflected the new and growing realities of a post-cold war international order.

Congratulations are also to be given to our colleague, Bob Hicks, the MP for Scarborough East, who was elected a vice-president of the North Atlantic Assembly in London.

* * *

## PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

**Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North):** Mr. Speaker, as the member of Parliament for Etobicoke North, I would like to express my opposition to the plans to add three additional runways at Pearson International Airport, as outlined by Transport Canada on November 12.

Although aware of the need to address the future transport requirements of metro Toronto, the citizens of Etobicoke North and other areas around Pearson International Airport have already sacrificed more than their share in terms of their quality of life.

In March, 1990 the residents were informed that, pending the outcome of an environmental assessment, Transport Canada proposed two additional runways at Pearson International Airport. Now, not eight months later, the residents have been informed that three additional runways are contemplated. It is evident that Transport Canada has no equitable, long-term plan for metro Toronto's transport needs, merely a series of *ad hoc* expediencies which serve only to aggravate the fundamental problems.

I call upon Transport Canada to re-evaluate plans for Pearson International Airport so that the residents of Etobicoke North and surrounding areas are not being asked to carry a disproportionate burden of future metro Toronto transport requirements.

* * *

## WESTERN DIVERSIFICATION

**Mrs. Louise Feltham (Wild Rose):** Mr. Speaker, Alberta's diversification efforts are working. According to a survey of private sector forecasters, Alberta can expect real growth rates of about 2 per cent in 1990 and 1991, about double the expected national rate.

A major reason for this growth is that diversification efforts are succeeding. There are now 750 technology intensive companies in Alberta and they employ 78,000 people. They also generate more than $4 billion in annual revenues. Manufacturing output is expected to increase by 3 per cent both this year and next and exports in goods and services are expected to rise 8.2 per cent in 1990, and another 6.3 per cent in 1991. This will translate into increased employment opportunities.

The federal government's Western Diversification Initiative has assisted in this growth. Above all, it has put the decision-making powers in the hands of those who know best, the people of Alberta.

*S. O. 31*

## VIA RAIL

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Mr. Speaker, for too long VIA Rail has been a half-measure of a company whose corporate motto has been, "Yes, but—".

Yes, it exists, but it has no mandate.

Yes, it owns equipment, but it owns no track.

Yes, there is service, but, in many cases, only on some days, and with unreliable equipment and agonizing delays.

Yes, it runs a transcontinental service, but not where there is real demand, and not along the historic Canadian route.

Yes, VIA is running, but it is not running to win. It is not designed to.

That is why we have launched a national campaign to get Canada back on track.

Canadians will remember the broken promises of the government and they will remember what the Liberals and their recycled leader did to VIA when they were in power.

Time is running out. The fight to put Canada back on track has started, and we are not going to stop until Canadians have a national rail passenger system and a government that we can be proud of.

* * *

## INCOME AND POVERTY

**Mr. Lee Richardson (Calgary Southeast):** Mr. Speaker, data released Thursday by Statistics Canada on income and poverty has revealed positive news for Canadians.

When the Conservatives came to power in 1984, there were four million Canadians living below the poverty line, which, for example, was just over $20,000 for a family of four in an urban area. Today, there are only 3 million people living below the current poverty line which, for the same family of four, is $24,706. This means that one million Canadians have been able to move out of the poverty levels in the past six years.

• (1410)

For Canadian families, the government's policies have also meant that the percentage living below the poverty line has decreased from 13.5 per cent in 1984 to 9.6 per cent in 1989. This drop also corresponds with a $5,000 increase after inflation in the average income for a family of four from $45,000 in 1984 to just over $50,000 today.

These statistics clearly illustrate our government's strong commitment to helping those less fortunate Canadians find their way out of the despair of poverty. We still have a long way to go in our efforts to eliminate poverty in the country, but these statistics show that the Conservative government is indeed on the right path to achieve this goal.

* * *

## GUN CONTROL

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce):** Mr. Speaker, once again this past weekend, a semi-automatic rifle was used in Vancouver to kill two men at a public meeting, while the government has put its gun control bill on the back-burner.

On December 6 this week, we will remember the 14 women who were selectively massacred with a semi-automatic weapon in Montreal one year ago. In April, the Minister of Justice went to the École Polytechnique where she was presented with 25 boxes of petitions with over 500 names asking for stricter gun laws. She promised legislation but now we are getting a study instead of a law. We do not need another study to tell us that semi-automatics should not be sold over the counter like fishing rods.

Whenever we have tightened our gun laws, we have lowered the rate of crime with guns. Why then is the government sabotaging its own bill? Why is it breaking faith with the students at École Polytechnique and millions of other Canadians?

* * *

[*Translation*]

## INCOMES AND POVERTY

**Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec-Est):** Mr. Speaker, on November 29, Statistics Canada published the 1989 data on incomes and poverty. Here are some of the highlights:

Last year, 199,000 people ceased to live below the poverty line, which makes for a total reduction of 956,000 since 1984. During the past few years, 104,000 women and 38,000 children left the ranks of the poor. Since 1984, the number of poor women dropped by 333,000, and the number of poor children by 297,000, a reduction of more than 25 per cent. Since 1984, the average family income, adjusted for inflation, has increased by more than $5,000. Even the proportion of family poverty dropped from 13.9 per cent in 1984 to 9.6 per cent last year. Among single Canadians, the poverty rate dropped from 37.7 per cent in 1984 to 30.5 per cent last year. The overall poverty rate dropped from 16.8 per cent in 1984 to 12.2 per cent last year, a reduction of one quarter since 1984.

Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree we are still on the right track!

* * *

[*English*]

## AIR TRANSPORTATION SAFETY

**Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to first associate myself with the views of my colleague from Etobicoke North in terms of runway expansion plans at Pearson International Airport, because for the surrounding communities enough is enough. There are also safety overtones to that.

Last week, the department's inspection supervisor said that the effectiveness of air safety inspectors will be reduced by 60 per cent due to a manpower shortage and that, as a result, safety rules are routinely being waived.

To make matters worse, there are plans to phase out the emergency back-up system for radar units across Canada in order to save $500,000.

I do not know about you, Mr. Speaker, but when I fly, as do many Canadians, I want an assurance that all radar safety units are in working order all the time, not only when the government decides to allocate the necessary funds. Moreover, with the advent of the government's deregulation and privatization policy, there is a need for more air safety measures and not fewer. Safety in the skies is a price worth paying.

## AIDS

**Hon. David MacDonald (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, in April, 1990 the film *Talkin' about AIDS* was aired nationally. *Talkin' about AIDS* was developed by the Department of National Health and Welfare and received much critical recognition, including nominations for two prestigious Gemini Awards to be decided this evening.

Designed to inform young people of the facts about AIDS in a straightforward manner, people with AIDS, including a 17-year-old, talked openly about their struggles and experiences. Dramatic skits were used to demonstrate some of the social skills and assertiveness techniques that our young people can use to encourage responsible sexual behaviour.

The films were accompanied by teacher and student guides and have been distributed to high schools and school boards across Canada by the Canadian Association of Principals.

These AIDS education initiatives for youth demonstrate the Department of National Health and Welfare's continued commitment to the national strategy on AIDS and to preventing the spread of HIV infection in Canada.

* * *

## SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair):** Mr. Speaker, today the Canadian Advanced Technology Association asked the government to adopt the following policy statement: "Canada must shift to a higher percentage of national investment in the production and marketing of advanced technology goods and services into the production of higher value-added products in all sectors and to the application and use of technology to build competitiveness and into the development of human resource capability to facilitate these shifts."

These are the indispensable steps to industrial restructuring to which the government has given lip service, while in fact adopting monetary policies that make them impossible to achieve.

CATA says that the finance minister must scrap his high interest policies now because not just the short-term but the long-term future of Canada is at stake. With that New Democrats agree.

---

# ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

## PERSIAN GULF

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre):** Mr. Speaker, it is nice to be home. I can say one thing after what I have seen in the past two weeks. Question Period is like having a picnic in a rose garden. We can now get on with the menu, I expect.

I would like to ask a question of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. On Friday the minister indicated that either he or the Prime Minister would be prepared to go to Baghdad as part of the proposed peace negotiation.

Is the government willing to review its policy of making direct representations to the Iraqi officials on behalf of the Canadian hostages still held in that country? In particular, could I ask the minister if the government would be prepared to provide direct support for families or other private groups which are also prepared to go to that country to make representations on behalf of Canadians still held there? If I could make a specific plea, I would ask the minister if he would be prepared to make representations on behalf of Mr. Rustom who is the elderly pilgrim who is being held there even though Iraqi officials have said that he is free to go but has not been given his visa as yet?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, may I welcome the hon. member back. He made reference to a news report that I am sure surprised him as much as it surprised the Prime Minister and me. My exact language from the transcript when the question was put to me as to whether I was looking at going to that part of the world quotes: "Well, we rule nothing out. I think that the roles that Canada can play at this stage are more likely more private than that, although it goes without saying that I am prepared to go, the Prime Minister is, other ministers are, anywhere it would be constructive". That was the context in which I made those comments. Indeed, that kind of action by the

Government of Canada, the Prime Minister, myself and others, wherever it can be constructive in this context is the practice that we have been following.

With respect to the Rustom situation, our ambassador, Chris Poole, has been in again. We have sent seven diplomatic notes. There have been 20 meetings with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. There have been three personal letters from Mr. Rustom to Saddam Hussein. We intend to continue to press vigorously to have him released.

With respect to support that might be given to others, the hon. member knows very well and has respected with a faithfulness, which I very much appreciate, the distinction between official and unofficial missions with respect to persons held captive in Iraq. We would continue to respect that distinction.

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre):** Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, I want to ask the minister about the question of sanctions. In August the United Nations indicated that the most effective means of securing the Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait was a program of sanctions. We have followed it up to now.

I can say, from direct experience, that the sanctions are having an incredibly strong impact on that country. Health care services and transportation are deteriorating. There is incredible inflation. Spare parts are running out. Even the military capacity is being affected.

In light of that, I want to ask the minister why it is that the government keeps insisting that it has to support a military option, when in fact it is clear the continuation of economic sanctions against Iraq will have, and can have, the desired result of having them withdraw.

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the option that this government is pursuing and will continue to pursue is the United Nations option. That is the option that gave rise to sanctions. We intend to continue with the sanctions program. We intend to continue as vigorously as we can.

The United Nations also, with the support of most of the world and the majority of this House, excluding the Liberal and New Democratic parties which decided not to vote for continued United Nations action in the gulf on that particular matter—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

• (1420 )

Our position is that we have now taken through the United Nations actions involving the clear signal that force will be used, but also involving a pause for peace, a pause of good will, on which action has already begun, as has been evidenced by the statements by the Americans and by the Iraqis.

With respect to sanctions, I certainly cannot dispute the fact that they are having an impact upon social services. I have no doubt that they are having an impact upon the children of Iraq. I have no doubt that they are having an impact upon the poor of Iraq, but there is very little reason for us to believe that they are having an effect on the military planners or the military capacity of Iraq.

What we are trying to do is have a range of measures that will cause changes in the military plans of Iraq so that there will be respect for the United Nations resolutions, and so that it will move back from Kuwait.

I look forward to the opportunity to meet with the hon. member and other members of this House who have just come back from Baghdad. I understand because of their collective schedules, that cannot occur for another week. I look forward to having the advantage of their personal experiences. I also look forward to meeting with the standing committee.

I believe a meeting is scheduled now or being discussed for Thursday morning in which we will have the opportunity to discuss at some length and in as much detail as circumstances allow our assessment of the impact of sanctions on various elements of Iraqi society.

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I look forward to that exchange.

I think that we can provide the minister with pretty clear evidence that his thesis about what is working and what is not working is wrong. In fact, we can affect the military capacity of that country.

As a follow-up supplementary, I would like to put this question.

[*Translation*]

President Bush said that several members of the multinational force would be asked to take part in discussions with the Iraqi Minister of Foreign Affairs. Will Canada be part of this group? Will the United States consult our allies before this meeting? And what peace alternatives does the Canadian government intend to suggest before the meeting, to deal with the conflict?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, there are ongoing consultations between Canada and the other members of the coalition who are trying, by peaceful means, to get Saddam Hussein to leave Kuwait. Today, for instance, the Prime Minister spoke directly to Secretary of State Baker, to communicate information we had that was not available to the Americans, about a certain aspect of the situation in the gulf. When I went to the Middle East last week, I had some worthwhile discussions with ministers, presidents and kings of certain countries in the area about approaches that could be effective and in which Canada could play a part. We have a pretty solid reputation in the area, and it would be a mistake for Canadians to underestimate Canada's impact in the area and in the crisis. We are now considering, identifying and putting into practice all the ways in which we as Canadians can bring our influence to bear to achieve a peaceful solution in line with the UN resolutions.

* * *

## IMMIGRATION

**Hon. André Ouellet (Papineau—Saint-Michel):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. On the weekend, the Prime Minister referred to an increasingly sovereignist climate in Quebec. I would like him to tell the House whether he realizes how important it is for his government to take concrete action to deal effectively with the situation. In this respect, is the Prime Minister prepared to instruct his Minister of Employment and Immigration to conclude as soon as possible an agreement with her provincial counterpart, as the previous administration did with the Cullen-Couture Agreement, in order to get rid of at least one of the irritants in the Canada-Quebec dossier?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Of course, Mr. Speaker. The government is working actively with the Government of Quebec and other provincial governments on agreements in the difficult area of immigration, an area that is particularly important to Quebec, considering its demographic impact on the francophone part of our country. I think both governments will have more news on the subject in the not too distant future.

My hon. friend alluded to my comments that there was a sovereignist wind blowing in Quebec and that this was particularly obvious from the proceedings of the Bélanger–Campeau Commission. In fact, I have urged Quebecers to be very prudent and to ensure that the process is not skewed, considering this, probably short-lived, phenomenon in Quebec. In any case, I would like to point out, since we find this phenomenon at all levels in our society, that it started mainly because the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Chrétien, said that Meech could be killed without serious consequences. Today, we see the consequences in Quebec and Canada, which can be laid squarely at the door of Jean Chrétien.

**Hon. André Ouellet (Papineau—Saint-Michel):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the encouraging remarks of the Prime Minister with regard to the settlement of the immigration issue. I hope that the minister who is now in this House has heard the very precise and urgent indications in this regard.

As to the second part of the Prime Minister's reply, I can say that the failure of the Meech Lake Accord could not be attributed to someone who sat neither in this House of Commons, nor in any of the provincial legislatures.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Blais:** Say it again with a straight face!

**Mr. Ouellet:** In this connection, I should like to ask the Prime Minister to demonstrate the same good will and to describe for Quebec men and women the benefits and significance of belonging to Canada. Is he planning to appear before the Bélanger–Campeau Commission, as Mr. Chrétien will?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** First of all, I want to very sincerely praise the Hon. Member for Papineau—Saint-Michel for his unfailing support of the Meech Lake Accord during the three long years of debates and discussions. All hon. members will recognize, however, that my hon. friend is somewhat stretch-

ing the point when he says that someone outside this House has had no impact on the ultimate result. They will remember that, last January, Mr. Chrétien said: "The failure of the Meech Lake Accord is of no consequence; it is like when you are stuck in a snowbank: You move forward, you move backward, then you do it all over again, and again, until eventually you manage to get out." Such was Mr. Chrétien's position. We saw the high point of all this when Mr. Chrétien embraced Mr. Wells in Calgary and said:

[*English*]

Thanks Clyde for all your good work.

[*Translation*]

All Canadians are aware that this new impulse given to the sovereignty option is the result of Mr. Chrétien's move. Now it is the responsibility of all other hon. members of this House to rebuild national unity.

* * *

• (1430)

## THE CONSTITUTION

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. According to an article in *La Presse* the Prime Minister is reported to have a constitutional plan. Yesterday, the Prime Minister announced the setting up of a joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate whose mandate would be to develop a new amending formula. There is no indication that the Prime Minister consulted anyone and, what is more, the Prime Minister chose to make this announcement in front of Tory supporters. I am somewhat concerned about the whole process.

My question to the Prime Minister is this: Before my party can support this initiative, could the Prime Minister assure us that this process will include the participation of the Canadian public, that this is an honest exercise, and that so far no decision has been made?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is blaming me for coming out openly in dealing with this issue. I mentioned it last Friday when I met with the editorial team of *La Presse*, and I mentioned it again yesterday in Montreal before 1,400 Conservative supporters. I might have done that before NDP supporters, but it would have been difficult in Montreal.

I mentioned the setting up of a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons. I know that the Government House Leader intends to consult tomorrow with his two opposite numbers and later on with various senators. If I understand the Standing Orders correctly, the committees themselves are responsible for establishing their own rules and regulations.

Therefore let the NDP Leader be reassured, that this committee will be totally independent. Our purpose is to remedy a major deficiency in the current process which hinders any progress in the area of constitutional reform. This deficiency came to light between 1987 and 1990, and we must absolutely find a way to remedy it for the future.

[*English*]

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. No one is in disagreement that constitutional talks need to continue. No one is in disagreement that the amending formula must be discussed. What this party is in disagreement with is that the Prime Minister's idea of consultation is making announcements at $500 a plate Conservative dinners.

The Prime Minister has made an announcement that he is going to take further initiative on the Constitution, and we welcome that the Prime Minister has a plan. I would also ask the Prime Minister if he is prepared as well to make good his promises that he has made to aboriginal people, both during the Meech lake process and during the summer.

What is the Prime Minister prepared to do to keep his promises to the aboriginal people of Canada concerning both the Constitution and the other promises which he has made to that group?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, we of course are in the process of working as well in regard to those particular commitments which we view as very serious and most important for the well–being of the country. There have been undertakings made thus far, and there will be others made in the course of the next few months.

My hon. friend apparently is angry with me for making a statement at a $500 a plate Conservative dinner. We have never been angry with her when she has gone to make a statement at the CLC at $1 million a plate.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, I wish I could share the Prime Minister's optimism about the kind of dinners I attend.

The Constitution is crucial. It is crucial for aboriginal people. It is crucial for all Canadians. It is crucial for the future of Quebec and for the provinces within the country. I think it is important that all Canadians be concerned about the future of our country and the Constitution.

There are many Canadians whose primary preoccupation now is how they can find a job or how they can keep a job. The recession is hurting all sectors of our economy: farmers, people in the manufacturing sector, workers in the logging industry—every sector of our economy.

The Prime Minister is prepared to establish a committee on the Constitution. This is important, but surely the economy deserves the same kind of attention because people are just trying to keep bread on the table, to keep their job, house, clothe and feed their children.

Would the Prime Minister also support the establishment of an all-party House of Commons committee on combating the recession, on positive measures to get Canadians back to work?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to examine any ideas my hon. friends have in regard to working with the government. We are in difficult economic times, and obviously any good concrete proposals will be looked at and studied very carefully.

I point out to my hon. friend that, while we are going through difficult times, there were numbers published by Statistics Canada on Thursday which I know she will find both interesting and encouraging.

Since 1984 real family income has increased 11.5 per cent. The proportion of people below Statistics Canada's low income line has declined in 1989 for the sixth consecutive year, for example from 20.1 per cent to 14.6 per cent among children. Since 1984—and I know this is of particular interest to my hon. friend—956,000 Canadians have been taken off the poverty roles in Canada.

That to me is the sign of an economy that is working in a socially positive way.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to the constitutional issue and direct my question to the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister has the bad habit of blaming others for his unsuccessful ventures. First I would say to him that we welcome the proposition he made over the weekend to change the constitutional amendment process. As it happened, Liberal leader Jean Chrétien rejected the unanimity rule on January 16, 1990 and advocated a more flexible formula.

Given the Meech Lake Accord experiment, is the Prime Minister now prepared to invite all Canadians to play an active role with the parliamentary committee he has proposed so as to take a closer look at the whole issue of the amending formula?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Indeed, Mr. Speaker, yesterday I formally announced that no later than tomorrow the government leader will consult with my friend to follow up on the propositions I made public precisely to look into the serious problem of the paralysis flowing from section 38 of the Constitution Act, 1982. If my friend has specific suggestions or comments to make either on the establishment of the commission itself or on its on-going or future proceedings, we will be pleased to hear them.

[*English*]

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that every time the Prime Minister goes into the province of Quebec he announces a new constitutional procedure.

It came as no surprise to us that at Mont Ste. Anne, for example, he announced the Spicer commission. Yesterday in Montreal he announced the new parliamentary committee.

As of today it is true that the opposition has not been consulted. We wish we were. Yet the Prime Minister promised to set up before Christmas—that is in a few weeks—a committee to look into this whole procedural question.

Can the Prime Minister share today with us in this House some of his thoughts and plans on setting up this commission? How soon? Who will be on it, and who will be involved in it?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I gather the House leaders will meet tomorrow and agree upon the manner in which this committee will function.

• (1440)

My hon. friend seems to express some concern that I would go into Quebec or elsewhere and announce the creation of the Spicer commission and then subsequently announce the creation of a parliamentary committee to examine the paralysis that has resulted from section 38. I can only assume, because he is unfavourably impressed, that he disagrees with these two approaches: the Spicer commission approach and the parliamentary commission. The question is: Why are they required?

**An hon. member:** Right on.

**Mr. Mulroney:** My friend says "Right on". On June 9, when we signed the Meech Lake Accord at the Conference Centre, Premier Bourassa said that with the 1981 Constitution Quebecers were part of a legal Constitution but, with the conclusion of the Meech Lake Accord, Quebecers for the first time felt they were part of a real Constitution and a real country. Those were very important and significant times: a commitment by the government of the province of Quebec and its premier to profound Canadian unity.

This was dashed a few days later because some people believed the statement by Mr. Chrétien that Meech Lake could be rejected without consequences. His short-sighted partisanship prevented him from endorsing Meech Lake. We as Canadians have to work hard now to maintain the unity of Canada that he placed—

* * *

## THE ECONOMY

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister is aware of the serious allegations made by his former industry minister regarding a secret deal struck with Washington to increase the value of the Canadian dollar in order to get a free trade agreement. The Minister of Finance disagrees with this.

If there was no such deal, why has the value of the Canadian dollar risen so dramatically since the free trade agreement was signed? Will the Prime Minister move today to drop the value of the Canadian dollar so that Canadian companies can compete on a level playing field?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I commented publicly yesterday on that. I said that the statement was absurd speculation, but it is simply also not true.

I would remind my hon. friend that Mr. Stevens was basing his speculative comments on a conversation that he had with a man who was not involved in the negotiations and a conversation that was held some two years before the final negotiations were completed.

**Hon. Roy MacLaren (Etobicoke North):** Mr. Speaker, the minister has said that the allegations are untrue, but the policy outcome is the same.

The solution to Canada's current economic problems, including its deficit and inflation, lies in improving Canada's international competitiveness. Yet this government persists in a high interest rate policy, which drives up the Canadian dollar, which in turn reduces our ability to compete, especially with the United States.

How can the government claim to be making Canada competitive when its own policies are at the root of the problem?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend is saying that we should have ignored the inflationary pressures that have clearly been in the economy over the last three years, I do not know what he thinks that would do to our competitive position.

What would have happened had we ignored the inflationary problem as has been the case, as an example, with the United Kingdom? We both had an inflation rate at about the same level in 1988. Its most recently has been just short of 11 per cent; ours has been in the 4 per cent range for a number of months now.

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance as well who has denied the allegation of his former cabinet colleague that there was a secret deal with the United States to boost the value of the Canadian dollar in connection with the free trade agreement.

Would the Minister of Finance not agree that it is the U.S. trade balance which has improved while the Canadian trade balance has deteriorated; that it is American goods that have become less expensive while Canadian goods have become more expensive; and that in fact such results of the free trade agreement and this government's monetary policy, that is the high dollar, have the characteristics of a smoking gun with which Canada has shot itself in the foot?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, it surprises me that my hon. friend would attach such significance to a speculative statement made by someone who was not at the table.

Simon Reisman, the number one trade negotiator, has said on a number of occasions that there was no such deal and no such understanding. Gordon Ritchie, the number two man in the negotiations said exactly the same thing. Derek Burney, who was present at the final negotiations, within the last few months has made the same statement also. I do not know where my hon. friend is getting the support for the deal that he is alleging was made.

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair):** Too much, Mr. Speaker. Today, StatsCan reports that a composite leading indicator has dropped for the eighth consecutive month, this time at the accelerated rate of one-half of a percentage point. Thus, we have one more indicator confirming what so many Canadian workers know: that the country has been plunged into a recession by its own government.

If there was no deal with United States to keep the dollar high, what possible explanation can there be for this government's refusal to change a policy that is a cause of a national economic crisis? Why not lower interest rates? Why not lower the value of the dollar? Why not put Canadians back to work? Why not look after the long-term interests of the economy of this country?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what we have been doing. Interest rates have come down two percentage points over the last few months as a reflection of the weakness in the economy.

I call my hon. member's attention to the fact that there have been increasing inflationary pressures. They are still in the economy and have been there since the third quarter of this year. If we ignore them, we will go back to the same sort of problem that we had in 1970s and early 1980s when governments ignored the problem.

Inflation surged from about 5.5 per cent in the mid-seventies to 13 per cent in 1981. This resulted in interest rates that were in the 21, 22, 23 per cent range. Unemployment in some parts of the country was in excess of 25 per cent.

That is what we are trying to avoid with the policies we have been following. We have been able to control the rate of inflation. We have a healthier economy today going into a recession than was the case in 1981-82. Certainly it is the case with the United Kingdom.

* * *

## BÉLANGER-CAMPEAU COMMISSION

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

A few minutes ago, he said: "We have to work hard for a united Canada." We all agree with him on this. If that is the case, why won't the Prime Minister go before the Bélanger-Campeau commission and speak for a united Canada? This may be hard work, but is Canada not worth it?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, as the smile on the face of the hon. member for Papineau tells you, there may be things that are hard work in Canada, but going before the Bélanger-Campeau commission to read a brief is not among them.

What is and was hard work was trying to bring 10 provincial premiers together to agree on a method of amending the Canadian Constitution, which was endorsed by the Liberal Party, the NDP and many Canadians.

We have been across the country discussing outlines of the manner in which Canada can evolve in the future. I have just come back from making two or three major speeches in the province of Quebec. We will be doing many other things as a government and as a Parliament to work together for Canadian unity.

There are all kinds of ways in which members and ministers can contribute. But in the circumstances, I believe that the representation of my party and of the party of the opposition on that commission are appropriate. I think it would be inappropriate in the circumstances for the Prime Minister of Canada to appear before a provincial commission.

• (1450)

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, there are precedents of provincial ministers, in fact provincial premiers, appearing before committees of this House of Commons to speak for Canada. I ask the Prime Minister, why is it not a good precedent for the Prime Minister of Canada to go before a provincial commission to speak for Canada? Hon. Jean Chrétien has the guts to do it. Why doesn't the Prime Minister?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I have no comment in regard to Mr. Chrétien's decision, if he wishes to go before that commission. He is presently a private citizen. If, indeed, at that point in time he is a member of Parliament, God bless him. He is entitled to do whatever he wants and if he wishes to go before that commission to speak out clearly, that is his privilege, and we will respect him for it.

Perhaps we would have respected him a little more if when the occasion arose and his voice was needed in June, rather than choosing to hide under his pool table in his residence in Ottawa, he had spoken out clearly on behalf of the Meech Lake Accord which would have brought unity to Canada.

* * *

## PERSIAN GULF

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. On Friday I asked the Secretary of State about initiatives which Canada would take to bring about a peaceful resolution to the gulf crisis before January 15. A few hours later, President Bush took the important step of calling for high level talks between Iraq and the United States. Immediately the Secretary of State offered supportive Canadian initiatives.

Why did the government wait until after President Bush's announcement on Friday to support other peace-making initiatives? Why are Canadians not privy to strategies discussed by our Prime Minister and Mr. Baker, or is this government only taking action after the U.S. leads?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, that is a particularly silly question—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** —from a member of Parliament who, if she could put aside her partisanship, has demonstrated that she can make a substantive contribution to deliberations in the House. Her timing, for one thing, is wrong. I referred to the Bush initiative during Question Period on Friday.

I wonder if the hon. member is aware of the work that was begun by the Prime Minister, for example, at the children's summit of the United Nations. He talked to the leaders of countries who are involved in organizations that by their nature have a different kind of relation with, a different kind of potential impact upon Saddam Hussein: leaders of the non-aligned movement, leaders of underdeveloped countries in the Commonwealth and *la francophonie*, leaders of the Islamic conference, and leaders of organizations active in OPEC.

I have myself been involved in discussions. I have just come back from extensive conversations in the Middle East with regard to a range of ways in which Canadian expertise or Canada's very good reputation might be applied to try to find ways in which we can achieve a peaceful solution to the situation in the gulf. This is a time for a little more statespersonship than the hon. member has been showing.

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we heard anything about Mr. Bush's announcement in this House on Friday.

My supplementary question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. The UN resolution passed last Thursday by the UN Security Council is very vague and potentially dangerous in its call to member states to use all necessary means to restore international peace and security in the gulf area.

Will Canada immediately put another resolution to the UN to assure that individual member states cannot take unilateral action, allegedly pursuant to the UN resolution, which might jeopardize western alliance peace-making options in the Middle East?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, let me refer the hon. member to page 16042 of *Hansard* for last Friday. Let me refer her also to the undertakings that were given in the Security Council, the general view expressed by nations that there would not be other action taken in that council between now and the period in January that was stipulated by the Security Council resolution. Let me also, and I think most to the point, indicate to her that while there had been some uncertainty on the Thursday, or while some members of the House claimed there was some uncertainty on Thursday as to the purpose of the UN resolution, whether it was to threaten war or to arrange time for peace, that surely now must be resolved because it is already in the process of using this pause to seek peace that is being joined.

The Americans have taken an initiative and Saddam Hussein—and this is not an unremarkable comment—indicated that he thought that the American initiative was helpful. That is the tone in the debate, as there was a tone in the discussion in the Security Council, that is altogether helpful.

Canada has been playing, and intends to continue to play, a very active and constructive role. The hon. member asks me if I am going to advertise on the floor of the House of Commons every initiative that Canada is taking, which could succeed only if it proceeded privately. Am I going to, for the purposes of a television camera in Canada, jeopardize the diplomatic initiative that Canada might undertake? No, I am not prepared to do that and I hope the hon. member would not be.

* * *

## MEDICARE

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

The provincial ministers of finance will be meeting in Winnipeg this week. Some of the western ministers, including Mel Couvelier of B.C., are seeking the withdrawal of the federal government from direct financing of national medicare and seeking the transfer of tax points and jurisdiction to the provinces.

The federal government has remained silent on this threat which would mean the death of our national medicare program.

Will the minister guarantee that his government will continue to directly fund national medicare?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, that is one of a number of options that has been discussed by the provincial finance ministers. It has not been endorsed by any of their governments. I am sure that they will have that as well as a number of other options on the table today and in their meetings this week.

The simple response to the hon. member's question is that we have no intention of relinquishing any sense of responsibility that we have for the National Health Act. We have every intention of continuing to assist provinces and in particular, assist those provinces who are low-income provinces to assure that they can continue to provide the services that are available in the wealthier provinces of the country.

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

The federal government has the authority and responsibility to set national standards for medicare in the Canada Health Act. There are continuing reports that amendments are now being prepared that will weaken this authority.

Will the minister assure Canadians that no amendments to the act are being prepared by either the Department of National Health and Welfare or the Department of Finance which would allow the provinces to undermine national standards through extra billing or user fees?

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, no changes to the Canada Health Act are currently being contemplated.

It is important to recognize the fact that full discretion in terms of delivery of health care services is given to the provinces under our Constitution.

What the Canada Health Act does is provide that any program has to be universal in its coverage, provides reasonable access to insured persons, is publicly run on a non-profit basis, covers all necessary health services and provides coverage to those who are temporarily absent from their province or country.

Beyond that, the provincial governments have considerable scope in terms of the delivery of the services. One cannot imagine how medicare or how health care services to Canadians would be strengthened by derogating from any of those principles which exist in the Canada Health Act.

* * *

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, CBC radio and television remain one of the nation's last institutional links for Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

The parliamentary channel is for many Canadians their only direct access to see and know what is the nation's business and what their MPs are doing.

My question is for the Minister of Communications. Will he recognize the importance of the parliamentary channel? Will he promise to seek direct parliamentary appropriation to pay for this democratic, open and informative channel? Will he make that commitment today and save this service?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that, in spite of the budget cuts it is facing, the CBC remains a national institution coast to coast, which is more than we can say about the Liberal Party.

It must be noted that, since November or December of 1936, there has always been restlessness about the future of one CBC service or the other. The same is happening again this year, Mr. Speaker.

• (1500 )

[*English*]

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, the minister well knows this is not one of the mandated services under CBC and so I would ask him a supplementary question.

[*Translation*]

Will he ensure that the parliamentary channel will remain by approving the inclusion of this service in the new Broadcasting Act called for in the liberal amendment? Will he approve it today?

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no!

## IMMIGRATION

**Mr. Jean-Pierre Blackburn (Jonquière):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. The members of the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration have indicated they intend to invite you again to testify before them about the difficulty of reaching an agreement with the Quebec government on immigration.

This issue really concerns the members representing Quebec ridings. It is important for the survival of the francophone culture that newcomers be well integrated to the francophone community in Quebec. My question is the following: What is going on? Are discussions ongoing with the government of Quebec? Is progress being made or is there a freeze with Quebec?

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister already stated today in response to the hon. member for Papineau—Saint-Michel, the government is still strongly committed to this. Yes, I spoke with the Quebec Immigration Minister, Mrs. Gagnon-Tremblay, and discussions between officials from our two governments will begin shortly.

---

# ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

## PETITIONS

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSES

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's responses to five petitions.

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

## EFFECTS OF ECONOMY ON FAMILIES

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL COMMITTEE

**Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there might be consent for me to present at this time a motion which has been distributed among the parties.

I would like to move, seconded by the member for Churchill:

That a Special Committee of the House of Commons to study the current recession and its effect on Canadian families and to offer recommendations on measures to counter its effects be appointed;

That 15 members of the House of Commons be appointed to serve on the Special Committee, to be appointed no later than three sitting days after the adoption of this motion, upon report of the Striking Committee;

That the Committee have the power to appoint from among its members such sub-committees as may be deemed advisable and to delegate to such sub-committees all or any of its powers except the power to report directly to the House;

That the committee have the power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House of Commons;

That the committee have the power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the Committee;

That the Committee be empowered to authorize television and radio broadcasting, as it deems appropriate, of any or all of its proceedings, pursuant to the principles and practices governing the broadcasting of the House of Commons, when in the parliamentary precincts and to the extent possible when outside these precincts;

That the Committee have the power to travel within Canada;

That the Committee submit its report no later than February 15, 1991 provided that, if the House is not sitting, the report will be deemed submitted on the day such report is deposited with the Clerk of the House of Commons, in which case the Clerk shall immediately notify each Party Leader of the receipt of such report;

That substitutions be authorized according to normal procedures for Legislative Committees; and

That the quorum of the Committee be eight Members, whenever a vote, resolution or other decision is taken.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The House has heard the terms of the motion put forward by the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam. Is it the pleasure of the House to consider the hon. member's motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

[*English*]

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I just want to indicate that I was one of the members who said no to this motion on the basis that these kinds of things are discussed between House leaders. We are discussing business of the House from now until Christmas and beyond—endeavouring to, that is.

The request for a special committee and work for members of Parliament to do comes as a surprise. What I think all members of Parliament will be doing over Christmas is talking to their constituents, hearing their concerns, and talking about the economic situation in the future. We can all do that.

In the meantime, if the hon. member has suggestions to make through her House leader that we might discuss together with other House leaders as the future business for members of Parliament, we are of course always delighted to receive them in the proper form.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Since the consent is not unanimous, the House cannot debate the motion.

[*English*]

**Ms. Langan:** Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate to respond to the intervention by the House leader.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but we cannot act indirectly against the rules. The House did not give unanimous consent. Therefore, the hon. member's motion cannot be considered and we shall proceed to the next item.

* * *

## PETITIONS

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table today a petition signed by several Canadians from Ottawa, Nepean and Gloucester who are opposed to the GST. They point out that never since Confederation have the printed word and books been taxed in our country. Now, this government plans to tax these items. Like the Liberal senators in the other place, we are against this unfair and regressive tax and we join these petitioners in asking the government to withdraw this tax.

[*English*]

URANIUM MINING

**Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River):** Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions that I have the honour to present today. The first is signed by petitioners from many locations in Canada, such as Edmonton, Saskatoon, Winnipeg, Toronto, Willowdale, and others.

These people point out that we still do not have adequate answers to the questions raised by the spill of radioactive wastes in Wallaston Lake a year ago. They are calling upon the government to convene immediately a comprehensive independent public inquiry into uranium mining in Saskatchewan and northern Canada, to involve effectively aboriginal people and northerners in the inquiry, and to provide them with the resources to do so.

LOW-LEVEL FLIGHT TRAINING

**Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River):** The second petition I have is signed by people from places such as St. Catharines, Burlington, Mississauga, London, Ontario, Edmonton, Alberta, and others.

These people are supporting the call by the Assembly of First Nations and the Innu of Labrador for an end to low-level flights over their territory and that of other aboriginal peoples. They call on Canada to redirect NATO-NORAD funding toward enabling Canada's aboriginal people to regain control of their lands and livelihood and toward promoting sustainable development for all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the pleasure to present a petition to this House on behalf of people from the city of Ottawa, from my riding of Ottawa Centre as well as from Nepean and the whole region who are opposed to the concept of taxing books and magazines. They call upon the government to withdraw the proposed tax on books and magazines.

• (1510 )

[*English*]

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 339 and 359.

[*Text*]

PSSA REDRAFTING

Question No. 339—Mr. Harvard:

Further to the government response to Question No. 312, answered on June 20, 1990, (a) does the 60 percent minimum apply to the Public Service Superannuation Act (b) has a period of grace been given regarding the P.S.S.A. redrafting and, if so when will that period terminate?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** a) The Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985 (PBSA) does not apply to the Public Service Superannuation Act (PSSA). Under the PSSA a surviving spouse's allowance is equal to one-half of the contributor's pension. This is an add-on benefit, which means that the initial amount of the contributor's pension is not actuarially reduced to finance the survivor benefit.

b) One of the objectives of public service pension is conformity with the requirements of the PBSA. The reform process is well underway and it is hoped to introduce appropriate legislation early in the New Year.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL MARINE PARK IN NEWFOUNDLAND

Question No. 359—**Mr. Simmons:**

Since the Minister of the Environment announced a National Marine Parks Policy for Canada in 1987 (a) have any sites been targeted in the Province of Newfoundland for a Marine Park and, if so, which sites (b) have any discussions been held with the provincial government for the establishment of a National Marine Park in Newfoundland?

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** a) Two of the four marine regions adjacent to Newfoundland territory have been the subject of regional analysis studies, namely the Labrador coast and the eastern coast of insular Newfoundland. As a result of these reports, several sites in each region have been suggested as potential areas for marine parks.

National Parks personnel undertook a field study of the Labrador coast in August of this year. Selection of one of the suggested sites as a candidate for a future National Marine Park is underway. The eastern coast of Newfoundland will be the subject of a field study sometime in 1991.

b) As the process of establishing a National Marine Park in these regions has only barely begun, even within the Canadian Parks Service, no discussions have as yet been held with the Newfoundland provincial government. As soon as the conclusions of the Labrador coast field report have been studied within the Service, discussions with the Newfoundland government will be initiated.

* * *

[*English*]

## STARRED QUESTIONS

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Starred Questions Nos. 365 and 375.

[*Text*]

### HIGH FREQUENCY DIRECTION-FINDING RECEIVING FACILITY

*Question No. 365—**Mr. MacWilliam:**

Is the Department of Communications High Frequency Direction-Finding Receiving Facility, located between Stittsville and Richmond, Ontario, still operational and, if so (a) were some or all of the construction costs for this facility paid by the Department of National Defence and, if so (i) is this a DND facility or a DOC facility (ii) which government department or agency pays for the maintenance and operation of this facility (iii) which government department or agency directs the activities that take place there (b) what is the nature of the data collected at this site (c) to what uses is it put (d) does this site intercept or monitor high-frequency radio transmissions (i) to or from Ottawa (ii) to or from other locations (e) does this site intercept supply to or share data with (i) the Department of National Defence (ii) the Communications Security Establishment (iii) the Canadian Forces Supplementary Radio System and, if so, for each organization named above, what is the nature of the data supplied or shared (f) is there any reference in Department of Communication Annual Reports to the operation of this site and, if not, for what reason (g) are there (i) current and available budget figures for the operation of this site (ii) a current and available calculation of the costs recovered from the Department of National Defence for the operation of this site or the work done there and, if so, what are these figures for the current fiscal year?

Return tabled.

### INDIAN AFFAIRS

*Question No. 375—**Mr. Riis:**

As a result of the events at Kanasatake and Kahnawake, Que., has the government been informed of any allegations of (a) unlawful detention (b) harassment by soldiers or police (c) failure of police to control individuals throwing objects at cars driven by Native Canadians (d) intimidation of international observers (e) abuses of human rights and, if so, for each allegation (i) what are the details (ii) what measures have been taken to investigate (iii) what action will be taken?

Return tabled.

* * *

[*English*]

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, if Starred Questions Nos. 365 and 375 could be made Orders for Return, the returns would be tabled immediately.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is it the pleasure of the House that Questions Nos. 365 and 375 be deemed to have been made Orders for Return?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The questions as enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

## BROADCASTING ACT

### MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from November 29 consideration of Bill C-40, An Act respecting broadcasting and to amend certain Acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunication, as reported (with amendment) from a Legislative Committee; and Motion No. 17 of Mr. Waddell (p. 15801); and Motion No. 30 of Mrs. Finestone (p. 15801).

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to take part in the debate on Motions Nos. 17 and 30 of my colleague and good friend, Mrs. Finestone. Basically the amendments to Bill C-40 advocate maintaining the CBC role as promoter of national unity. This is clear enough, simple enough and very important.

Bill C-40 now before the House and as proposed by the government cancels this mandate, this mission given to the CBC in 1968. Members will recall that in 1968 Parliament saw fit to include these words in the mandate or mission, namely that the CBC "—should contribute to the development of national unity and provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity".

Mr. Speaker, the deletion of these words stems from recommendations contained in the 1986 Caplan-Sauvageau report and in the 1987 report of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture. Both commissions were concerned that this section might prevent the CBC from ensuring that programming would fairly and faithfully reflect Canada's various cultural, social, political, economic and linguistic realities.

Hon. members will recall that former CBC President Pierre Juneau did not feel that the words "national unity" had created problems during the many years he headed the corporation.

The Canadian Radio-Television and Communications Commission, CRTC for short, also said that the interpretation given to this expression had never prevented nor thwarted a political debate where all views were heard.

At a time when Canada is facing serious challenges—the post-Meech situation, free trade, inter-regional rivalries; remember what happened last summer in Oka and the important role which some people say the CBC played in these sad incidents—we feel it has become ever more urgent and important that the public radio and television network take part in and contribute to the promotion of national unity.

All regions, all social partners must work together to build our country's identity. A few years ago, Parliament voted massively in favour of a resolution to promote Canada's linguistic duality. Not long ago, it also voted in favour of a bill to protect and promote language minorities in this country: Anglophones in Quebec as well as Francophones outside Quebec.

Why should it now deliberately decide to withdraw one of the tools that helped to achieve these objectives? National unity and Canada's linguistic duality should not be relegated to the realm of good intentions. They should be defined and involve firm commitments and concrete action. To remove from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation's mission its mandate to promote national unity would, in our opinion, remove part of its soul, of what sets it apart from other public networks.

Some people claim, and I am one of them, that broadcasting has done as much for this country's unity and cohesion in the 20th century as the railways did in the 19th century. This has been the century of communications. We in Canada have become experts in communications. And as I see it, our national network has done more than any other network to keep this country together. I experienced this in 1973, when I came here as a member of Parliament. I asked for a policy of accelerated coverage so that Canadians communities in the North, in Western Canada and Eastern Canada, in fact across the country, would have access to French radio and television.

At the time, the government agreed to spend the money and give the CBC this clear mandate to accelerate its coverage of every community of 500 people or more, so that Canadians in this country would have access to television in their own language, in English in Quebec and in French outide Quebec. This was done, Mr. Speaker, and it provided the glue that cemented Canadians, born in this country or new Canadians, whether they were anglophones or francophones, together. We knew that when travelling across the country, we could tune in to a station that would give us the news and programs in our own language. East or west, centre, south or north, this system made it possible for us to see each other, hear each other, and speak to each other. It helped us understand each other and build a culture and a society in our own image. It wasn't easy, considering the vast expanse of this country, and the way this country was built, on an east-west axis instead of north and south. It's not easy, when you have to cover thousands of kilometres both ways. Mr. Speaker, it has helped us to be

Canadians and to further develop our understanding of who we are.

Mr. Speaker, the role played by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is vital for Canada, and for the French Canada I know, which is culturally isolated and in a minority position everywhere on this continent, except in Quebec. Spread out as we are, we are extremely vulnerable. We are constantly in danger of being assimilated. We depend a lot on the CBC to give us balanced programming, and Mr. Speaker, the CBC contributes to the survival and development of French and English culture, and it is very important to have access to this kind of broadcasting across the country in order to keep this country together. As I said, it acts as a cultural, social and educational link, and it is one of the linchpins of French survival in Canada. That, Mr. Speaker, is why it is so important to have access to this service from coast to coast.

• (1520)

If I paid tribute to the CBC, Mr. Speaker, it is because I think the corporation plays an important role in national unity. Still the fact remains that the network does not reach all Canadians, and I am prepared to admit that. Too often francophones outside Quebec, particularly in remote areas, have to be cultural beggars in their own country. In too many places inadequate services are tantamount to no service at all. Where there are no transmitters nor cable service Radio-Canada is not heard nor seen. In other regions, francophones are at the mercy of cable companies if they want to see French programs. In most cases French signals originate from the Montreal region. In many cases francophones outside Quebec must rely on English channels to tune in to local and regional news.

If you talk to the CBC head he invariably brings up the issue of shortage of funds. Mr. Speaker, if we turn to the minister to make the same request he refers us back to the CBC. One thing for sure, Mr. Speaker, is that any budget cutback made by the government— and I have some doubts about it because after checking the figures I am not sure that the budget cutbacks have been severe enough to justify the lack of services we have experienced over the past five years. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we will have to want to maintain in this country a national radio and television network readily accessible to all Canadians regardless of the language they speak.

[*English*]

**Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie):** Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague from Port Moody—Coquitlam and our Liberal colleague from Mount Royal for their excellent impassioned plea for a most worthy of all causes, the CBC.

I will begin with a quotation from 1962 by a philosopher. I will wend my way down to some grass roots individuals who also speak out in 1990 in defence of CBC and the proposed cuts to it.

Owing to Canada's size, communications have always meant more to us than to most other countries. We have proceeded and still proceed less by settlement than by communications. Very little of Canada has really been settled. The great gaps of northern Quebec and Ontario and the British Columbia mountains amaze transcontinental travellers. Even more astonishing are the vast emptinesses of our immense northern hinterlands. The emergence of the electronic mass media offers Canada the best prospect it has ever had of becoming a genuine national community.

That was in the sixties. In 1974 an executive or a television critic said: "It should be possible to turn on one's television set and know what country one is in. One would almost never be in doubt in the United States. One is frequently in doubt in Canada." Some people from my community have written to me and voiced their concerns with cutbacks to the CBC.

Miss Noble says: "I am writing as a friend of public broadcasting to ask that you and your party support increasing funding and the continuance of public broadcasting."

Mr. Houston says it better, certainly, than I ever could: "I am writing you to express my concern over proposed cuts to the budget of CBC. Over this summer I have travelled the east coast of our country and was pleased to be able to listen to CBC all the way. I was equally pleased to have this contact with our country when I travelled to B.C. a few years ago. It is hard to express my feelings when, in every province in our country, I found people listening to, and sharing in the culture of every other province. It is more than just being part of our country because the people would not be listening if it weren't also quality programming. It is radio that we are truly proud of and radio that is unique in the world. We must continue this excellence and we must expand our support to spread this quality into our television. I am

sure if these budget cuts go through, we will lose out to American culture."

Grace McEwan says: "I am pleased with recent additions to CBC programming on TV.

The 24-hour Newsworld channel is a helpful addition to enable the viewing public to become aware and to keep up with current affairs in our country." Mr. McIntyre: "I want to add my voice to the thousands who deplore the extreme cuts in the CBC's budget in recent years, and in particular in the next five years."

Mr. Tully: "I know you are concerned about the erosion of Canada's economic independence as a consequence of free trade, but what good is economic independence to Canadians if our very cultural identity is in danger of being submerged in the overwhelming swell of American broadcasting media that is engulfing Canada."

There are more, Mr. Speaker, but I just wanted to cite those few. The present president of CBC has some interesting turns of words. He suggests that we are going to have to do some "constructive damage" to the CBC. Those two words together are an antithesis and a paradox. They just do not fit together. How one can go about making constructive damage to the CBC, I think is beyond the comprehension of just about anyone.

How severe are the cuts? They are $140 million over four years, on top of the cuts that have taken place over the past eight or nine years. I believe the funding for operations has gone from $1 billion and conceivably it will drop to about $675,000 by the years 1993-94. The cuts are, indeed, very severe.

It seems strange at this point in time to be talking about cuts when the ratings in fact have gone up. I cite a column from *The Toronto Star*, Gina Mallet, who suggests that it is funny and sad just when CBC's radio ratings are higher than ever, 11.9 per cent of the audience for AM, 3.5 per cent for FM seems the most inopportune time to make cuts when, in fact, the ratings are increasing.

The amendments proposed by my colleague, and also by the Liberals, are very noteworthy. The one that we have highlighted and the one that gives us the most concern is the deletion of the unity clause, if you will, in the mandate of CBC.

We have deleted many other Canadian symbols like VIA Rail. The post office is under attack. Petro-Canada and Air Canada are being sold off. Is the CBC next? I think the minister has suggested that some people are saying the CBC is too aggressive with the private corporations.

We resent that. Let us be ever more aggressive and competitive to maintain our cultural sovereignty. We appreciate that the deficit is a huge and difficult one to handle for the government, but the incessant cutting of everything across the board is not acceptable. Surely it would latch onto one last vestige of something that speaks for Canadian unity.

What better medium than the CBC, a transmitted message of unity that is most natural? It is instant and effective. It can be powerful. It has a captive audience. If the material is credible, it is informative, unbiased and thought provoking. The CBC had the opportunity of distributing a passionate, poignant message to Canadians, not editorializing on the view of Canadian unity, but presenting a view from across Canada.

Canadians desire and even long for a voice to speak out on behalf of Canadian unity. The division of the one complete board into two separate boards in the CBC apparently is endorsed by no one. One cannot present a unified message by division. It is impossible. This is our Custer's last stand, and we have to always go back to American statements. Let us make CBC the last vestige of hope for a message to the Canadian people on Canadian unity.

• (1530)

The minister says that the unity clause will lead to propaganda, an artificial political notion of unity. That is truly the epitome of hypocrisy when the government is able to spend millions of dollars selling propaganda on the GST that nobody wants to accept. There is propaganda, and there is a disunifying message.

What about Mr. Watson, who is longing to become the true chair of the CBC? Is my time running out, Mr. Speaker?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Yes.

**Mr. Butland:** So quickly. I am going to have to bypass most of my comments and get to the point.

I do not accept the CBC indicating that it may cut the parliamentary channel. I think that is a most unfortunate way of drawing attention to the severe cuts which have been brought about by the government. I do not accept the fact that it should have to cut $4.5 million from allowing Canadians to view Parliament at work, especially when not several months ago the CBC was forming a contract to present to this House of Commons—

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please! I want to remind you that according to the rules and unless the Speaker gets the unanimous consent of the House to do otherwise, speeches last 10 minutes at this stage.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this afternoon to be able to speak to Bill C-40, dealing with CBC communications.

In 1968 the Broadcasting Act required that the CBC contribute to the development of national unity. What we are concerned about in particular in this debate this afternoon is the fact that Bill C-40 drops the CBC's 1968 mandated role to contribute to national unity and provide for continuing expression of Canadian identity.

Across this country there are hundreds of thousands of people who listen CBC radio and television broadcasts regularly. Among those many hundreds of thousands of people, there are thousands who reside in my riding of Northumberland. Many of them have expressed to me their deep concern about the cutbacks the government has imposed on the CBC. In fact, since 1984 the government has cut CBC's parliamentary grants by over $240 million, which includes severe reductions to CBC technology as well.

Many people in my riding come from rural areas. They need to be kept in communication with the reality of this country. Some of them, those who reside in the more urban areas, have the benefit of cable television into their homes. One of the problems with the particular bill in front of us is the fact that it does not say that those who transmit by cable into homes across this country are subject to the same regulations as individual broadcasters. Individual broadcasters are subject to a percentage of Canadian content, and that content has to be accessible.

Through the cable system, depending on what area the system is going into and the type of programming, sometimes those who subscribe to cable broadcast have to use expensive and more sophisticated technologies to receive. It is important that cable broadcasters be subject to the same provisions as individual broadcasters. Also it is important that those who subscribe not be subject to having to purchase high cost technology in order to receive Canadian content.

Since this government came into being the Canadian public has been alarmed with the many ways in which disunity has been imposed upon the country. We recognize that the CBC, our national communications system, is one of the most important factors in uniting this country and keeping it together. We have seen the erosion of other national communications systems which have contributed to an unacceptable regionalization of Canada.

The 1968 bill respecting the Broadcast Act supported contributing to the development of national unity. It in no way prevented the CBC from focusing on particular regional issues, whether it were issues that concerned the economy on the east coast or the west coast, whether it was industrial concerns in the mid-provinces of Canada, Quebec and Ontario, or whether it was northern programming. We all learned and grew to appreciate much more what Canada stood for, by seeing either news broadcasting or situation programming that showed what life was in the diverse regions that make Canada one.

There is no reason that we should drop this particular focus and role for the CBC in the present Broadcasting Act. This is all the more reason that at the present time in Canada, when we are suffering from extreme pressures of national breakdown, we should be concerned about the development of national unity. If ever there was a time when that was important, that time is now. This is no time to be ruling out the importance of developing national unity.

Some of the programs and agencies of the CBC which contribute to the national unity are not protected and mandated through this legislation, Bill C-40. In particular, as other members of Parliament have raised, it is my concern that the northern service, the all-news service that we now have, Newsworld, our parliamentary channel, and Radio Canada International will no longer be mandated and protected specifically in legislation. When we see the enormous cutbacks that CBC has experienced and hear suggestions that it is special programs and agencies such as Radio Canada International and the

parliamentary channel that should be dropped, I find it totally unsatisfactory and a great disservice to Canada as one nation.

I have travelled outside Canada to regions of the world where there is very little international broadcasting, areas of the world that do not experience the security that we do here in Canada. It was very important to be able to sit down with a short-wave radio and pick up Canadian news, to get what seemed to us to be an objective view of what was going on in the world.

It was important as well for the Canadian public to understand that non-Canadians, foreigners, also looked forward to the programming and broadcasting of Radio Canada International. They too perceived our broadcasting as objective, full and good reporting on many international issues. However, for Canadians who were travelling abroad like us, no matter what region of Canada we came from, no matter what our racial or ethnic origin, no matter what our language background, French or English, it helped to be able to communicate with each other and to feel proud and unified as Canadian citizens.

• (1540 )

Certainly, since I have become a member of Parliament, I have been astonished to learn of the number of people who tune in to the parliamentary channel. These people depend on the parliamentary channel to understand more fully what is going on in our world.

The same applies to Newsworld. Rather than getting the seven-minute clip on our regular CBC daily news programs, they get the full coverage of events and issues and are helped in making their own objective decisions about the important issues of the day.

This is a freedom that Canadians must be able to benefit from. It contributes to a sense of national unity when people are able to come to a consensus of understanding of what is happening in the different regions of this country.

In discussing Bill C-40 as we are today, it is very important that we address the national unity clause and ensure, through proposed amendments, that the CBC continues to contribute to the development of national unity and that there be a specific clause to this effect in the final bill approved by this House of Commons.

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and speak in favour of the Motion No. 17 in the name of the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam, which reads as follows:

> That Bill C-40 be amended in clause 3 by striking out lines 39 and 40 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:
>
> "(vi) contribute to national unity, shared national consciousness and identity,".

Bill C-40, in describing the CBC's mandate, sets out that CBC programming should:

> (i) be predominantly and distinctively Canadian,
>
> (ii) reflect Canada and its regions to national and regional audiences, while serving the special needs of those regions,
>
> (iii) actively contribute to the flow and exchange of cultural expression,
>
> (iv) be in English and in French,—

Yet the government has removed one particular obligation from the CBC in this legislation, and that is the promotion of Canadian unity. The removal of this clause, combined with the division of the CBC board into both English and French standing committees, in fact weakens the CBC as a national institution. This in particular is a time when more than ever Canadians need national institutions to keep the country together. Surely it is reasonable at this time for the national broadcaster of Canada to play a pivotal role in maintaining our country and our national unity.

I would like to go back and reflect upon the traditional role that the CBC has played, as it has been a very important component in pulling this country together from coast to coast. It has been traditional that the CBC links all parts of Canada, whether the west coast, the Arctic coastline, or the east coast. It was also set up to provide a complete service for Canadians, covering a whole range of programming and day-to-day news so that people could and can keep in touch with events that were happening throughout this land. It was part of its mandate to serve, equitably, both official languages and to be predominantly Canadian in content. The amendment submitted by my colleague is fully consistent with that objective. Actually both amendments represent social goals, essentially something that our Canadian society can strive to achieve. The process is more important than the end because the end will be constantly evaluated and re-evaluated and therefore can change.

As Canadian society matures, norms and values can be challenged, and attitudes can change. But this process in itself, to be meaningful, requires information, it requires discussion and debate.

I want to ask the question as to whether there is something about a publicly-owned, yet autonomously operated broadcast system that can contribute to the very goals which we pursue. In fact, the CBC as a national institution, is ideally suited to contribute to national unity, to contribute to a shared national consensus and identity.

Let me return for a moment to the point that I was trying to emphasize about our goals. These goals can be broadly defined as being perhaps some, but certainly not all, of the components of a nation. I wonder whether the government's objection to this particular amendment begins with the goals themselves, and whether the government members must actually question that very point themselves.

The over-all strategy of this government, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, is exemplified through the funding cuts and through the bifurcation of the management structure of the corporation. In fact, it suggests that this government is simply not willing to fully endorse CBC's pursuit of these goals.

Let me return to the question. Is there something about a publicly-owned, yet autonomously operated broadcasting system that can contribute significantly to the goals of national unity, shared national conscience and a true Canadian identity?

I would like to submit, Sir, that the answer is yes. How do we achieve that? First, we can achieve it by having CBC's operations based across the country, sharing information, commentary and analysis. We can have that by bringing the artistic and the entertainment achievements of the nation to the nation. We can achieve it by sending Canadian journalists abroad to report and analyse events around the world, with consideration for the impact and importance of these events in Canada.

Second, we can achieve this by operating two unique national radio networks, by operating a first rate national television network, and by operating an around the clock all news television channel.

This government seems to have an antipathy for publicly-owned enterprises. That has become pretty obvious. It has been quick to point out the weaknesses and just as quick to sell off those enterprises to the private sector.

I wonder if it is prepared to point to a successful, publicly-owned enterprise and actually perpetuate it, because, Mr. Speaker, the CBC is that kind of success. The success of the CBC is also a measure of its contribution to the goals contained in the amendments that are being discussed at this very moment.

The CBC makes what is Canadian available to Canadians across this country and across the world. It gives Canadians a chance to listen to the country's own heart beat. Some examples of unique CBC's initiatives are *Morningside*, *The House*, *Sunday Morning*, and Newsworld's *This Country*.

These are examples where local reporting events are transmitted across the nation in a popular format. They are events, I might add, that are widely respected and widely listened to. The CBC has been a model. It has been a pioneer and trendsetter in broadcasting in this country. In so doing, it has assisted the nation in its search for a shared national consciousness and identity and has also contributed, I think significantly, to that national unity.

There are program formats, Mr. Speaker, that are unique to CBC, such as television's *Marketplace*, *Man Alive* and *The Nature of Things*; radio's *Arts Tonight*, *The Food Show*, *Media File*, and *Inside Track*.

• (1550 )

These are unique programming formats which have been made possible because this nation some time ago made a commitment to a national broadcasting service to bring Canada in touch with itself, not unlike other commitments in nation-wide communications, our national rail service, national postal service, and our national telephone service, although I submit, Mr. Speaker, all of those are under severe attack by this present administration.

Sir, I see my time is very limited and I have much more to say on this. I want to summarize by placing the emphasis on the point of national unity. National unity is not something imposed, not something positioned or structured. If this is the government's view of national unity and the goal contained in this amendment, then it is no wonder this country has landed in the kind of mess it has.

National unity is an elusive quality of our life. It is constantly evolving, and like informed judgment it requires information and a means to broadcast that information.

This amendment, if adopted, will confirm a commitment to publicly-owned and operated broadcasting services that can assist in the pursuit and realization of our goals of national unity, shared national consciousness and identity. I would urge the members of the House to seriously consider supporting this amendment to the legislation.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to speak to Bill C-40, an Act respecting broadcasting and in relation to radiocommunication in Canada.

[*English*]

This is an extremely complex bill comprised of three parts: the goals and objectives of a broadcasting act in Canada, the role of the CRTC, and the role of the CBC.

[*Translation*]

Recently the Prime Minister has insisted on the importance of national unity, stating with passion that all that has been accomplished so far can be attributed to our spirit of national solidarity, to our national unity. If the Prime Minister is so convinced of that, why does he want to take away CBC's mandate relating to the promotion of national unity?

[*English*]

Many have spoken on this bill at the various stages. This has been a supposed priority of the government since the beginning of this Parliament. There are many issues that have been addressed, for example the regionalization of the CRTC and the need for an educational service. However—

[*Translation*]

—the main objective here, according to me, is the unity of our country.

[*English*]

According to the 1968 Broadcasting Act under which the CBC now operates, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is required to be specifically Canadian or precisely to contribute the development of national unity.

At this particular time in the history of Canada—

[*Translation*]

—with the Meech aftermath, with the native versus Canadians problem, the Middle-East crisis, the lingusitic problem across the country, the dissension problem, the West versus Centre problem and that of the Centre versus the Atlantic provinces, we need instrument to promote national unity. And what better intrument of national unity than the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation could there be? It is important to note that, in the preamble to the bill, we can read and I quote: "the Canadian broadcasting system, operating primarily in the English and French languages and comprising public, private and community elements, makes use of radio frequencies that are public property and provides, through its programming, a public service essential to the maintenance and enhancement of national identity and cultural sovereignty." We, in the Liberal Party, are in agreement with this statement.

[*English*]

The airways are public and belong to the public. There can be no better instrument of national unity than a public broadcasting service promoting the issue of national unity and reflecting the truly national flavour which is Canada.

[*Translation*]

What needs to be changed in the bill is section 3(*m*)(vi), which reads:

"contribute to shared national consciousness and identity".

It should be replaced by "promote national unity"!

[*English*]

By removing the expressed national unity mandate, the government is neglecting a very significant role for broadcasting, that is, to assist Canadians in developing a national personality and consciousness. Let us use this vehicle to highlight our diversities and to educate ourselves about our uniqueness.

*The Ottawa Citizen* of May 16, 1990 says: "The CBC is an agent of Canadian unity. It must remain that way as a bulwark against various decentralization forces." Do we need to state explicitly that the CBC has an obligation to promote national unity when it does so every day? Does the obvious fact that Quebec is a distinct society need to be written down in a Constitution?

These days, I would suggest—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

[*English*]

The member for Portage—Interlake, a Conservative member of the government and also chairman of the Standing Committee on Communications expressed some concerns in that committee. A number of Conservative MPs oppose the federal government's plan to abandon national unity as a mandate of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

"Removing the pursuit of national unity as an objective of the Crown-owned radio and television network has a negative connotation," says the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Communications, the member I just mentioned from Portage—Interlake.

[*Translation*]

The government is proposing that, from now on, there be two standing committees, one English and one French, both reporting to the Board.

So, there will be an English and a French side to the CBC, but they will not communicate with one another. Each will serve their separate clientele, have their own definitions of different words, themes, objectives and goals in Canada. The word "national" is a good example of the case in point. That word is given a different meaning in some parts of the country.

I congratulate the hon. member for Mount Royal who has been fighting for Canadian unity in the Committee on Communications for many years. She wants the CBC to be an agent of national unity.

Mr. Speaker, why change the part of the law dealing with national unity? Why endeavour to change and correct something, if all we are doing is tampering? We are not repairing anything and we could do a lot of damage in the process. First and foremost, we must give ourselves the tools to foster national unity. We are proud of our CBC. After having been away and having immersed ourselves in another culture, we are twice as proud to see that the CBC is there to protect us, to help us grow and become better Canadians, as francophones or as anglophones. The CBC is there to promote the linguistic duality. We are so very proud to hear the French language spoken, whether on Baffin Island, in a Vancouver high school or in a Toronto elementary school, in support of our national unity.

• (1600)

We are proud as well to hear English spoken in Three Rivers. So, linguistic duality and national unity are essential, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

**Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West):** Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in speaking in the debate focusing around Bill C-40. It is a piece of legislation that not only ought to grip this Chamber, but also be taken account of by Canadians from coast to coast.

I would like to preface my brief remarks this afternoon by complimenting the communications critic for our party, the hon. member for Mount Royal, not in jest, but because of the substance of her arguments. The good work that she has done on Bill C-40 and the battle she has waged which, I think, is in concert with the thinking of the vast majority of Canadians and hopefully averting a piece of legislation being put through as written.

Previous speakers have made reference to the fact that, in 1968, as part of the official mandate of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, was the role "to contribute to the development of national unity and provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity". That was part of the mandated role in 1968. It was a good mandate then and, on this side of the House, we believe that it is a mandate, not only worth keeping but in fact it is crucial and drives at the very heart and essence of the existence of the CBC. Yet, Bill C-40, in its present form, would suggest dropping that portion of the CBC mandate.

We, on this side of the House, and many Canadians are asking: why should we be dropping that essential form of the CBC mandate? The previous president of the CBC, Pierre Juneau, suggested that there was no handicap in having that particular mandate. Many Canadians would agree with me that that should not only be part of the mandate but an essential requirement. And yet, the Minister of Communications, who is in the House today, has been quoted as saying that this 22-year-old clause, the national unity mandate, "is intolerable interference because the CBC was maintain-

ing this political value artificially and it was a constraint on the freedom of expression".

We ought to remind the minister that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is funded thanks to the taxpayers of the country and that the CBC, regardless of where one lives, reaches the livingrooms of the nations. As such, Mr. Speaker, I believe that if there was ever a need to keep national unity as part of the CBC mandate, it is right now.

The country is yearning for that thread of identity and it is going through the advent of a post free trade agreement. People are wondering what this country is all about in terms of its sovereignty; in terms of the decisions being taken south of the border, when we are losing our economic levers, if you will; and in the advent of the situation in the Middle East, where it seems that our foreign policy is a carbon copy of that of the United States. We are talking about the various pulls and tugs of various provinces in the country which are contemplating doing without Canada and contemplating going out on their own. It is also a time when Canadians are more apt to identify with the regions than with that term called Canadianism. We are talking about adopting immigration programs, first to the provinces, then to the regions, and third, if there is time, to the country. There is no thought that the immigrants are coming first to a country, then to a region, and finally to a provincial context.

VIA Rail was gutted, Mr. Speaker. You know, as well as I, the historic role that the railway has played in the country in terms of keeping the east, west and north symmetry together and not giving into the pressures that normally would have an easier time flowing north and south.

The government is talking, in the transportation sector again, about an open skies concept, allowing American air carriers to come into our airspace at will and with freedom, when in fact our industry cannot compete head to head with the Americans. In the end, I think Canadians do give a damn about what kind of air carrier transports them between point A and point B. They do care whether the emblem on the tail of that airplane is the Maple Leaf or Stars and Stripes.

With the advent of all these forces unleashed at this very time in our history, I believe that it is important for our medium of communication, for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, to do all it can to try to enhance the forces of unity and to try to rally Canadians from coast to coast. Therefore, there has never been a better time and a greater need to foster the cause of national unity through the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

For the government even to be contemplating dropping this clause is not only wrong, but an absolutely incomprehensible abdication of responsibility. The government is going against the very grain of why, in part, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation was established and has existed.

Rather than weakening the cause of national unity through the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, we in this Chamber, and members on the other side of the House, namely the government, ought to look for ways of strengthening the resolve, strengthening the tools, strengthening the commitment of national unity, and not undermining the fabric of national unity and undermining the cause for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Otherwise, when combined with all the other policies of government, we wonder what the federal government will be doing in a few years, other than delivering the mail and doing a bad job at that.

[*Translation*]

I think, therefore, that it is most important for the House and the government to recognize that the CBC and Radio-Canada have a major role to play in the promotion of national unity. That this government should refuse to promote national unity throughout our country is entirely inexplicable. I believe that one of the functions of the CBC and Radio-Canada is to advance unity, and together with the co-operation of the Canadian people, to promote our own Canadian values as Canadians, not as Quebecers, Ontarians or Albertans, and to transmit them with pride and justice to the whole country. I suggest, therefore, that in addition to promoting these Canadian values, we must be proud of our

country and, instead of depriving it of its role, to allow the CBC to reinforce national unity.

• (1610 )

[*English*]

I am pleased that I have this opportunity. Mr. Speaker, I see that you are indicating that my time is up. I am very hopeful that by the end of this debate, the government will see fit to change this important clause and to stand up for Canadian unity and Canada, and not be scared of promoting national unity at a time when it is badly needed.

**Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to support my colleague's amendments that would preserve the national unity objective of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

I might point out that if one lives in a west coast riding such as mine, which is on the far west coast, on the Pacific Ocean, this is exactly the kind of concern that my constituents would have.

For example, a small community like Ucluelet has a population of somewhere between 1,100 and 1,500 people, depending on what time of the year it is. Because of the policy of CBC, they are entitled to get the CBC radio in Ucluelet. Previously, because Ucluelet was located on the far west coast, we received our radio transmissions from places such as Los Angeles, California which had a direct line of sight between Los Angeles and Ucluelet. We also received our radio in Spanish from Tijuana, Mexico. If you recall, Mr. Speaker, the programs of Wolfman Jack were the kind of programs we received from pirate radio stations in Tijuana, Mexico.

As a result of CBC's national unity policy, translators are now placed in places like Ucluelet so that we can receive those CBC AM and FM stations and we can receive CBC French and English programming. That kind of thing helps to keep the nation together. Whereas when I was teaching in Ucluelet many years ago, the kids in my class knew far more about what was happening in Los Angeles, the American political system, and American culture and music than about what was happening in Canada. As residents of the far west coast, they did not receive Canadian programming. They were too remote from Canadian centres to receive Canadian radio and television programming.

It is a serious problem. If we drop the commitment to national unity, does this mean that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation can give up its obligation of locating translators and stations in remote communities on the west coast of Vancouver Island? I can tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, that is not what people on the west coast of Vancouver Island want. They prefer to be Canadians, to remain Canadian, and to be in touch with Canada. The major link between the west coast of Vancouver Island and the west coast communities of British Columbia is that CBC link. They would like to retain it.

If the government abandons as an objective of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation the objective of retaining and promoting national unity, that is exactly the fear that the people on the west coast of Vancouver Island have, that they are going to lose CBC services and end up hearing the radio stations of the west coast of the United States and Mexico. That is not what people on the west coast want for themselves or for their children. They want to be Canadians, and they want the government to respect their desire to remain Canadians.

It is a dangerous action on the part of the government to eliminate this section which, as other speakers have pointed out and as has been mentioned by the management of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, has been absolutely no impediment to the kind of programming it does, the quality of programming it does, or the independence and the impartiality of the programming it does. In fact, it is an important objective and it should be stated in the legislation governing the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

When I look at a community such as the one I live in which is Port Alberni in central Vancouver Island, it is surrounded by mountains. We cannot receive radio from outside the Alberni Valley because of the problems with line of sight transmission. It is very difficult to receive radio transmissions from outside the valley. We have difficulty in receiving Canadian Broadcasting Corporation programs. It is only because there is an obligation on the part of CBC to protect and promote national unity that we receive and have installed transmitters that transmit CBC programs through the mountains and into the Alberni Valley where they are received by the 19,000 to 25,000 residents who live in that valley.

Without this objective to protect and to enhance national unity, I believe that those kinds of transmitters would be pulled out of those communities because they do not make money, do not earn advertising in the Alberni Valley or support in the Alberni Valley. These are things that are done as part of a national obligation to make sure that this country holds together.

My constituents are concerned that if we drop this clause to promote national unity from the objectives of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation then places like Ucluelet on the west coast of Vancouver Island and places like Port Alberni in central Vancouver Island will simply be ignored. Their transmitters will be cut as part of their cost-cutting measures because once this objective of promoting and protecting national unity is dropped from the CBC's objectives then the CBC is going to say: "Who cares about these small communities; who cares about protecting?"

My constituents are concerned about retaining this section as one of the objectives of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to preserve national unity. I think it is an objective that every Canadian institution should have.

I am beginning to doubt the institution of the Conservative Party as to whether they have, as a fundamental objective, the national unity of this country, because when I see what the Conservative Party has done, this wrecking crew of Canada, since it took office in 1984, it has virtually destroyed every link that connects this country from ocean to ocean to ocean. That has been a serious problem with this wrecking crew of a Conservative Party that does not have built into its objectives the national unity of this country.

Phil Edmonston has more concern about this country in his little finger than you or any other member of that caucus and I can guarantee it.

I will tell you, the actions of this government demonstrate it.

At least I got 42 per cent of the popular vote and never, ever—

**Mr. McDermid:** I got 56.

**Mr. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** My party got 42 per cent of the popular vote and you guys cannot even scratch up 14 no matter what you do in this country.

It would be good to see an objective of national unity as part of the Conservative Party, this party that has destroyed the cross-Canada links of VIA Rail, one of the institutions that brought our country together, held our country together and was respected by Canadians all across the country as a link that kept our country together from sea to sea.

Air Canada is another link that was developed by the Government of Canada. When other airlines refused to do a trans-national, across-the-country service because they felt it would not make a profit this government stepped in, developed the Trans-Canada Airlines that later grew into Air Canada, served communities that were uneconomic to serve and used a system of cross-subsidization between the lucrative runs to subsidize other runs so that everybody in Canada could enjoy an air service.

One gentleman here mentioned that the post office is the last remaining Canadian institution. In my riding they wonder who runs the post office in this country. If you want to buy stamps or get parcel service in the country, you do not go to a community centre that flies the Canadian flag and says this is your national postal service. You go to a 7-Eleven store or a Quickie store. They wonder whether the symbol of Canada is Shoppers Drug Mart or 7-Eleven, an American store. That is the problem with the Conservative Party. It has spent all of the last eight years undermining and tearing apart all of the links that keep this country together from sea to sea. Then they start setting up committees to try to help pull us back together again.

• (1620)

I will give them a hint. All they have to do is respect those national institutions and to preserve as their objective the objective of retaining national unity in this country. That is what the people of Canada want. Unfortunately, it is not what the Conservative Party has been shooting for.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased this afternoon to take part in this debate. I should like to deal also with national unity, but first of all, I will start with the subject matter of Motion No. 30, which is perhaps closer to ordinary people.

[*English*]

This motion would amend the bill to require the CRTC to establish priorities for the Canadian Broadcasting system based upon the national interest. As I say, I am referring to somewhat ordinary pedestrian concerns. I would like to bring the attention of the House to simply the matter of regulation of cable distribution systems within Canada and make a plea for the emphasis of the

national interest being pursued when the regulation of cable systems is brought forward.

Let me give the House a couple of examples. First of all, with respect to the nature of the channels that are provided on basic cable service, many of us, certainly in the urban areas of Canada, paying a basic fee, receive a certain cable service. At the moment it is up to the cable companies to decide the nature of the programming that is going to be provided in that basic service.

It seems to me that the CRTC in pursuing the national interest ought to require that very careful consideration be given to the nature of the basic cable service in Canada. Clearly, Canadian channels, local stations as well as national networks need to receive first-run priority in the basic cable service everywhere in Canada. Clearly, Canadians also want the service of the three networks from the United States, together with public broadcasting. That is certainly within the band of the basic cable service. However, in addition to those, any other non-Canadian services surely should be looked at from the point of view of what national interest is being served.

Another example on the same point with respect to the parliamentary channel, that service is one, which I think has been noted earlier in the debate here this afternoon, of great importance to many Canadians who sit at home and watch the debate that we have here. They learn a great deal about our institutions and about what is happening in public affairs in Canada by following the parliamentary channel.

In my area of Ottawa South, there are two cable distribution companies. Their practice with respect to the parliamentary channel differs. In one part of my constituency, the basic cable coverage includes only the English version of our debates here in the House of Commons. In the other part of my constituency, the floor sound, in other words the language that is being spoken by the people participating in debate, is broadcast to my constituents. Neither is particularly satisfactory. In the former case, my francophone constituents, who live in one part of my riding, are unable to acquire the parliamentary channel in their language. The other part of my riding, where certainly the predominant language is English, the floor sound precludes my constituents from understanding the debate that is occurring in this Chamber in their own language.

It seems to me that as part of the pursuit of the national interest, the parliamentary channel not only should be available to all Canadians, but it should be available to all Canadians in French or in English, whichever is their language of choice.

I think that is a very important characteristic that should be pursued in the national interest of broadcasting in Canada.

I would also like to speak briefly about the amendment that would restore to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation a mandate to contribute to national unity, shared national consciousness and identity.

This point is of profound importance. I do not think that there is a Canadian who would say that since 1984, when this government was elected, that national unity has been enhanced or improved in any degree. In fact, what we face is probably the greatest crisis of national unity in our history.

The Prime Minister is quoted as having said: "Everything that we have accomplished as a country can be traced back to our sense of national purpose, to our national unity". If we think back over the great accomplishments of the last 123 and a half years, there are many. All of them relate to this sense of national purpose, whether it is the founding of the country in the first place by the Fathers of Confederation, or the construction of the CPR that brought together the extremities of the country.

The establishment of the CBC itself was an expression of national purpose. Now, we have the very idea that this part of the CBC's mandate would be stripped from it. Surely, with the climate of division, strife, anger and frustration that we have in the country at the present moment, this is not the time to reduce any measure that we have at our disposal to promote national unity.

I do not say this lightly. The minister made the comment in the past that giving a national unity mandate to a broadcasting system is somewhat perilous in a democracy. I understand what he is saying. Particularly in the reporting of news and currents events, it can be difficult to say the least, to say that we want to convey a certain purpose in the broadcasting of news and current events coverage.

That is not all that the CBC does. What we are debating here is not a mandate on a broadcasting authority, to somehow repress certain kinds of news or to emphasize other kinds of news in order to produce a certain result. That is not what we are talking about.

We are talking about the kind of broadcasting that the CBC has become known for, the broadcasting of special events, the coverage of Canadian events, the emphasis on Canadian broadcasters, the programming that we hear on our radios and see on our televisions that is uniquely Canadian and that brings us together as a nation. We understand one another a little better each time that we hear and see this kind of broadcasting. That is what we are talking about here.

That surely needs to be part of the mandate of our entire broadcasting system; the CBC itself as a national broadcasting outlet and other broadcasters to the extent that they are regulated by the CRTC.

Unfortunately, what we have is a government led by a Prime Minister who stood before the people of Canada and said that the Constitution of the country was not worth the paper that it is written on. In making that kind of provocative statement, which should be denounced not only here but across the land, he set the tone for national division that is tearing our country apart.

Now is not the time to be stripping our national broadcasting authority of its power and its responsibility with respect to national unity. Now is the time to be building it up. Now is the time for Canadians to recognize at this moment what it is that they have that is so important and so valuable. As members of Parliament we all know that there are hundreds of thousands of people around the world wanting to come to Canada. What we have here is precious. What we need is a modern broadcasting vehicle to help Canadians remember and understand the uniqueness of what we have, the importance of it, the values that we share in common as Canadians. That is what the CBC should be doing. Its mandate must not be changed.

• (1630)

**Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq):**

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak to this very important Bill C-40 respecting the CBC and the issue of national unity.

The government has said that under the new Broadcasting Act the CBC will no longer have a role in contributing to the development of national unity. In 1968 the Broadcasting Act, which Bill C-40 will replace, gave the CBC a mandate "to contribute to the development of national unity and provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity". Bill C-40 now requires only that the CBC "contribute to the shared national consciousness and identity".

I find it rather disturbing that the government would want to try to distance itself from a bill which in the past had done so much to keep Canada together. We understand why the government has done what it has done. I do not think it really has an idea of what national unity is all about. It has done more to divide Canada in the six years it has been in power than in the 117 previous years that Canada as we know it today has existed.

I would like to touch on a few issues that have done more to divide the nation: free trade, railroad cuts, the proposed goods and services tax, Meech Lake, and now we have the Spicer commission and another parliamentary committee to look into amending the Constitution.

We should also talk a bit about the gun control bill that the government would like to scrap because its backbenchers do not want to see it passed. It would have done a lot toward easing the concerns of a lot of women today in Canada. They just want to follow the gun lobbyists as is done in the United States of America.

I want to touch a bit on national unity and the government. I do not think the government has any concept of how to keep national unity intact. I say this because its policy seems to be that one way to keep Canada together is to roll the dice. Is that how we keep Canada together, by the roll of the dice? No wonder Canada is splitting at the seams when national unity depends on how the dice come up.

Even when the majority of Canadians disagrees with a measure on how to keep Canada together, government members insist that it is their way or no way. They will

not agree on who killed the Meech Lake Accord in the end. The majority of Canadians knows that it was our good friend, Elijah Harper, from the Manitoba legislature who said no three times to a request for unanimous consent, and effectively killed Meech Lake.

The government would have us believe that anybody but the very people who were here to welcome those who sailed across the ocean effectively killed Meech Lake. It was the agreement of the aboriginal people because they did not like the Meech Lake Accord. We all know that the government does not want to place the blame where it lies because we might get too much sympathy. Instead, it places the blame on people who did not really have a role in determining the death of Meech Lake.

The minister has decided to relieve the CBC of the obligation to promote Canadian unity and to substitute therefor the obligation to report on the cultural reality of this country. Even some of his own caucus members do not necessarily agree with him.

The chairman of the communications committee, the hon. member for Portage—Interlake, on May 9, 1990 said: "Removing the pursuit of national unity as an objective of the Crown owned radio and television network has a negative connotation about unity. Dropping such a phrase now would indicate we are going in two separate ways. It would be most unfortunate." There is a person who knows what the rest of Canadians are thinking. There is a person to whom this minister should be listening, as he should be listening to others from this side of the House.

When will the minister realize that people need this Crown corporation to promote national unity and that this is a very small way of showing that the House is serious about keeping and promoting national unity?

**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 Parkdale—High Park—External Affairs; the hon. member for Markham—Whitchurch—Stouffville—Housing; the hon. member for Prince Albert—Churchill River—Cameco.

• (1640)

**Hon. Roger C. Simmons (Burin—St. George's):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise and participate in this important debate on Bill C-40.

First, I want to acknowledge the magnificent work being done on our behalf by my colleague and friend from Mount Royal on matters relating not only to this bill but to communications. She is in every respect our guiding light on those issues. She does a very remarkable job, as does her staff.

This debate is an important one because it goes right to the very heart of what this country is all about. The bill itself addresses just one particular aspect of that debate, but it is symbolic of the larger agenda of this government. Much as been said in the past few days during the course of debate about the matter of national unity and how the bill not only ignores but seeks to undo part of the CBC's mandate.

The Prime Minister of the day, R. B. Bennett, not a man of my party but the man who introduced this bill, set forth in very clear, concise and precise terms exactly what he wanted a piece of broadcasting legislation to achieve. Not only did he say it well, but the instrument he crafted, together with his cabinet colleagues in the House of Commons at that time and in Parliament generally, has served us well in the intervening years. One wonders first of all why there is a need to fix something that is not broken.

**Mr. Benjamin:** I am listening to the Liberals stealing my stuff.

**Mr. Simmons:** It is nice to have the gentleman from Regina here. We are here every day at this time. He should come more often and speak in his turn.

**An hon. member:** Order.

**Mr. Simmons:** As I was saying a moment ago, this issue goes to the very heart of the government's agenda. I remember very well the Prime Minister talking about how his mandate was a national reconciliation. There is a phrase he has had to eat a few times. Can we think of any time, since R. B. Bennett in 1932 who brought in the broadcast bill, under any Prime Minister of whatever party stripe when a leader has so crafted his public policy as to get an effect which is absolutely opposite to national reconciliation?

It is significant that today, with a broadcast bill before the Chamber, one of the only two ministers in sight is the minister responsible for privatization, the paid wrecking ball of this government. He is also the paid heckler today, and he does not even do a good job at that.

**Mr. McDermid:** Former broadcaster, that is what I am.

**Mr. Simmons:** Emphasis on former. As I was saying before the paid heckler decided to get eloquent, instead of being here and behaving like a 12-year old, why does he not find his cowardly minister, the Minister of Communications, who does not even have the courtesy to come in here and talk to the bill? Where is his minister?

**Mr. McDermid:** Order, order.

**Mr. Simmons:** Suddenly I am out of order, am I? Let me be completely in order.

Instead of just beating his gums over there, will the minister go out and tell his colleague his responsibility to be here and to tell us where he stands on this bill? Or, does he still stand on both sides of it as he did in the press clippings that I have here? Is that where he stands?

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Simmons:** The Minister of Labour has just made his maiden speech in the House. We should hear from that minister more often too.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Simmons:** Mr. Speaker, I think we have got them all worked up for some reason.

**Mr. McDermid:** Who's worked up?

**Mr. Simmons:** Not me.

Mr. Speaker, if one phrase would characterize this particular Prime Minister, it has nothing to do with national reconciliation. It has more to do with a wrecking ball. If ever there was a wrecking ball abroad in the country—maybe the Minister of Labour takes some credit. Maybe he takes some satisfaction in that. As a Newfoundlander and as a Canadian, I take no satisfaction that I have a Prime Minister who is going around as a wrecking ball, who is wrecking this country every day, whether it is through CBC or anything else. I take no pride in that. He can smirk, he can laugh. I take no pride in that, none whatsoever. A wrecking ball.

**Mr. Corbeil:** Where does Chrétien stand?

**Mr. Simmons:** If the minister would stop shouting long enough, I would tell him where Chrétien stands because at least Chrétien knows where he stands.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Simmons:** Also, unlike his leader the Prime Minister, and unlike the Minister of Communications, Chrétien stands in only one place. He is not having trouble with a picket fence. He doesn't have to worry about being injured by a picket fence. Is there anything else the minister would like to get off his chest before we go on?

**Mr. Corbeil:** Speak to the bill.

**Mr. Simmons:** I think, Mr. Speaker, he wants me to speak to the bill.

As I was saying, this bill is symbolic of the Prime Minister's wrecking ball approach to Canada. A wrecking ball, contrary to popular view, is not something that is out of control and just wildly swinging around. Oh, no. A wrecking ball in its best sense is something that is the result of pre-planning, premeditation. The people who own that ball, who rent it out, know exactly what they want done with it. By applying it properly and with pre-planning they can have it do exactly what is intended.

When I say that the Prime Minister is a wrecking ball, I do not suggest that he is flailing around without an agenda. No, Mr. Speaker. Like every other wrecking ball that ever was rented, he is rented by people who know exactly what it is they want to have wrecked. They want this country wrecked. They apply every strike of the ball with precision.

One day they go after the CBC, another day they go after various Crown corporations like Petro-Canada, and another day they go after some other institution. They go after regional development. They undermine the less populated parts of this country. They close post offices in rural Newfoundland. Day in day out they attack unemployment insurance. Every day, they attack fisheries policy. Everything to do with rural Canada has to go under the wrecking ball. Everything to do with identity in this country has to go under the wrecking ball.

Mr. Speaker, do you realize that if this government's policies in this general area had been applied some time back, the way they are going now, we would not have certain gifts in this country. I will give you one quick example, because I see your signal, Sir, that I am just about out of time. One example is that marvellous godsend to Nova Scotia, Rita MacNeil. Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, but for Canadian content requirements she would have never got her break. This woman has just come back from a very successful sold-out tour in Australia. She is about to tour the British Isles, which is all sold out before she even gets there. She is a credit to Canada, but she is flying on her own. That is more than we can say for this Prime Minister. If he was not trying to fly on somebody's coat-tails, if he was not taking his orders from Georgie Bush all the time, he would not be such a wrecking ball.

That is the guy paying the rent, George Bush, on this particular wrecking ball. We are paying for the consequences, for the premeditated, pre-planned wrecking of this country through the CBC, through UI, through fisheries policy and the many other things I could mention. They are all orchestrated by people who are not without an agenda. They have a diabolical agenda all right, but it is not an agenda that will serve this country very well.

• (1650)

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The vote is on Motion No. 17 in the name of Mr. Waddell. May I dispense with the reading of the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** 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 Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on Motion No. 17 is deferred.

The vote is on Motion No. 30 in the name of Mrs. Finestone. May I dispense with the reading of the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** 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 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), the recorded division on Motion No. 30 is deferred.

We will deal now with another group of motions which is made up of Motions Nos. 18, 19, 20 and 21. May I dispense with the reading of the motions?

[*English*]

**Mr. MacWilliam:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** You have the floor.

**Mr. MacWilliam:** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my colleague for Port Moody—Coquitlam, I would like to seek unanimous consent of the House to put forward his motion on his behalf.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House agreed to the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (for Mr. Waddell)** moved:

Motion No. 18

—That Bill C-40 be amended in Clause 3 by adding immediately after line 9 at page 6 the following:

"(*o*) broadcasting services reflecting aboriginal cultures and representative native languages shall be provided where numbers warrant;"

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal)** moved:

Motion No. 19

—That Bill C-40 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 11 at page 6 and substituting the following therefor:

"nal cultures and representative native languages should be provided".

[*English*]

**Mr. MacWilliam:** Mr. Speaker, as with the previous motion, due to the unavoidable absence of my colleague, the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam, I seek unanimous consent for both this motion and motion No. 21 to be considered by all members at this time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Does the House agree?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (for Mr. Waddell)** moved:

Motion No. 20

—That Bill C-40 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 13 and 14 at page 6.

[*English*]

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (for Mr. Waddell)** moved:

Motion No. 21

That Bill C-40 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 17 and 19 at page 6 and substituting the following therefor:

"Canadian broadcasting system;".

He said: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the House for giving unanimous consent for me to present the motions that had been submitted by my colleague. We feel these amendments are extremely important in strengthening the intent of the broadcast bill.

Motion No. 18 reads:

That Bill C-40 be amended in clause 3 by adding immediately after line 9 at page 6 the following:

"(o) broadcasting services reflecting aboriginal cultures and representative native languages shall be provided where numbers warrant;".

Motion No. 20 also states that the proposed legislation be amended. These motions are intended, as I mentioned, to strengthen aboriginal broadcasting provisions in Bill C-40. The bill states that "programming that reflects the aboriginal cultures of Canada should be provided within the Canadian broadcasting system as resources become available".

However, this bill gives little priority to the communications difficulties of Canada's aboriginal communities. As the Canadian Broadcasting League noted before the committee on Bill C-136, the government's proposal "gives provision of broadcasting services for aboriginal people, no priority at all".

The government's proposal reflects its basic lack of support for aboriginal communications in Canada. The most recent budget singled out aboriginal communications societies for particular attack and I want to cite some specific examples.

The Northern Native Broadcast Access Program, which was established in 1983, has been repeatedly cut by this government. The program was created to ensure that northern native people have fair access to distribution systems to maintain their cultures and languages, that programming relevant to native concerns be produced and that northern native representatives be consulted regularly by government agencies. In fact the Northern Native Broadcast Access Program funds over 13 communications societies. Those societies have a significant impact on the communications of our native peoples up north.

When it was created, this program was given a budget of some $40 million over four years. However, the government has cut this in 1985 and in 1986 to reduce the four-year payment to only $33.7 million. In 1987-88, 1988-89 and 1989-90 funding was cut and frozen. In the budget this year, the government again took the hatchet to the program and cut it back to $11.3 million. This represents a cutback of some 15 per cent. This was done to a program which, according to the Nielsen task force report, shows promise as an effective tool for meeting special native broadcast needs and should be considered.

The government also cut the aboriginal friendship centre by some 6.8 per cent, the Native Communications Program by 100 per cent and the Aboriginal Representa-

tive Organization Program by some $2.5 million. We submit to you that this constitutes a virtual attack on the cultural expression of aboriginal peoples at the worst possible time.

• (1700)

The approach reflected in the amendments before the House at this time are much more positive than those found in the currently proposed bill. It states that broadcasting services, not just programming, shall be provided in Canada. In doing so, the amendments adopt the language found in the standing committee report which was supported by all parties and in fact included a majority of Conservative members. The amendments would ensure that aboriginal peoples have access, whether it be in the north or the south, to broadcasting services that they themselves control. This reflects comments made before the Bill C-136 committee by the Wawatay Native Communications Society when they noted the importance of having a native communications system in the north.

We need a new broadcasting policy that meets the concerns, objectives, and aspirations of aboriginal peoples, not only in the north, but in virtually all parts of Canada. The inclusion of this amendment we think would be a positive step along the road.

As the standing committee recognized in its unanimous report, there could be no way of underestimating the importance of broadcasting on the future of aboriginal communities. The communications media are essential to the preservation of the cultural heritage of Canada's aboriginal peoples. Broadcasting policy cannot ensure the survival of native languages. We recognize that, but it can and should play a key and fundamental role in helping to mitigate the threats that currently exist with regard to native cultures. I urge all members of the House to consider and support these recommendations.

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James):** Mr. Speaker, I too would like to address a few remarks to the matter of aboriginal communications.

It comes as no surprise when I say that aboriginal people in Canada feel alienated. They feel left out of so many of the important affairs and matters in the country. I can go back just a few weeks or months and relate what happened at places like Oka and Chateauguay last summer. These were very disturbing and traumatizing events and for the first time in a long period Canadians got some sense of native grievances in the country. These grievances have run extremely deep for centuries. It is little wonder that we had the kind of blow-up or explosion in the province of Quebec last summer.

It seems to me that one way to deal with aboriginal grievances is to address the matter of communications in a very serious way. There is no doubt in my mind that Bill C-40 in no way gives any kind of priority to aboriginal language broadcasts.

I cannot think of anything that is more alienating or traumatizing than to never see one's own culture, values or life styles reflected in mainstream communications around one. Can you imagine if you turned on a radio or television set and never heard anyone speak in your own language? Perhaps you did not see anyone carry out the kind of work that you carry out, speak the kind of language that you speak, or express the kinds of values that you embrace. Can you imagine that if almost everything you saw on the television screen, almost everything you heard on the radio was kind of foreign. Can you imagine how out of place you would feel, how alienated? It would be as if you had travelled to a foreign land, some land far away with a strange and rather foreboding culture, a landscape, where you really did not feel you belonged. Yet, I would submit that that is how many of our aboriginal people feel today.

When you are in that kind of milieu it must say to you, not only that you do not belong, but perhaps you are not even wanted. It seems to me that if we really want to bring about a much better relationship between aboriginal peoples and the rest of the country that we have to start speaking to each other and developing all our communication system in such a way that our aboriginal people feel they belong, that they can stand up and say: "That's me. That belongs to me. That's my country. Those are my people. That's what makes me proud. That makes me proud as a Canadian, proud as an aboriginal".

Anything we can do to foster that kind of development in our communication system is not only good for

aboriginal people, it is good for Canadians and good for the country.

**Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to congratulate the member for Port Moody for advancing this amendment which calls on the CBC to broadcast in aboriginal languages, or as the amendment states:

> (o) broadcasting services reflecting aboriginal cultures and representative native languages shall be provided where numbers warrant;".

As the House knows, there are 53 aboriginal languages existing in Canada today and, of those 53, only three are expected to survive for the next 20 years. The other 50, in many cases, have only one speaker, and when that speaker dies, that language will cease to exist.

We all know as a result of the linguistic debates that have taken place in the country over the last several decades, and perhaps back centuries, that language is really the medium of culture and once language goes, then the culture tends to disintegrate.

One of the things that has happened in the Northwest Territories is that a number of their aboriginal languages have been declared as official languages and that territory now has simultaneous translation of those languages in its legislature. Laws are translated into those languages so that the native people in the Northwest Territories, as a result of their languages becoming the official languages of the territory, have now become full participants, recognized by the law, recognized by the legislature, and recognized by the institutions of that territory. I believe that the same thing should happen with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

The aboriginal affairs committee of the House has delayed introducing its last report on native language and literacy into the House until it can be translated into the three major aboriginal languages spoken in Canada, as well as the two official languages of the House. It is important that natives are involved with the business of the House, especially with the aboriginal committee, and are involved to the extent that they can read the reports of the House in their own languages. The same thing applies to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Native Canadians demonstrated last summer, not simply in the crisis at Kanesatake and Kahnawake, that they are frustrated with the process of debate on their issues in the country, and frustrated with the delays that are taking place in recognizing and settling their claims. They also demonstrated, through the person of Elijah Harper and his ability to thwart the passage of the Meech Lake Accord in the Manitoba legislature, that Canada cannot proceed on its constitutional programs until the role of our native people, the role of their cultures, and especially the role of their language as the medium of their cultures is recognized. It should be recognized, not at the end of the constitutional debate, but in the same place that the native people came in the history of the country and that is, in the first place in our constitutional debate.

• (1710)

It would be worth-while on the part of Parliament and a gesture on its part to have the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, where numbers warrant, use aboriginal languages as the language of broadcasting in those regions of the country where that method would be an effective one of communicating with the people resident in those parts of the country.

I would like to congratulate my colleague from Port Moody—Coquitlam who introduced this legislation and to recognize the statements made just a few minutes ago by the member for Winnipeg and the member from the Okanagan. They pointed out that in the last year or two native people have seen attacks on their language and on their culture by the government. They have seen cutbacks in the native communication program that provided native newspapers all across Canada. The budgets of those newspapers were cut by the Secretary of State by 100 per cent. As a result, many of those newspapers closed down.

For example, the *Micmac News*, was a newspaper that made a point of communicating with the Micmac people of Canada in their own language. It was a newspaper that made a point of communicating native concerns to the dominant society and addressing native people and others in the country who suffer from literacy problems in a language that they could understand and in a way that would help build their understanding of literacy so that they could become more functional citizens of the country.

Another thing the *Micmac News* did before it was cut off by the cancellation of funding by the Secretary of State for External Affairs was to expose injustices to native people; cases such as the one involving Donald Marshall, who was put in jail for 11 years for a crime he did not commit. These are the kind of things that have increased the frustration of native people over the last year or two and that frustration has built up and ultimately resulted in the situation at Kanesatake and Kahnawake.

I hope that Conservative members will read this amendment carefully and will recognize that there are problems in preserving native languages in the country. The government has done next to nothing in a positive way to support native language. In fact, through the budget cuts of the Secretary of State, it has done a great deal in a negative way to prevent the survival of native languages over the next 20 years.

Here is an opportunity, working through the national agency of the CBC, one of the main communications agencies of the Canadian people, to bring some of its people back into the communications stream by allowing them to communicate to their own people in their own languages. At the same time, it can use those languages as a conduit for their culture and communicate with each other as every other Canadian has the right to use the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to communicate between themselves, whether they speak French or English. This is an opportunity to extend it to the languages which have not yet been considered and that is the aboriginal languages of Canada.

I would urge the Conservative members to consider this amendment carefully and to consider what they have done over the last year. I hope that they will vote for this amendment and make it possible for native people to communicate with each other in their own native language and at the same time preserve their native language by doing so.

**Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq):**

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today in support of Motion No. 19 put forward by my colleague for Mount Royal, which would recognize aboriginal languages in Bill C-40.

I congratulate her for her recognition and understanding of the importance of aboriginal people having their language recognized in the Canadian broadcasting policy. I regret that the government has not chosen to put aboriginal languages in this bill.

The motion would amend clause 3(o) of the bill. That clause now reads:

> 3.(1) It is hereby declared as the broadcasting policy for Canada that
>
> (o) programming that reflects the aboriginal cultures of Canada should be provided within the Canadian broadcasting system as resources become available for the purpose;

My colleague's amendment would add "representative native languages should be provided" to this clause.

This amendment is consistent with the recommendations of the 1986 report of the task force on broadcasting policy, also known as the Caplan-Sauvageau report. That report recommended that:

> The Broadcasting Act should affirm the right of native peoples to broadcasting services in aboriginal languages considered to be representative where numbers warrant and to the extent public funds permit.

It went on to say that the term "representative" was used to suggest broadcasting service in the dominant aboriginal dialects of those aboriginal people concerned with the preservation of their language.

When the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture examined the task force report in 1987, it supported this recommendation.

The standing committee, in its sixth report to the House in May of 1987, noted that the aboriginal peoples have a special status in Canada, a fact recognized in the Canadian Constitution.

They commented that in recent years, the policies of the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission had encouraged and promoted native broadcasting. They concluded that the inclusion of a provision regarding broadcasting in representative native languages in a new Broadcasting Act would therefore be consistent with recent policy initiatives.

Accordingly, the committee recommended, and I quote:

> The Broadcasting Act would include the right of aboriginal peoples to broadcasting services in representative native languages, where numbers warrant and as public funds become available.

The government has taken a step in the right direction by referring to aboriginal cultures. There is some recognition. I want to acknowledge that. But the government

has still held back. It has not gone as far as it could have, or should have, in my view.

I fail to understand why the government has ignored aboriginal languages in this bill, despite the numerous recommendations made to it to include these languages; recommendations made by aboriginal people, by its own task force, and by the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture.

There is great concern expressed by members of this House about the foreign cultural domination of this country. That reality is even more stark for aboriginal people.

A year ago, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Communications said the government's challenge with respect to broadcasting was:

> —to equip our system with the means to generate Canadian programming which addresses the needs of Canadians to see themselves on our screens, to see our stories and our creators amid the sea of imported products.

I happen to agree with his comments. I wish the government would see fit to extend that sentiment and understanding to aboriginal people.

How often do the aboriginal people of this country get to see themselves on their TV screens, hear the stories of their people and see their creative citizens on their screens?

North American non-aboriginal cultures dominate almost 100 per cent. Aboriginal people have developed aboriginal communications societies. There is aboriginal TV, aboriginal radio and aboriginal newspapers, but the numbers are small.

• (1720)

These aboriginal communication societies have had their funding cut by this very same government. Nice words will not restore the lost funds or cancelled programs.

Our languages are fragile. The threat of extinction is far more real and pressing for aboriginal languages than for any other language in this country.

There are millions of people in this country who speak French. There are millions of people in this country who speak English.

The people in Canada who speak aboriginal languages number in the thousands, the hundreds and sometimes the tens, depending on the language.

Of the 53 aboriginal languages in this country, only three have excellent chances of survival. Thirteen are moderately endangered and eight are on the verge of extinction.

Does Bill C-40 do anything substantial to ensure these languages survive and thrive? Unfortunately, it does not. Clause 3 does not mention aboriginal languages.

What all the MPs in this House and all Canadians must remember is that our languages, the way they are spoken here, do not exist anywhere else in the world. We do not have a mother country across the oceans to go back to where we can hear our own languages spoken on the radio, on TV, on the streets and in the stores, see it written in books, magazines and newspapers. There is no other place in this world where we can practice our cultures.

Our mother country is Canada. We are from here. We are of here. There is no other place in this world where we can go and communicate in our languages and be understood.

As linguistic and cultural minorities, swamped by communications of a foreign language and culture, it is absolutely vital to our cultural survival that our aboriginal languages and cultures receive the support they deserve from the Canadian government.

I call on the government to accept this motion. I urge the government to demonstrate that it really means what it says about supporting aboriginal cultures. Aboriginal cultures cannot survive without protection of the aboriginal language that is part of that culture.

On February 22, 1990, the following press release was noted: "IBC's 5.5 weekly hours of programming are watched by 95 per cent of Canadian Inuit according to the 1988 survey by Concordia University. Its programs have been broadcast internationally and have won many awards in Canada and the United States.

IBC's programming has received much more than popularity. It has helped retain the rich culture and language of Canada's most northern people. Over half of the IBC viewers said they had developed better language and traditional skills by watching IBC."

I urge the Government of Canada and members opposite to accept my colleague's motion, Motion No. 19, to ensure that aboriginal languages survive and that aboriginal languages are part of our daily lives in this country.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I ask you a question I put to all members of the House, particularly to the Minister of Communications. Would he not like to have access to information, to entertainment and to informative programs? Would he not like that? Whether referring to a native person or somebody who is deaf and mute, that person would automatically be in the minority, be it a linguistic and cultural minority or a minority whose members suffer from certain deficiencies, and he or she would not be able to have access to certain services like all other Canadians.

[*English*]

In that light, both my colleague from the NDP and myself argued quite vigorously, and I think in the interests of minority Canadians, those who have been disenfranchised—if I may put it that way—because of their language and their culture, the aboriginal peoples who are the founding peoples of this country who help define us as a people, as well as those people—a large percentage of our population—who suffer from hearing impairment. Both those groups have appeared before us. We know well that there has been little attempt to answer each of these particular constituencies' needs. I have asked the minister to give serious consideration to the concerns of aboriginal peoples. If there is a minister who should understand the link and the relationship, and as he is chatting with another of his francophone minister colleagues, the two of them should understand how—

**Mr. Charest:** Ex-colleague.

**Mrs. Finestone:** No, you are not an ex-colleague. You are just an ex-minister, but you will soon be back in the ranks, they tell me. At least, I think so. If it was up to me, Jean, you could get reappointed.

As far as I can see, those two ministers who are chatting away over there—at least the Minister of Communications is here in the House, which is wonderful—know how language and culture are interrelated. If there are any people in this House who should be sensitive to that issue, it is these two gentlemen.

I would suggest that is not understanding when you cut off access to aboriginal languages. I know there are a lot of them but there are some that should certainly survive. It is very important for the transmission, particularly in that society, from grandparents, to parents, to children. My colleague from Winnipeg and myself saw that and heard about that when we were up in Iqaluit. We were very impressed with what we saw with respect to the aboriginal peoples, what they can do, the number of people they have trained and the wonderful creativity that has come across. The Secretary of State has cut them out and now the Minister of Communications within this bill is ignoring their needs.

I would like to focus for a moment on the disabled with respect to the hearing impaired. Not only have we in our broadcasting bill, but prior to that in the report by the task force—on which I had the privilege of sitting—*Equality For All*, we addressed the concerns of the hearing impaired in our society at great length. We heard from many of them, because we are not supposed to discriminate based on a series, race, culture and language, et cetera. Within that list of people we should not discriminate against are those who are hearing impaired.

The report of that special task force was then picked up and addressed by the standing committee, interestingly enough, chaired for the first time by the same person who had chaired the task force, namely the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. That standing committee on the status of the disabled in a report on the media and disabled people recommended that the CRTC require that 50 per cent of all Canadian programming be captioned.

That is what it is all about with respect to the disabled. It is captioning. It is the quantity of programming that is available.

In the instance of our aboriginal peoples, they are cut off, period, because of language. In the instance of the hearing impaired, and their numbers are almost equivalent—in fact, there are many more in the hearing impaired—the quantity of captioning is only in prime time. They can only turn on news at various times in the evening. Mind you, I should not say that because there are game shows in the afternoon which do have some captioning and there are some religious services and gardening programs, as I recall. Basically it is the prime time network series, newscasts at various levels and

national commercials. It is fascinating how if one wants to sell something one can find the mechanism in the marketing principles. However, when wants to sell one's values as a Canadian and as a member of society, we cut that out.

I would ask the minister to stop being so stubborn and so narrow-minded and start accepting some very worthwhile amendments that are being placed before him in this House. They are not being placed because it is the Liberal Party or because it is the NDP party. They are being placed because constituents have come and pleaded before this minister. Unfortunately, through either lack of thought and foresight or a plain lack of understanding, these issues have not been covered.

Now that he has been enlightened, perhaps he will see the light and in terms of enlightenment, entertainment and information, he will make the necessary corrections and will accept the recommendations in Motions Nos. 18, 19, 20 and 21.

• (1730 )

**Ms. Ethel Blondin (Western Arctic):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to speak to these three motions put forward by both opposition parties in relation to broadcasting and Bill C-40.

Motions Nos. 18, 19, and 20 really strike at the heart of communications, particularly in my part of Canada. In my area aboriginal people constitute the majority. We have 54,000 people, and the majority of the population is aboriginal. This is reflected in almost everything that is carried out in terms of government services. The purpose of Motions Nos. 18, 19, and 20 is to ensure that services will be provided, where relevant, to reflect aboriginal cultures and languages.

When I spoke on the national unity motion last week, I referred to the cuts that have been made to the Inuit Broadcasting Corporation. If these trends continue, most of Canada's aboriginal languages are destined to become extinct in the very near future. I do not want to be repetitive by going over the same information that was given, but Canadians should know that out of the 53 aboriginal languages only 3, Cree, Inuktitut and Ojibway, have the strength to survive and be preserved. The rest have individual speakers and once they die, that is it. The aboriginal languages are indigenous to this country. There is nowhere to go to revitalize these languages and bring them back. It is truly a loss to what Canada's history should be and what Canadian heritage is all about.

The goal of Canada's aboriginal people is to participate equally in the economic, social, political and cultural life of Canada. They recognize the need to reinforce their cultural identities. That is why language is so important. We know that, because the major political battles in the last 20 years have been won over language rights or linguistic rights.

What does a person hold dearer to his heart than the way he or she thinks? The psychology of that person is reflected in the language he or she speaks and in the particular ideas put forward.

You think in your own language first. If you are a French speaker, you do not think in English; you think *en français*. If you are an aboriginal language speaker, you think in your language first. Those ideas that are prominent are those values and principles which you are raised with and which the language you have learned has taught you all of your life. It is the means of transmitting the uniqueness of the culture of aboriginal peoples.

In the north we say that language is simply about understanding one another. If we understand the importance of another person's language, we understand why it is so important to that person to be able to communicate in that language, why language is held so dear, and why it is a true reflection of that person's culture. We have gone to great lengths to ensure that we accommodate what is important to enhance the quality of life.

The north is the model of the promotion of languages. There are nine official languages in the Northwest Territories. If you were to visit the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories, Mr. Speaker, you would find that the majority of MLAs are native and that the proceedings are being simultaneously translated into seven aboriginal languages, French, and English. This service is unique in North America and is worth preserving.

I want to take a few minutes to explain the cultural linguistic groups in the Northwest Territories. The Dene, which means people in our tradition, are comprised of several groups of people depending on where they live, each with their own dialect. The Chippewan, the Dog Rib, the Loucheux each has aboriginal culture which is really quite distinct from one another. Inuit means people in Inuit, the language of a people inhabiting the circumpolar world from Siberia to Greenland. There are three major dialects of Inuit languages. They are the Inuvialuktun, Innuinuktun, and Inuktitut. The Inuit

cultural linguistic groups in N.W.T. include the Salliq people, the South Baffin Inuit, the Iglulik Inuit, the Netsilik, the Caribou, and the Copper.

In general the Inuit language is highly viable, with most Inuit children learning Inuktitut as their mother tongue. Inuivialutun is the Inuit language in the western region which uses Roman orthography. Syllabic script is used to write Inuktitut in the eastern Arctic.

As the former Assistant Deputy Minister of Culture and Communication for the Government of the Northwest Territories, I am proud to have been involved in the development of these language services in the Northwest Territories. I am proud to say that it is something worth continuing, with some persistent endeavour. The federal government has in fact taken the unspent moneys from the 1984 agreement and reprofiled them for further use so that the total budget that was given, $16 million, is not entirely expended toward aboriginal languages.

When we speak about national unity we do not just talk about a concept that is held in books or documents or a concept that lives within the walls of the House of Parliament. We talk about a concept of where Canadians from one coast to the other, from all three coastal regions of Canada, can hear the same message, the same ideas, and the same programs being broadcast. There is a connection there.

There is also the sharing of major events. When the Berlin Wall came down, surely every part of Canada heard through CBC the news that came forward. When John F. Kennedy was killed, I can remember living in a very small, isolated community in the Northwest Territories where we had one or two radios. It was the CBC that brought the news to us that this great human being had been lost to the world. I can remember the effect it had on our community. We had no power. We had no running water. I guess we had the very rudimentary lifestyle which many people enjoyed at the time in a hunting and trapping economy. But we did get the message. We did receive messages through this thin wire of accommodation, I guess, that went from one side of the country to the other.

There are many ways in which the whole essence of aboriginal languages can be preserved. Bill C-269 was prepared. It was a private member's bill. It was an attempt, not by one private member but by aboriginal groups across Canada, to preserve their languages and to develop the Aboriginal Languages Foundation in private member's Bill C-269.

It was Chief Mike Mitchell from Akwesasne who stated:

> Language is a gift from the creator. Embodied in aboriginal languages is our unique relationship to the creator, our attitudes, our beliefs, values and the fundamental notion of what is truth.

I believe the establishment of an Aboriginal Language Foundation would help to ensure the preservation, revitalization, and perpetuation of aboriginal languages and cultures across Canada.

In order for aboriginal peoples of Canada to take their rightful place in society, it is necessary to ensure the survival, development and transmission of aboriginal languages which are the lifeblood of culture, the necessary element for our advancement.

These motions are simply trying to accomplish what other Canadians take for granted, that people can expect service in their own language. In many areas, particularly the north, it is critical that vital information be communicated in languages which serve the majority of people.

Aboriginal languages are indigenous to Canada. In one of the smaller fishing communities messages can come over the radio which mean nothing to other parts of Canada, but it could tell one fisherman or one trapper that there is a plane on the way to pick up someone who is sick, that there is someone bringing in supplies for the winter stay in the bush, or that something as important as medicine, shells or any other needed supply is coming in on the plane and what time it would arrive.

It is important for people, specifically large populations of aboriginal people, where they are located, to preserve a service which CBC has started in many areas. It has persevered without policy to continue this service for the aboriginal people of Canada. It is very important. It would aid national unity to a great extent.

• (1740)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The question is on Motion No. 18, standing in the name of Mr. Waddell. May the Chair be dispensed with reading the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** 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 Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on Motion No. 18 is deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 19 in the name of Mrs. Finestone. May the Chair be dispensed with reading the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** 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 Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on Motion No. 19 is deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 20, standing in the name of Mr. Waddell. May the Chair be dispensed with reading the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** 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 Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on Motion No. 20 is deferred and the vote on this motion will apply to Motion No. 21.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal)** moved:

Motion No. 22

That Bill C-40 be amended in clause 3 by striking out line 23 at page 6 and substituting the following therefor:

"(i), educational television programming".

Motion No. 23

That Bill C-40 be amended in clause 3 by striking out lines 30 to 48 at page 6 and substituting the following therefor:

"(r) the programming provided by an educational television service should

(i) provide innovative programming that stimulates and encourages learning across many sectors for all ages,

(ii) be complementary to existing programming,

(iii) reflect Canada's regional and multicultural and multiracial nature,

(iv) include programming exploring social concerns,

(v) be predominantly from independent educational authorities as contemplated in paragraph (j) as well as international co-productions;"

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few remarks to this matter of the alternative programming service. I would like to start off by saying that it is really one of the more curious pieces of Bill C-40. I say that because to some extent it comes out of nowhere.

If anything, I think it belongs to another era. It comes from another ministerial era. It was a notion belonging to a previous minister, and a notion that certainly has not been articulated very well by the current Minister of Communications. I am not too sure whether he knows that much about it. He did not go the extra mile to define what this alternative programming service was to be all about. Certainly Bill C-40 does not in any way tell us how an alternative programming service would be financed.

As you already know, Mr. Speaker, broadcasting is very expensive. The CBC, in a financial sense, is under siege. I find it curious that this government would want to put into Bill C-40 something called an alternative programming service.

If we are to have an alternative programming service, what is the CBC all about? Is that not what the CBC is there for? The CBC is providing a pretty good service despite its financial constraints. It seems to me that the CBC can handle the alternative broadcasting service quite well.

If the government wants an extra service of some kind, it certainly could get into the business of educational broadcasting. Before I touch on that, I should remind you, Mr. Speaker, that, of course, education comes within the jurisdiction of the provinces. But if the federal government really wants to provide a service in education, it can ably assist the provinces.

First of all, let me touch on what I might call the plethora of services that we already have now. We have a veritable profusion of television and broadcast services in the country. I was just thinking a few moments ago about the number and the kind of services that I have on my own home television set.

Just to use my memory, we can start with the CBC television and then we can go to PBS, the American Public Broadcast System that is readily available in most parts of the country. Of course, there is CBS, ABC and NBC. Those are the three major American broadcast systems, not to mention CNN, which is available to a lot of subscribers in the country in all provinces and territories.

I can go further. There are community channels. In my own area there are three French television services. Not one, not two, but three, which is not bad for the western part of the country. Of course, there is home shopping. There is the sports network.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, there is this proliferation of broadcast services. Yet, in a curious way, the government has placed in Bill C-40 this alternative programming service, ill-defined and certainly with no budget.

If the government really wants to do something extra, I think it should think about education. Never before has education been so important to our lives. Nowadays, if you do not have a good education, perhaps you are doomed, certainly doomed in making a good living, a good income.

It seems to me that by using television and radio, the modern broadcast technologies, we can teach basic skills; teach literacy.

• (1750)

We can foster a greater awareness in scientific subjects. I think it has to be done. When our parents and grandparents were alive and making a living, when they were starting out in their careers, they could assume that when they started a career, they would stay in that career for the rest of their lives—30, 40 or perhaps 50 years.

That is not the case anymore. We live in this rapidly changing world of rapidly changing technologies. Young people who start a career now cannot expect that they are going to be in those careers for the next 10, 20, 30 or 40 years. They are going to have to change careers perhaps two, three or four times. They are going to have to learn to adapt to new ideas, new technologies and new careers.

It brings into focus the importance of education. I think we would be remiss as a country and as a federal government if we did not address this problem and if we did not use television in a much more efficient way to provide a better educational service.

I do not think at this particular juncture that we should be talking about an alternative program service because after all, I think the CBC is quite well equipped in that regard. We should be talking about education.

I remember reading an article some time ago about and including remarks by the chairman of TV Ontario, Mr. Ostry. He was speaking to this matter of how important it is to make better use of our broadcast services to promote education. After all, it would be done for the benefit of our children and future generations.

At this particular point, I would like to introduce an amendment to Motion No. 22. I move:

That Motion No. 22 be amended by striking out everything after the word "out" and inserting the following:

lines 23 to 29 at page 26.

I would also like to introduce an amendment to Motion No. 23. I move:

That Motion No. 23 be amended by deleting all words after page 6 and inserting:

period.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** While the Chair considers the motion introduced by the hon. member for Winnipeg St. James, the House will resume debate. The hon. member for Mount Royal.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I hope the Chair will accept the amendment moved by my colleague because I think it makes a lot of sense. It is along the same line as alternative television programming. Even the name or the words used are wrong.

[*English*]

During the course of the study and legislative hearings, an ardent plea was heard from ATEC, the Association of Tele Education in Canada. That group, as we well know, represents the public educational broadcasters in Canada. They have very finely tuned and carefully honed programming that is presented in each province and for which we are all very proud. They win awards across this world, whether it is TV Ontario, Radio-Quebec, Access Network, and hopefully SCN—the new program that is coming in from Saskatchewan—and the knowledge network out of B.C.

They have wonderful experience in bringing before the public, issues and social concerns such as criticisms of the current educational standards. Mr. Stuart Smith is presently presiding over a committee put together by the universities. He is very concerned about the quality of our manpower and womanpower as it comes out of our universities and collegiate systems. Are they really empowered through the teaching, the programs and through the materials that we have within our system to be able to supply the international talent skills, research and development to the Canadian workforce that will enable us to be true competitors on the international scene? There is an emphasis on the delivery and the capacity for education in Canada.

There is a tremendously high rate of drop-outs from our school system. You, Mr. Speaker, as a former broadcaster from Quebec, know this. You have heard the reports and you have seen those concerns presented on the airwaves. It is a very serious issue. It costs millions of dollars to our employment agencies and to the business forces when there are illiterate and ill-prepared students going into the workforce who cannot, with their shockingly high level of illiteracy, handle the modern technology of today. There is ignorance in science and technology. There is the need for teacher in-service for the upgrading and renewal of all kinds of skills.

We can use that incredible force that Marshall McLuhan has talked about to educate people on prevention with respect to their own personal health. AIDS is a serious issue in today's society. Proper care and respect of oneself and understanding of the use of condoms and the use of self-prevention within that sphere can be used on a program that would be on an educational channel. Substance abuse, whether it be drugs or alcohol, has a tremendous impact and is very damaging to our society.

A Canadian learning channel would have been a wonderful opportunity. I must say that it was not my idea. I wish I could credit myself with such a bright and intelligent observation. The ideas came from Mr. Bernard Ostry and ATEC. They proposed that any promotion, pursuit and financing of new initiatives be directed to establishing a viable learning channel for all Canadians facilitated by ATEC members, based on existing financial and institutional resources. That was presented on April 23, 1990. It was very clever, intelligent, open-mined, and very Canadian in spirit. There was a problem

about copyright and I understood that. Had the minister been willing to understand and support this group, we might have been seeing today a different kind of approach to alternate programming.

However, on June 19, I received another letter from Mr. Ostry, where he points out that they had a subsequent meeting with Access Network, Knowledge Network, Radio-Quebec, and SCN Saskatchewan. In looking at Bill C-40, they decided that it would be difficult because if education is a provincial mandate, we should not be able to participate in such an undertaking.

It is a ruddy shame that boundaries, which are just lines drawn on a map as far as Canadians are concerned, constrain the educational concerns that should be directed from the national level. However, I must respect the will of ATEC because I think they would be fundamental to this particular project. The reason I want to support the amendment that has been brought by my colleague from Winnipeg is because behind this alternate programming were funds. Originally, there was $100 million behind that programming. The previous Minister of Communications had committed those funds so that we could do target marketing, something the CBC already does.

• (1800)

It occurred to me and to my colleague that, as we move into another period of recession, there is a crisis in the CBC. We have heard about the challenge to the existence of this parliamentary channel and I hope people who are watching will recognize that this minister who is sitting in front of me said "no" today to considering saving the parliamentary channel which is not a mandated service of the CBC.

Radio Canada International is not a mandated service, neither is Northern Services. If the minister would get rid of the alternate programming which has a $100 million budget behind it—it has probably shrunk now but it was supposed to be $100 million so even if it shrank to $50 million—it could certainly enable these services and the cuts to the CBC to be offset.

It is not promoting and going ahead with my concerns for a learning channel, and recognizing that we are allowing the Americans to take up this space through the increased subscriptions that they have of the American system, the American learning channel. I think that is a little bit sad because it is important for our children to have a Canadian connection, and our adults for that matter. Notwithstanding all that, I support the withdrawal of my amendment and I support the amendment that will remove the alternate services completely, sections 3, 2, and (r) from this bill.

[*Translation*]

SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** After a short deliberation the Chair is now in a position to rule on the motions introduced by the hon. member for Winnipeg St. James.

To begin with it is rather unusual for a member to present two amendment motions and, according to the Standing Orders, only one can be introduced. That being so, the amendment to Motion No. 22, which is a new motion and for which notice should have been given, is not in order. The Standing Orders are rather strict on that point, for it is not an amendment to Motion No. 22 but indeed a new motion.

On the other hand the motion to amend Motion No. 23 is quite in order. Therefore we will resume the debate if other speakers seek the floor.

MEASURE TO AMEND

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Resuming debate on the amendment motion. Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The next vote is on Motion No. 22 in the name of Mrs. Finestone. May I dispense?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**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.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Motion No. 22 is negatived, on division.

Motion No. 22 negatived, on division.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The next question is on the amendment to Motion No. 23, standing in the name of Mrs. Finestone. Shall the Chair be dispensed from reading the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the amendment to Motion No. 23 negatived on division.

Amendment to motion No. 23 negatived on division.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The amendment to Motion No. 23 having been negatived, the House will now vote on the main motion, that is to say Motion No. 23 in the name of Mrs. Finestone. Is the Chair dispensed from reading the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I am reminded by the Table Officers, in their wisdom, that the vote on Motion No. 22 also applies to Motion No. 23. The latter is therefore negatived.

Motion No. 23 negatived on division.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Let us call the next group of motions, that is to say Motions Nos. 24, 26, 27 and 28.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal)** moved:

Motion No. 24

That Bill C-40 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 12 to 14 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"of Canadian broadcasting undertakings in French and English with first priority given to publicly mandated services; followed by independent educational authorities, in their province of origin; and then by private sector Canadian broadcasting undertakings.

Motion No. 26

That Bill C-40 be amended in Clause 3 by adding immediately after line 14 at page 7 the following:

"(ii) should carry foreign originated programming services where the programming they provide is complementary to programming offered by existing Canadian broadcasting undertakings or where those foreign programming services were already carried by distribution undertakings;"

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (for Mr. Waddell)** moved:

Motion No. 27

That Bill C-40 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 15 to 18 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"(ii) shall provide efficient delivery of programming at rates that are at all times just and reasonable,"

Motion No. 28

That Bill C-40 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 26 to 34 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"(iv) may, where appropriate, originate a community channel as defined by the Commission, under terms and conditions set out by the Commission."

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James):** Mr. Speaker, I want to confine my remarks to the matter of priority carriage. With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I shall be moving an amendment at the close of my remarks. I will not be talking very long, but I want to point this out.

• (1810)

Television has certainly changed a lot in the last 20 to 30 years and it certainly has changed since the 1968 Broadcasting Act. Every facet of television has changed since 1968 and certainly its delivery.

I can remember when television first came to southern Manitoba where I grew up. It was 1955. We got our first television service which consisted of one channel, the Canadian Broadcasting Television Network. That was it. In fact, the first year or two the service was pretty snowy. It was quite difficult at times to see the images on the screen. The images looked more like ghosts than they did like human beings. That was television in its infancy, in its embryonic stage. Certainly, television has come a long way since 1955 when it was first delivered to the southern part of Manitoba.

At that time, one did not have to worry about priority of carriage. All you could get was one channel, one simple service. We did not have to worry about priority.

After I had taken up a radio and television career, I moved to the city of Winnipeg. At that time, there were only two channels, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation network and CTV, which was really in its infancy in 1960. After that came a private television station and then somewhat after that came the cable services and, of course, with the cable services came the American broadcasting services, Global, and so on.

Today, we have a wide range of television services. This brings us to this matter of what is called priority of carriage. We just cannot ignore what is being served up first on the television screen. Television technology is changing so rapidly that even things like tiers are rapidly fading from our vocabulary. At one time, our television sets started at channel 2 and went up to channel 13. Now, with the new technology, they go up to about channel 99.

It seems to me, and certainly on this side of the House, that there should be a priority given to certain services. In our opinion, the first priority should go to public television services, publicly funded, publicly supported television services. For example, the CBC should certainly be given top priority. I am talking not only here of the English service, but French service as well. In our considered opinion, that is first. Public television services should have top priority.

Number two should be the provincial educational services. For example, TV Ontario here in the province of Ontario has to be given priority consideration. Put it on the first tier, to use this fast-fading television language. After that comes, in our opinion, the Canadian privately owned services, Global, CTV, and other private services.

After those services have been given first priority on the television system—CBC, provincial educational services and the private Canadian services—then the rest can come, be it specialty services, American services, community channels, whatever.

I perhaps failed to mention that we feel that community access channels or community access services should be given a major priority at the top of the channel. There is no doubt about it, if a service shows up on those first channels, on those beginning channels, say channels 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, they are going to be watched more. They are going to be exposed more, if I can use that word, to the viewing public than those channels that may be up at 30, 40 and 50. At least that is the kind of thinking that I would have on that.

As I said in my beginning words, priority at one time was not a big deal in television because there were only one or two services. That is not the case any more. We as parliamentarians have to make sure these priority services are given top treatment, first treatment.

I would like to move an amendment now to Motion No. 24. It is a very simple amendment. I move:

That Motion No. 24 be amended by deleting lines 12 to 14 and substituting the following therefor:

"line 12".

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The Chair will take the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg St. James under advisement.

The hon. member for Mount Royal has the floor.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, if you look at this particular amendment and all the amendments brought forward by my colleague, it is merely a matter of the line on which the amendment is to be completed, because we would certainly not, in any sense of the word, wish to remove the carriage of local Canadian stations. Therefore the numbering on the line was inaccurate. All we have asked for in this amendment is instead of lines 12 to 14, just line 12. It has nothing to do with the content of the wording whatsoever.

What we are really talking about is empowering the CRTC in this bill which, in a sense, is defining the relationship between the regulator and the body politic. That is really what we are talking about.

We are saying that all elements must collaborate, must work together, and play a role in ensuring that the Canadian broadcasting system and its Canadian content be a reflection of this particular act, which is the Canadian Broadcasting Act.

One of the ways that we can ensure the appropriate application of a Canadian Broadcasting Act is to ensure that this system works effectively and efficiently, and that we ensure windows or accesses so that the public can see what is on that screen.

In amendment 30, I had addressed the issue of ensuring that the CRTC, as the regulator, would have the responsibility for applying the principle of an orderly and organized Canadian broadcasting system. In this particular amendment, I am ensuring, hopefully, that the distribution undertaking —that is the cable company— will similarly have that responsibility.

I am very sensitive to the fact that a nation that overly restricts its citizens access to information and to entertainment could not be considered or claim to be a free society. Certainly we know all about that. We have seen the walls crumble in those societies that have not allowed ordinary citizens to have access to information, education and programming.

• (1820)

On the other hand, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that a nation that relinquishes control over its communications policy to extra-territorial forces will ultimately cede its sovereignty as well over much of its affairs.

I know that this minister has been very sensitive in many, many areas to the concerns of artistic integrity, artistic merit, and artistic productivity in the field of the arts within our society, particularly to those who are writers, singers, performers and certainly those who can prepare the scenarios that appear on film on our screens, either on video or in the theatres. So I find it quite surprising that the holes in this bill allow for much more Americanization than I believe this minister was prepared to allow in the first place. Whether that is a fallout from free trade or something else, I am not sure. But, as there is no more pervasive medium than that of broadcasting to ensure enlightenment, entertainment and information, and no more powerful way of getting one's message across, I wonder if the minister realized the impact of first of all not ensuring that all programs that appear on our cable need to have a sanction and go through the CRTC.

There are marvellous ways in which the CRTC through article 9.4 can exempt, but everything that goes on that screen should be under the charge of the regulator. It should not be up to the cable operators to decide what and who shall get onto our screens, but it should be brought before the regulator for permission.

I would like to point out that at the present time the majority of the programs that are heard are from sources outside of Canada. It has been emphasized to us time and time again that continued reception of these has a tendency to mould the minds of young people to ideas and opinions that are not necessarily Canadian. We saw that happening through the kind of broadcasting and the input into China and Tiananmen Square and we saw, when access was closed down, what happened.

We saw what happened in Berlin with the newly emerging democracy. It was hit constantly by the Voice of America, by Radio Canada International and the BBC, and the spark of man's normal wish for freedom of expression and freedom of action comes through when a role model is seen. The Canadian role model is different from the role models one might see in Britain, in France, or in the United States, our largest cousin to the south. Although there is nothing wrong with the United States, it is a different country. I think we want to maintain who we are and what we are. When we consider this medium and the geographic dimensions of Canada which are enormous, broadcasting can be that great force in fostering that national spirit and interpreting national citizenship and leading to national unity.

Given that an average of 10,000 hours of mostly American television are watched by our children as they grow up it is vital, in the national interest, to ensure access to a larger percentage of those 10,000 hours as Canadian. This does not mean to say that one should close his eyes or ears to the rest of the world. What it is saying is to affirm and reaffirm our future through the presentation of those kinds of information and entertainment that tells the story of who we are no matter on which coast of the three we live.

I would say that our national realities in both taste and in culture are properly reflected and accessible when our programming and the operations of our Canadian broadcasting system are in conformity and cable has the responsibility, as much as broadcasters, to ensure that we get access to that kind of programming.

I have indicated in Motion No. 24 that I want to see us put an orderly process within our regulatory structures so that our cable priority rankings would include the publicly-mandated services, which would include the public educators as well and followed by those independent educational authorities, we would have the private sector and the local level, following of course the retention of the three plus one, PBS, ABC, NBC and CBS.

Those are important. Then you add on above that, Mr. Speaker, anything else that is deemed through consultation and the regulator as advisable.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that if we do not make affordable and accessible to the general population through cable the kinds of programs I am talking about and you allow complete access to anything, we make a big mistake.

Cable rates are going up. People do not have options and choices on those cable rates. If the cable people are not careful and do not pay attention, and if the regulator does not pay attention, we are going to be in a serious dilemma. Then we will need to have a serious public debate.

Shall we open up cable so that we can have an open Sesame situation where cable shall have competition? Or, shall we look at them as public utilities and regulate them like we do Bell Canada and our telephone companies? Is that what cable wants?

There is a serious concern about the profits. There is a new thing out there that is not even addressed in this bill which is very disquieting. It is called Skypix. I do not have the time to talk about this incredible United States satellite service that is coming in and is going to block every single window and for which we are going to have a problem.

I just want to put on record—this will be the last point—that Statistics Canada gave us some extraordinary figures with respect to the Canadian communications industry.

In 1988, the gross revenue for Canadian cable companies was just over $1.2 billion. During the same year, the gross revenue of all Canadian radio and television stations was just under $1.2 billion. The after tax profit for cable was $173 million and for broadcasters $77 million.

In 1989,—look at the change—when cable's after tax profit rose to $218 million, broadcasters' after tax profits declined to $51 million. I would suggest that in these circumstances it is ironic that the CRTC continues to look to broadcasters for the most stringent requirements to provide support for our cultural and industrial policy objectives and the cable people have only the responsibility for the community channel.

There is something wrong, and I think we are going to have to address that in a much more significant way. I would like to strongly recommend that we support Motion No. 24, for organization; Motion No. 25 on foreign services and Motion No. 27 that would look at cable rates. I think then we would do a good job for the Canadian broadcasting system.

[*Translation*]

SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Having considered the amendment to Motion No. 24 proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg St. James, the Chair rules the amendment in order.

MEASURE TO AMEND

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Resuming debate. Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The first vote is on the amendment to Motion No. 24. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment to Motion No. 24 moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg St. James? I have no indication from the House. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment to Motion No. 24 moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg St. James?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** All those in favour of the amendment 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 yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on the amendment to Motion No. 24 is deferred.

• (1830)

The vote is on Motion No. 26 standing in the name of Mrs. Finestone. Should I dispense with the reading of the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt 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 Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded vote on Motion No. 26 stands deferred.

The vote is on Motion No. 27 standing in the name of Mr. Waddell. Should I dispense with the reading of the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** 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 Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded vote on Motion No. 27 stands deferred.

The question is on motion No. 28 standing in the name of Mr. Waddell. Shall I dispense with the reading of the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**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 will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** In my opinion the nays have it.

Motion negatived on division.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal)** moved:

Motion No. 31

That Bill C-40 be amended in clause 6 by striking out line 40 at page 9 and substituting the following therefor:

"but no such guidelines or".

She said: Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting issue. Notwithstanding the non-democratic approach of this government across the floor, and recognizing how important it is not only to have democracy work but to have it proceed to work, I am proposing this amendment. What we are discussing in clause 6, which in part deals with the powers of the CRTC in relation to broadcasting. It is found on page 9.

Hundreds of people wrote in and asked for copies of this bill. They were following this debate. I find that quite fascinating. I hope for them that it is satisfying and that they are pleased we are trying to improve this bill in their interest.

It is a good bill and it contains many changes, but it is also a bad bill. If the minister were not so stubborn, he would have the consent of this entire House to put into place a good broadcast bill, but he just will not listen.

[*Translation*]

He is incredibly narrow-minded! He is sitting there, wearing blinkers and with his ears plugged!

**An hon. member:** Narrow-minded and with his ears plugged!

**Mrs. Finestone:** He has his mind, his ears and his eyes blocked.

[*English*]

It says in clause 6 that the commission may from time to time issue guidelines and statements with respect to any matter within its jurisdiction under this act, but no such guidelines or statements issued by the commission are binding on the commission.

Essentially I have asked the minister to consider removing "under this act" .If the minister would stop reading his paper and listen, he might understand why this is important.

**Mr. Lewis:** When you start making sense he will stop reading.

**Mrs. Finestone:** Doug, even you would understand this.

What we are really referring to here is the serious concern that constrains the CRTC to being enabled to issue guidelines, regulations or behaviour under certain terms and conditions that are not already outlined in this act. I think every member of the House should realize that the CRTC will no longer be in a position to give rules and regulations and terms and conditions under the Elections Act. All members are interested in getting re-elected. All members are interested in the democratic process. All members are interested in fairness under the law. Members should not laugh; it is a serious matter.

Now we are going to leave it to the government of the day, through cabinet, to issue a direction as to how the election shall be run. It was bad enough under the CRTC running it, and we did not win. However, if they are going to put the Governor in Council in charge, I think that is a serious matter.

I am suggesting to the minister that he remove the three little words "under this Act" and allow the CRTC to continue the responsibility that it has had over many years for setting the terms and conditions under the Elections Act.

There are other areas, but I thought that one might hit home, where it hurts us most in our heart and particularly where it would be of concern to the government of the day. That is the extent of my concern under the amendment we are proposing.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** So, the vote will be on Motion No. 31. Dispense.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**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 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.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The motion is negatived on division.

Motion No. 31 is negatived on division.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** We now move to another group of motions, that is Motions Nos. 32, 33 and 34.

Does the House agree to let Mr. MacWilliam propose the motion for Mr. Waddell?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*English*]

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (for Mr. Waddell)** moved:

Motion No. 32

That Bill C-40 be amended in clause 9 by adding immediately after line 14 at page 12 the following:

"(i) determine whether the rates charged by cable companies are at all times just and reasonable and, if they are not, revise them accordingly."

Motion No. 33

That Bill C-40 be amended by deleting clause 11.

• (1840 )

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** moved:

Motion No. 34

That Bill C-40 be amended by adding immediately after line 43 at page 17 the following new clause:

"20. The Chairman of the Commission may direct that a public hearing under this Act be heard on behalf of the Commission by two or more members designated by the Chairman, of whom at least one shall be a full-time member, and the members so designated have and may exercise for the purpose of that hearing the powers of the Commission set out in section 16."

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James):** Mr. Speaker, I want to deal specifically with Motion No. 34 in this particular grouping of motions and talk about the proposed reorganization of the CRTC.

We on this side of the House feel very strongly about this, because the ultimate effect of this part of the bill will be to balkanize the CRTC: balkanize, break it up and render it unable to give a real national pan-Canadian focus and views to its decisions.

We have said many times that this government is dangerous. It has, in a very systematic way, begun to destroy the traditions of the country, to destroy the institutions of the country, to break apart the very fabric of this country and to undermine the very foundations of this country. We see it in this bill; we see it in spades.

Up until now the CRTC could take a pan-Canadian view. It could take a very wide perspective of this country because its decisions had to reflect the entire body, that is the entire commission. If Bill C-40 goes through, that will not be the case any more. The effect of this bill will be to to break up CRTC into panels and to turn each little panel into its own fiefdom. That is what will happen.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, if you have a panel for Atlantic Canada, a panel for the province of Quebec, a panel for Ontario, a panel for the prairies, and perhaps a panel for British Columbia? You are going to have a panel of the CRTC for each region of the country. How is it possible that over a long period of time those panels are going to employ, exhibit and express a consistent point of view? It is impossible. It is inevitable that they will reflect their own regions. Over a period of time you will find an inconsistency in the opinions and decisions of the CRTC.

That is not good for this country. It is certainly not good for the unity of this country. Somebody has to speak for the country. Somebody has to render decisions that have a pan-Canadian view. The CRTC is an absolutely, crucial, important institution. If the CRTC is going to be balkanized, if it is going to be broken up, that is going to hurt this country. It is going to hurt national unity. We already have enough disunity in this country as a result of this government's policies. I am sure there are some people, certainly the Conservatives on that side and some viewers would say that this is just a partisan view, this is just a Liberal speaking, this is just the opposition speaking. After all, the opposition could never find anything good about what the Tories put forward so they have to find something wrong with almost every part of the bill.

**Mr. Lewis:** You've got that right.

**Mr. Harvard:** The Minister of Transport says that I have it right.

Let me put before him some comments concerning this balkanization of the CRTC, what is called, "he who hears decides". There are some very eminent persons in this country who do not like the balkanization of the CRTC. I could name names like Keith Spicer, Patrick Watson, and others.

Let me read some comments. This is what Mr. Spicer, now the head of the Citizens Forum said on February 22 of this year:

I do not think "they who hear decide" at all helps strengthen the national will or the national identity. It can be argued that, psychologically, if you make the regions feel more secure or powerful, and they are doing things for themselves, this in itself makes them accept the country more. I think that is a little bit of a side argument.

That is what Keith Spicer said on February 22, 1990. Western International Communications said:

The principle of "he who hears decides" might further destabilize policy making. Individual panels would make binding decisions inconsistent with one or another or with broader policy objectives.

CFCF in Montreal said on February 8 of this year:

With the "he who hears decides" rule, we are running the risk of contradicting one of the fundamental objectives of the system, to maintain a "single" system.

I want to quote one more source, Mr. Speaker. This is what TV Ontario said:

> The regionalization of the Commission and the initiation of the "s/he who hears decides" rule will lead to fragmentation of national policy and general confusion as to the guiding principles of regulations in all parts of the country.

That is what Keith Spicer and some rather important bodies have said about this particular part of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the name Patrick Watson a moment ago. Maybe I should not have said that. I do not have a quote of his so I will withdraw that reference to Mr. Watson.

In summation, this is a bad precedent, a terrible mistake, and I think we are going to pay for this mistake in the years to come. It is about time that we started giving more consideration to this whole country. We have become too parochial. We have become too provincial. We have become too regional. Somebody has to offer a Canadian perspective. If we do not, if we withdraw, if we go back into our regions and if we only express those things which we deem important for the regions, for our own narrow turfs, if I can put it that way, that is going to harm this country irreparably.

I would hope that the government would come to its senses and withdraw this aspect of the bill because it will serve no good. It will not serve broadcasting in a positive way, Mr. Speaker. What I would like to see are those issues which the chairman deems important.

I think that under the Broadcasting Act the chairman of the CRTC should be able to deem certain issues of national importance and that decisions made concerning those issues cannot be made by panels but only by the full body of the CRTC. That would give the chairman more power and give him or her the opportunity to say to the CRTC that we, in this particular case, are going to render a national decision, a decision with a national perspective, with a pan-Canadian view.

• (1850 )

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on behalf of my colleague, the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam who has moved Motion No. 32.

I should point out before I begin that it was unfortunate in the previous proceedings of the House that when I understood the amendment to Motion No. 24 was being presented, it was to be voted on separately. I did not understand at the time that having voted on the amending motion, in fact the whole group would be voted on. Unfortunately, I did not get an opportunity to speak to Motions Nos. 27 and 28, which have also been submitted by my colleague, but because the motions are reflected in Motion No. 32, I think the comments will be pertinent to all of those motions described.

The amendment basically establishes or provides assurance that there will be efficient delivery of programming in the cable industry at rates that are at all times justifiable and reasonable. I want to point out that the cable industry is the only territorial monopoly whose profits are unregulated.

In the opinion of many, the cable industry has been a virtual licence to print money. This amendment, along with others, would apply the same kinds of pricing rules to cable companies to establish sensibility and sensitivity in pricing that have been established in other jurisdictions, for example, to telephone companies under the Railway Act.

The Railway Act states that all tolls must be "just and reasonable". Just and reasonable has been, I submit, interpreted to mean that the rates must be profit regulated. The cable industry earns on the average close to 30 per cent profit on its fixed net assets according to the 1989 commission, and in our judgment the appropriate rate of return for this industry should be closer to the 16 per cent range on net fixed assets. This would be roughly equivalent to Bell Telephone's range of 12.25 per cent to 13.25 per cent profit on average common equity.

The cable industry's profits are very healthy indeed. I think these amendments would ensure that there is not the kind of price gouging which can take place in an industry that remains as yet completely unregulated. Cable rates have risen astronomically in Canada in recent years. Cable increases averaged about 6 per cent a year between 1984 and 1988. They rose 29 per cent in the 18 months since 1989, a 29 per cent increase in their rate structures. That is a pretty significant wallop in the pocketbooks of consumers in Canada. It has occurred at a time when average telephone rates in Canada have actually been on the decline. As a result, consumers of

monopoly cable services have been left virtually unprotected from these excessive price increases.

Telephone rates are just and reasonable, as I mentioned before, because the Railway Act, in fact, says they have to be. It specifically instructs the regulator to enforce rate of return provisions. It is in the legislation. In contrast, the CRTC presently has full discretion in setting cable rates and the result of this has been very plain to see. As I mentioned, there has been a 29 per cent increase in rates in the past 18 months.

Given that Canadians pay over $1 billion annually in cable fees, they would be interested to know just how rates are set by the commission. Before 1986, the main criteria used by the commission in setting rates was how much other cable companies were charging in the same general area.

The Public Interest Advocacy Centre has pointed out that this meant the greediest or the least efficient operators would apply first for a rate increase and then others would follow shortly. That has been the situation.

In effect, less efficient systems were used by the larger ones as an excuse to overcharge Canadian consumers. In 1986, a new formula was developed by the CRTC. Cable companies were given automatic increases of 80 per cent of the Consumer Price Index increase, plus an additional increase to cover the cost of capital investment in the system, an extraordinary increase based on need.

This formula was modified in May of 1990, but it remains basically intact.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons asks to be recognized. The hon. parliamentary secretary.

[*English*]

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hon. member for interrupting, but we are close to seven o'clock. You will find that there is consent for the following House order:

> That the House continue to sit, with quorum calls and dilatory motions not receivable, until no later than 11 o'clock p.m. today to consider report stage of Bill C-40 at or before which time (as the case may be) the Speaker shall interrupt any proceeding then under way and all deferred recorded divisions and all questions on all motions in amendment to the said bill not yet put at the time of such interruption, shall at such time be forthwith deemed deferred for recorded divisions or questions being put (as the case may be) until 3 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, December 4, 1990, at which time, at the request of Whips of the recognized parties, votes will be applied among motions in accordance with an agreement announced by such Whips at such time;
>
> That, following such interruption later this day, the House shall adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday, December 4, 1990; and
>
> That on Tuesday, December 4, 1990, the House continue to sit beyond the ordinary hour of daily adjournment, with quorum calls and dilatory motions not receivable during such period of continued sitting, for the purpose of considering and completing third reading stage of Bill C-40 and, when no member rises to speak in debate on the main motion, or on any amendment thereto, the vote or votes on such question or questions shall be deemed deferred until 3 o'clock p.m., on Wednesday, December 5, 1990.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, we have been consulted on this House order. Given the disposition of my critic and members of my caucus, we agree to extend the hours to pass the report stage of this bill to show our co-operation and in the spirit of trying to get this House moving in the right direction.

We do not agree with all the amendments the government is proposing but we certainly hope that this will be a step in the right direction. Therefore, we agree.

**Mr. MacWilliam:** Mr. Speaker, yes, I will comment that we have also been consulted on this matter. Due to inclement weather and the difficulty in pulling people back for any possible votes this evening, it seems reasonable to proceed on this basis and to hold recorded votes as has been described by my colleague.

There is consent from us in that regard.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Does the hon. parliamentary secretary have the unanimous consent of the House to move his motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The House has heard the motion. 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.

[*English*]

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, just on a quick point of order. I wish to advise the House that tomorrow at 11 o'clock a.m., we will commence with Bill C-88, which would then be followed by Bill C-91, should time permit.

• (1900)

**Mr. Flis:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would just like clarification from you whether the proceedings on the Adjournment Motion, pursuant to Standing Order 38, will continue following the completion of tonight's debate on Bill C-40.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** To answer the question raised by the hon. member, one of the consequences of the motion just adopted by the House is that the adjournment debate, commonly referred to as the late show, has been cancelled.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that in a spirit of co-operation, there would be unanimous consent, in recognition of the importance of these adjournment debates. The hon. member for Parkdale—High Park would have the assurance that as soon as the House finishes the report stage, it would allow him to make his speech at the usual time. I think the government would agree to that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The House has heard the suggestion of the Parliamentary House Leader. Is the House agreed?

[*English*]

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate that the government, as usual, bends over backwards to give every opportunity to every member. We are happy to give our consent to this, as well.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Therefore, we will have debate on the adjournment motion when the House has disposed of the report stage of Bill C-40.

The hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap had four minutes left. First, the Government Whip, on a point of order.

[*English*]

**Mr. Hawkes:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. All of those comments took quite a bit of time and I know there are many members out there who are watching their televisions but may have missed a little bit. The votes that everybody thought would occur tonight, will now occur tomorrow afternoon at three o'clock. There will be no stand up votes, but there will, indeed, be voice votes on the different amendments as the evening progresses from now until 11 o'clock.

The stand up votes that everybody has been looking forward to and getting their winter overshoes ready to carry them back to the hill, will not occur until three o'clock tomorrow afternoon. Members who happen to be at home, watching television, can rest easy for the rest of the evening.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Hon. members have heard the message of the Government Whip. I again recognize the hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap. You have four minutes left.

[*English*]

**Mr. MacWilliam:** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure where I was, but I will try to get back to where I left off.

I think the argument I was making, at the time when I was interrupted by a point of order, was that the cable industry in Canada is a virtual monopoly. Canadians cannot simply go out and start their own cable company business to compete with one that is already established. If consumers are unhappy with the service of their local cable company, they cannot switch companies because there is only one cable company serving that particular neighbourhood. They are stuck. It is as simple as that. Moreover, notwithstanding the claims of cable operators, other technologies such as satellite dishes and so forth are effectively beyond the reach of most Canadians. They are simply too expensive to consider putting in for a single network.

The Public Interest Advocacy Centre stated some time ago, before the legislative committee, that "approximately 80 per cent of households subscribe where cable TV is, in fact, available, usually in urban areas. This high rate of penetration is not affected significantly by the income level of subscribers. Households below the poverty line allocate a relatively large portion of their income for receiving cable TV services." The reason is

simple. The quote continues: "Cable TV provides the only form of entertainment that is remotely within the reach of low income Canadians."

It is significant that we have, in Canada, a situation which is allowed to be an unregulated monopoly in the cable industry. It is a situation which I have mentioned before. It has shown dramatic price increases of 29 per cent in the last 18 months alone. I think that speaks very clearly that there needs to be some form of regulatory authority in determining the rate structure for cable TV services.

The amendments that my colleague from Port Moody—Coquitlam proposed merely seek to provide cable subscribers with some form of fairness. It seeks to limit, to a degree, the profits of a monopoly industry and ensure that Canadians will get a much deserved break in their cable bills. The amendments would ensure that companies applied for rate increases only on the basis of a legitimate financial need. This is the same standard, I might add, that is applied to telephone companies and other monopolies.

Profit regulation has not denied the telephone or pipeline companies from making a fair profit. It has not undermined the investment in the system and, indeed, Canada has retained one of the finest telecommunication systems in the world.

Let me conclude by saying that the amendments proposed would simply provide the appropriate basis for setting cable rates in the future so that consumers, as well as the cable operators, are protected by a system that is both fair and equitable.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, what we are dealing with in this section of the bill is essentially the Balkanization or the regionalization of the CRTC.

What we had before was known as "they who hear decide". In the past, we have established, through the CRTC, the reputation of fair regulator, an intelligent regulator, and one that has a good solid record of being connected with a common view across this land.

I had a letter that came from TVA in which TVA pointed out that it had had some experience internationally. The way in which regulation is handled in France is something of serious concern, and we would not want something such as that to happen here. I will come back to that perhaps a little later in this debate.

Right now, we are talking about no longer requiring the taking of decisions in the national interest. We are going to take an approach rather than the collegial one, where a panel may have gone out, heard, come to a conclusion, and came back to the executive committee, reported the hearings and the views, concerns and considerations and gave a recommendation. The executive of the CRTC would then put this into balance with everything that had been happening across the country. In this way, there was a potential for a less fragmented policy, and we would certainly have more even and fairer decision making across this land.

This particular issue has been one of serious concern. Many witnesses appeared before the committee and spoke at great length and from depth of heart about the disintegration of a national regulator through this kind of a process called panels of "he who hears decides". Of course, in the changing dynamics that is Canada today, it becomes all the more sensitive to have these kinds of decisions that may be irregular across this land and may not always be in the best interests of all Canadians, of both language groups and of minority status across the land.

• (1910 )

One of the things that caused some reaction was a decision to award a new country music FM radio station in Toronto. There was a difference of point of view between the panellists and the regulators on the executive committee. There was some feeling that perhaps the black dance group ought to have received the mandate, rather than the country music format. The merits of the case were what the cabinet reviewed.

We now see that there was a frequency available and the case presented before the CRTC was a case that was offering incredible benefits to Canadian country music and artists. They are prepared to expend $800,000 a year on developing and promoting Canadian country music, with special emphasis on local performers and on radio programs and events. That is more than double what any other station in the market spends on talent development.

Certainly the Minister of Communications has been very sensitive to the development of musical talent in the country, the recording industry, and the distribution of Canadian songs. He should feel very comforted when he sees something of this nature. They made a commitment that 32 per cent of the new station's play list in the first year of operation will be Canadian content, rising to 40 per cent in the fifth year.

These proportions are very stunning if you realize that we have had between 20 and 30 per cent. On the French side, we had to have a big battle. We had to put money in and have sorts of support mechanisms and measures to ensure that the French song industry survived and grew, all the while knowing that we have fabulous artists and talent out there.

There were other things that were being done by that group that allowed them to win this particular request for a radio station. It is regrettable. There is a new frequency opening and new decisions will be made. I hope that the multi-racial, multicultural reality of Canada will be further reflected on our air waves when this new channel comes up. Notwithstanding, fair is fair, and one has to follow the rule of the commitments that were asked for by the CRTC.

With this "he who hears decides", when the idea of a resident regional commissioner is combined with those "who hears decides", one runs the risk of creating fiefdoms across the country and capturing the local industry. I quote Mr. Keith Spicer, who stated: "In broadcasting you have to look at the whole matrix of issues, many of them very subtle cultural issues, and I mean regional cultural issues. It is not only a matter of law, it is a matter of common sense sensitivity, as well as law. That is why in the broadcasting area, we think it is much better to have one national consensus so we can compare what we are doing in Newfoundland and Saskatchewan, and make sure that all Canadians feel they are being treated the same way recognizing their differences. At a time when there are some regional inter-ethnic tensions in Canada, we ought to be looking for some of these mechanisms to have a strong national view, but with much greater sensitivity to regional concerns. We all know that it is like squaring a circle but that is what we are trying to do and in our honest opinion, we think it could occur and be better done that way, rather than applying the "he who hears decides."

There was no question that Wick Communications felt that the principle was wrong. It was a destabilizing policy. There would be inconsistent results coming out of this. CFCF stated that it runs the risk of contradicting one of the fundamental objectives of the system to maintain a single system. TV Ontario said the regionalization of the commission and the initiation of the "he who hears decides" rule will lead to fragmentation of national policy and a general confusion as to the guiding principles of regulations in all parts of the country. The CRTC in its brief to the legislative committee on February 22 made an impassioned statement with respect to what it felt would be an ineffective and very improper approach.

I forgot to mention that Rogers believes that one of the overriding strengths of the CRTC since its establishment has been its ability to bring a broad range of national and regional concerns to bear on its decision-making. It felt it was very important, and were very deeply concerned that a more decentralized structure, even with the provisions requiring informal consultation, will result in the loss of this national dimension in the decision-making process. As a result, policies could diverge from region to region. We have heard from many with respect to this.

The commission, which has had experience in this particular regard with both the collegial and the small task forces, has made it very clear that basically, in a cultural industry and cultural regulation, one has to recognize that in the broadcasting industry, being an evolving one, highly sensitive and complex, decisions must be taken in full awareness of its impact on the entire system. Decisions involving individual licencees should find their anchor in and be consistent with a national overview.

There are many other aspects that the CRTC addressed; the fact that they have fact-finding bodies, the fact that it makes little sense when applied to a body whose function it is to apply a parliamentary policy in order to ensure that the cultural identity of a nation is preserved and strengthened. In broadcasting matters generally facts are seldom at issue. It is the consequences which flow from those facts which must be determined.

In closing, I would like to read into the record what the Canadian Bar Association, Media and Communication Law Section said, because they really are the experts, as well as the CRTC in this matter. They said: "We believe that the decision should not be required to be made by an ad hoc panel sitting in a particular city, rather where the commission deems it appropriate, it should be

possible under the act for such matters to be discussed and determined on a collegial basis in that by the full commission based on their collective experience. While it is true that a hearing panel could consult with the commission staff or with other commissioners pursuant to subsection 19(4), we believe that rule-making proceedings of this kind should involve the full commission".

I sincerely hope that the minister will look at this favourably and consider adopting an amendment called for by all sectors in this field.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** We are voting on Motion No. 32, in the name of Mr. Waddell. May I dispense?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**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 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 yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on Motion No. 32 is deferred.

The next vote is on Motion No. 33, in the name of Mr. Waddell. May I dispense?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**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 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), the recorded division on Motion No. 33 is deferred.

• (1920)

The question is on Motion No. 34 standing in the name of Mrs. Finestone. Shall I dispense?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** 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:** No.

**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), the recorded division on Motion No. 34 is deferred.

**Mr. Masse (for Mr. Edwards)** moved:

Motion No. 35

That Bill C-40 be amended in the French version in Clause 26 by striking out lines 18 and 19 at page 21 and substituting following therefore:

"admissibles à l'attribution, à la modification ou au renouvellement de licences,"

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to.

[*English*]

Motion No. 36. Is the House agreed that Mr. MacWilliam will move the motion for Mr. Waddell?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (for Mr. Waddell)** moved:

Motion No. 36

That Bill C-40 be amended by deleting Clause 28.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. The motion reads:

That Bill C-40 be amended by deleting Clause 28.

In this legislation the government has taken a new power *vis-à-vis* the CRTC, namely the broad power of policy direction. This allows the government to provide leadership and direction in broadcasting from time to time.

The power of policy direction was in fact recommended by many committees on broadcasting and we fully support it. At the same time, the government kept its power to review every CRTC decision. The various committee reports recommended that if the government took the power of policy direction, it should in fact give up its power of review. In fact, this joint power seriously tilts, we submit, the delicate balance between the government and the regulator too strongly in favour of the government.

It risks undermining the independence of the commission and as a result we have moved this motion to delete the power of review. In support of this motion, I would ask the consideration of the House. I think the concern is a legitimate one. I ask the government to consider the overwhelming view of the witnesses that were called before the committee and accept the amendment standing in the name of the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam.



**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this motion. I will make my comments brief because I know I have the undivided attention of the minister across the way who is listening attentively to my remarks, and will no doubt reconsider what his position on this issue is in light of what I am about to say. At least I am so convinced I will be able to do that that I am taking the liberty now to assume that the minister will be correct in his views after hearing the representations from the Official Opposition.

I say that, of course, knowing the minister to be one who listens attentively to the contributions of members on this side of the House.

**Ms. Clancy:** Normally, yes.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-40 would jeopardize the CRTC's ability to carry out its role as an expert independent quasi-judicial body because it would grant a new power to the Governor in Council while retaining the existing one. Basically, it would permit the cabinet to issue policy directions to the CRTC, but it would retain its ability to set aside decisions of the commission on the basis that the decisions derogate from the attainment of objectives of the broadcasting policy.

These dual powers of cabinet in the view of our party, that is the power of review over the CRTC and the power to establish the general policy directions of the CRTC, are quite excessive. We believe that our cabinet review should be removed and in that way the government—and I say this for the benefit of the minister across the way—will ensure, or at least we believe it would assist greatly, in ridding the uninvited political interference that could perhaps jeopardize the independence of the commission.

I wonder if the minister is aware that the Friends of Canadian Broadcasting in their brief to the legislative committee said that the cabinet review powers would "undermine the independence of the CRTC in licensing matters, opens the way for policy political interference, and encourages licensees and applicants to bypass the CRTC if they think politically directed appeals will be more cogent."

What this means of course—and I say this to the minister across the way—is he is creating a situation whereby he is going to invite lobbyists from all over the place to his office. I challenge the minister: does he want to see the Frank Moores of this world and all those people all over his office? Would you want that, Mr.

Speaker? I do not think I would. I think the member for Mount Royal, were she at this moment the Minister of Communications—which she will be after the next election, of course—she would not want that kind of proposition.

Let the minister think for a moment of the next government, the next Liberal government, which is going to be charged with straightening things out after they are finished messing things up, is going to want to have this bill done properly. I say to the minister, you might as well fix this now, pursuant to recommendations that we are making on this side of the House.

[*Translation*]

I would like to read a few more quotes. The Canadian Institute of Adult Education had this to say: "The power of review threatens the independence of the CRTC because, apart from dictating to the CRTC— its major directions— the government will also prescribe the procedures for implementing its own policies." Thus the government defines the operating policy of the CRTC then, of course, it also has the power to take a second look after each case is completed.

In other words, the government acts as if it was itself some kind of a CRTC by taking away many of its powers, thus opening the door to the lobbyists.

[*English*]

Finally, I would like to read a quote from ACTRA:

> The power to review should be removed.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the minister will now be convinced to correct the wrong of his previous views and to straighten things out pursuant to the recommendation which I make to him now on behalf of my colleagues in the Liberal Party.

• (1930 )

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, this is quite a simple matter. We are just talking about removing ministers and the cabinet. In this particular article the powers that are being accorded the Governor in Council allows for interference, favouritism, and cronyism. It is very unhealthy. Ministers across the way must recognize by now that that is very unhealthy. Why subject themselves to the potential for pressure where it is unnecessary?

I have said to the minister's face that he has done a good job with this bill, except for the few significant errors in here which make it an untenable bill. In general, if he would change a few little things, four little amendments, he would have a good bill. This is one of the four.

Perhaps the minister did not think it through and would like to change his mind. His parliamentary secretary has been incredible. I am sure the Minister of Communications recognizes the role his parliamentary secretary has played in carrying the ball with this bill for such a long time. In this particular section the minister gives the power of direction to the regulator. I think it is an excellent idea. After all, Parliament should decide how this very sensitive instrument of public policy should work.

Once the government decides and directs, then it is up to the CRTC to hold the hearings, to have the parliamentary committees do the listening, and to come back with an answer. That answer should not then be subject to review by cabinet. It is a very dangerous precedent.

If it is to be subject to review by cabinet, I hope, while the minister does not seem to be constraining himself or his cabinet, that he will at least make sure that this is a very narrow power of review. I happen to think that it is a very bad power of review and that is why my colleague, the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam, and I have called for this particular removal.

This is essentially the bottom line as far as I am concerned. Serge Gouin, president and chief executive officer of Télé-Métropole, points out how important and detrimental the power of review can be. He says something very interesting which perhaps we would all like to know. Télé-Métropole is the largest television broadcaster in Quebec. It owns, as we all know, CFTM, channel 10 in Montreal, CJPM-TV in Chicoutimi, and numerous other subsidiaries producing films and videos. It has over 1,000 employees. It employs 2,000 people on a temporary basis, and it has the highest viewing time per week in Canada. This is a competent, well managed,

forceful and innovative broadcaster who knows what he is talking about.

In talking about the CRTC and the impact of these two powers at both ends, this broadcaster wrote:

> I am one of the few Canadians to have been through the experience of obtaining an operating licence for a television network abroad and I am certainly the only Canadian to have done so in France.

That is up to the time that he wrote this. He goes on to write:

> I played a very active part in the project for the privatization of TF-1 and in the issuing of operating licences for two national channels, La Cinq and M-6. In addition, I am one of the three shareholders who appeared before the CNCL, the equivalent of the CRTC in France, to obtain the licence for La Cinq.
>
> The CNCL was established relatively recently, and at that time the French government indicated that it fully intended to ensure the independence of the organization by means of clear, precise regulations. Despite that statement of principle, the door remained open to political interference and this did not take long to materialize.
>
> Consequently, no procedural rules established by the CNCL were taken seriously and even the conditions opposed when operating licences were issued are openly flouted today. Eighteen months after the decisions were handed down on these three national channels, a number of people are still contesting these decisions and making representations to the political authorities in order to reopen the cases even though they resulted in investments of hundreds of millions of dollars.

We know that it takes that kind of money to prepare and to be ready. What he is bringing to our attention, and I think wisely, to try to save us a lot of heartache, is that through this bill we in Canada are preparing to create the same climate, with all the consequences that one could have easily observed if one had examined the impact of such policies in other countries.

I suggest to the minister and to the Governor in Council that before they take the vote on this amendment they should listen to Télé-Métropole and its experience. They should listen to the people who appeared before us. They should listen to the report that goes as far back as the Aird report in 1928 when it talked about the independence of the government of the day and ensuring that no political pressures could be exerted. It asked that we weigh arguments dispassionately through this arm's length regulator so that we would not have the parochial political pressures which are inevitable when big money and big businesses are involved this way.

I hope they will protect the ministers and the arm's length aspect. I also hope they will stay out of both power direction and power review. These tandem powers are very dangerous.

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James):** Mr. Speaker, during the course of this debate we have quite successfully made efforts to show where the government has made some serious errors, where it has been quite misguided in the crafting of this bill.

When it comes to the dual powers that this bill proposes to give to the government, it really smacks of a power hungry government which says that it is not good enough to have just the power of direction over the CRTC but that it must also have the power of review.

In effect the government is saying that it will tell the CRTC what to do, that the CRTC will go out and do its job, but that if it has second thoughts, or if in its opinion the so-called arm's length independent commission does not do a very good job, it will have the power of review and it will correct the mistakes.

It is a major mistake. This is a blunder of the first rank of this government, to take unto itself both the power of direction and the power of review. It makes no sense whatsoever.

In a way it suggests that the government is politically masochistic. It really wants to injure and bring grief to itself, because we can imagine what will happen if there are parties out there in the broadcast field who know that if the CRTC renders a decision they do not like the government has the power of review. What will they do? I am talking about the parties now. In effect they will ignore the decision of the CRTC. They will bypass the CRTC and go to the political headmasters at the top to appeal or argue before the government that the CRTC has made a terrible decision that is not in the national interests and certainly not in their interest. They will ask the politicians to review this decision and change it in their interest.

• (1940)

It makes no sense whatsoever, unless you are a government that is power hungry, wants to have control over every facet of the process and really does not respect for one minute the independence of the CRTC.

We must have a commission that we have faith in and that we respect, one that we feel has some competence. Sure, the government has the responsibility to set down broad policy and to give direction. There is nothing wrong with that whatsoever. It is a way of saying that the democratically elected people rule, but surely the power of direction is enough.

What more do they want? Having the responsibility and the power to set policy, to set direction, and then to say to these people who comprise the CRTC "go ahead and do your job within the ambit of the directions that we give you", is that not enough? I would think that is enough.

I talked about political masochism earlier. As part and parcel of that, we talk about and are concerned about political interference. There is enough political interference, as it is, in this whole business of governing a country. One will never stop political interference, but surely we do not go out to invite it; surely we do not go out and ask for political interference.

Yet, this section of the bill does exactly that. You can interfere with this commission because it does not have to be taken that seriously. After all, its decisions are not final. You can make an end run around it. You can bypass it. Or, if you do not like to think of it that way, you can indulge in some political interference, talk to the people whom you know and exercise some political muscle; you can interfere with what should be a process that cannot be easily violated. This is a serious mistake. This government does not need dual powers. It does not need both policy direction and review. One is enough.

We have looked at this bill from *a* to *z*. We have explored it very well. When it came to this part which was studied over and over again, we came to the conclusion that the government does not need both powers. The government does not need direction and review. Direction is enough. The government does not have to go any further than that to do a good job.

My esteemed colleague from Montreal pointed out earlier that a number of respected people in this country also agree with us on this side that to ask for this is dangerous government practice.

I do not know how much time I have left. Perhaps I have just a minute or two, but I want to refer to a statement made by the Friends of Canadian Broadcasting. What it has done is buttress our argument; it has given support to our arguments. The Friends of Canadian Broadcasting made a statement in its brief to the legislative committee which at that particular time was studying the power of review on the part of the government. The Friends of Canadian Broadcasting said "that the cabinet review power undermines the independence of the CRTC in licensing matters, opens the way for political interference, and encourages licensees and applicants to bypass the CRTC if they think politically directed appeals will be more cogent".

There it is in just a few words. The Friends of Canadian Broadcasting put it in a nutshell. They have summarized what I have tried to say in the last eight or nine minutes.

I really wish that the government would re-examine this part of the bill and take a good look at it. If the government really tried to be objective, it would come to one decision, that all it needs is the power of direction. It does not need also the power of review. It does not need dual powers.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House ready for the question?

The question is on Motion No. 36 in the name of Mr. Waddell. Am I dispensed from reading the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*English*]

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**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.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on Motion No. 36 stands deferred.

**Mr. Marcel Masse (for Mr. Edwards)** moved:

Motion No. 39.

That Bill C-40 be amended in Clause 36 by adding immediately after line 25 at page 26 the following:

"(5) Notwithstanding subsections (3) and (4), if a director is not appointed to take office on the expiration of the term of office of an incumbent director, the incumbent director continues in office until a successor is appointed."

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Resuming debate. The hon. member for Mount Royal has the floor.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Ah, but you should be impressed. Come on, it is not so bad!

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the minister to address this question. Perhaps I should have called upon the Prime Minister as it is his amendment.

It is extremely interesting. If I were the Prime Minister or Mr. Patrick Watson, I would certainly understand why we are bringing in this kind of amendment. Do you know what the amendment says? The amendment says that notwithstanding certain articles, if a director is not appointed to take office on the expiration of the term of office of an incumbent director, the incumbent director continues in office until a successor is appointed. That just makes good common sense. Up until now we have had an enormous number of vacancies, I believe, up to six, if not seven vacancies, at a very serious time in the development and history of the CBC.

We are very pleased that the minister has brought in this amendment. Once the opportunity to make a nomination was there, why did he not have to wait for this clause to have nominated Mr. Patrick Watson to the board of the CBC. Why did he not nominate him to the board where he could contribute in the manner which only this man can contribute, instead of leaving him on the outside looking in? What I would like to know from the minister is why was Mr. Patrick Watson not appointed to the board? There were so many vacancies. We even had to fill that hole with an amendment. I compliment him on the amendment, but I wish he would explain to us why Mr. Watson was not appointed?

• (1950)

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, the motion has been put forward in the name of the parliamentary secretary to the minister, but as a matter of fact, as we can all see, we actually have the minister here tonight. I find it rather perplexing that although the motion has been put forward, we hear no comment, no rationale or no explanation as to the precise reasons for this particular amendment.

With the minister in the House tonight, with his full authority to suggest changes, that amendments be made, that he at least explain the particular reason for those amendments. I think it is justifiable. He is asking us to vote on something that is somewhat confusing. Some argument has been made by my colleague in the Liberal Party and I have to support her on that. I think we need a fuller explanation than just the silence that pervades the Chamber.

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James):** Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of things to say on this particular matter. I too find it rather galling that the minister sits there and says nothing. Now, he gets up and walks away. He turns his back to us. It is really galling to have the Conservatives sit over there, not saying a word, never coming to the defence of the bill, never explaining any clauses, just sitting there saying nothing and doing nothing.

They might think that that is taunting us on this side of the House. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the taunting does not work. What it does is to show how foolish they have been during the whole course of this debate. They sit there like bumps on a log, saying nothing and doing nothing.

If they are that proud of the bill, what does it say about them? What does it say about the bill? I think that the concern raised by my colleague from Mount Royal, which really is the concern of the chairman of the CBC board of directors, is a very legitimate concern. We know that the CBC board of directors has to live with vacancies. It is only realistic and pragmatic that if the CBC board finds itself in that situation, the board should be able to continue its directors working, keeping them in place until a successor is named. To me, that is eminently reasonable and makes a lot of sense. I wish the government would listen to this suggestion, but as usual it is not listening.

**Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to intervene in this debate as well. What is at stake here is a very important parliamentary principle. The government needs to be held accountable for legislation that it proposes to this House. Certainly, in the case of this broadcasting bill, it has huge implications for the future development of a major industry in this country. It is not only an industry but something that is part of the very fabric of this country.

When this debate is taking place in this House, especially at a time when the ties that bind us nationally are fraying, it seems unbelievable that the government would not stand and come to the defence of its own legislation. The minister has been sitting here for a long time. He was challenged repeatedly by several members of the House to come to the defence of the legislation and has refused to do so. That is simply unacceptable. I think it is one of the reasons that this government languishes so low in the polls.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see the minister is ready to respond, at least he seems to be. I realize we are not supposed to comment on a member's absence or presence in the House, but let us say I am pleased to see the minister is in a position to respond to what I have to say.

There are two points I would like to make. First, I am concerned about the fact the government seems unwilling to address either the bill or the amendments this evening. The minister is here in the House. Neither the minister nor his parliamentary secretary have responded either to amendments proposed by hon. members opposite or even defended their own amendments.

When the minister is in a position to comment on what I am saying, Mr. Speaker since I cannot comment on his presence or absence, otherwise I would but when the minister is in a position to respond to my question later on, I hope he will deal with this point. In fact, I would have liked to know why we still have no response from the government. Why doesn't the minister even defend the government's amendments?

[*English*]

I have another question regarding this particular amendment. If someone sits on the board of directors of the CBC and is reappointed, in conformity with our Standing Orders that nomination is then reviewable by a parliamentary committee of this House. Under the McGrath Commission report that we established, any Order in Council appointment of the government can be reviewed by a parliamentary committee. By structuring this the way they did, I have a concern. By reappointing the same individual or rather, not reappointing the same individual, it allows the individual to serve another term, bypassing the Order in Council review process. That is a concern of mine.

I am wondering if the government is prepared to answer in that regard. We changed the Standing Orders of this House to reflect this concern some years ago. After several accusations of political patronage, the Prime Minister decided he wanted to get rid of them, that he wanted to offer, according to him, a new transparency to the system. He decided to go along with the recommendations of the McGrath Commission to establish the Order in Council review process.

In this particular case we may have found a way in which the government is attempting to bypass the process. I would like for the government minister—speaking of ministers, I do not see very many in the Chamber at this particular moment—who is responsible in answering for cabinet in the House—because a minister has to be in the House all the time when we speak—to immediately respond to that. I want to know the answer to this because I fear greatly that we might have uncovered something that the government is attempting to do which might just be slightly untoward.

If that is not the case, I hope that the minister will stand up immediately and place on the record of this House just what it is that this amendment will be doing. Now that the minister is in a position to answer, I would

hope that he would address that issue. If he wants me to repeat it, I gladly will.

**Mr. McCurdy:** Repeat it.

**Mr. Boudria:** There is some interest here. Did I make this perfectly clear to the minister? I know the Speaker understands everything quite well. Mr. Speaker always does.

I want the minister to clarify for us how it is that the Order in Council review process will work in the case of the amendment that is offered to us now. In other words, what stops the government from simply allowing all Order in Council nominations—the appointments to the board of directors—to lapse and simply not appoint anyone to any of them? It would thereby permit all the members who are on it to be automatically reappointed *de facto* by this process and none of them could ever be interviewed by their respective parliamentary committee.

• (2000)

**Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie):** Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the interventions of my colleague from Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, because I think he is onto something. There seems to be something untoward here that he has uncovered. It seems that, whenever we address the minister, he goes for a walk. I cannot say that he leaves the Chamber, but he does go for a walk.

**Mr. Boudria:** But if you could say it, you would.

**Mr. Butland:** If I could, I would.

I notice that he has some briefing notes and I know he is eager to speak. He has 10 or 12 colleagues who are present and I am sure they are very competent and able to explain the amendments, not only to us on the opposite side of the House, but to all Canadians.

I think that the minister has been told that he should show up for this bill as this is his bill and I do not think that he has been all that eager. His meandering in and around the House indicates that his presence here is not something that he really wants. We are really eager to hear the minister speak to this amendment and to the bill, in general.

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair):** Mr. Speaker, one might have gotten the notion that the minister was being contemptuous of the House by virtue of his meandering around the Chamber. One might have been given a similar impression by the fact that, on one such departure from his place, he engaged in singular jocularity with members of his caucus, including his parliamentary secretary whom we thought might say something in response to the questions that have been raised. This was only a suspicion.

As the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell has pointed out, the amendment that has been presented here would suggest that the impression that the minister and his government are contemptuous of the House is given substantiation by the nature of this amendment. As that member indicated, it would provide a circumstance in which a member of the board could continue as such *ad infinitum* without review, thus circumventing the House of Commons once more. This suggests, in fact, that the minister is contemptuous of the House.

However, by the urgency with which the minister has been reading when he has not been gone, it may be that he does not understand what has been said. I would urge upon him that he reflect as carefully as he might. We will give him as much time as he needs to read it over carefully to see if he cannot find a spark of understanding and respond to the interventions made from this side of the House which ask and plead with him to demonstrate to those of us here, as well as to the people of Canada, that he just does not think that this place is a waste of time, that it is taking too much of his time, and that he would rather be somewhere else than explaining his own bill, his own amendment to us and the people of Canada.

**Mr. Boudria:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps inadvertently or perhaps otherwise, I think we have uncovered something that I want to submit to the House that may be a breach of our Standing Orders.

This will take a moment or two, but I want to outline to the House that clause 36 of the bill expresses how individuals are to be appointed or reappointed to the board of directors. That is perfectly in order. However, there is an amendment proposed in Motion 39 by the minister. I am glad the government House leader is listening attentively, because I think he might be inclined to agree with me. Motion No. 39 describes that notwithstanding any other measures that if someone else is not appointed to take his or her place, the incumbent

director already on the board remains a director even after his office has expired.

Obviously, this bypasses Standing Order 110 of the House of Commons which states that anyone who is appointed to the board of directors in this way, that his or her appointment has to be laid upon the table of the House and be referred to a parliamentary committee under the Order in Council review process. There is no mechanism to make it happen.

Standing Order 110(1) states:

> A Minister of the Crown shall lay upon the Table a certified copy of an Order in Council,—

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I must regretfully interrupt the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, but all his remarks could be interpreted as questionning the Chair's decision concerning the motions. Because of the way the Chair made its decision, it is now too late and I must indicate to the Hon. Member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell that his point of order is really not one and I cannot accept it at this time.

[*English*]

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I believe under our rules, when the Chair rules on the acceptability of an amendment, he rules as to whether or not they are procedurally acceptable; in other words, whether or not they are correct as to form. I am not questioning whether the amendments were in their proper form. I am bringing in new information to the House which I hope to share very briefly with the Speaker, and ask the Speaker and his advisers to review perhaps over the next few hours in order to ensure that not the form but that in fact the content of one of these motions is such that it could in fact subvert Standing Order 110 of the House.

Briefly, that is the point that I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, and I do believe that there is no point in beleaguering it any longer. I have made that case to the Speaker and I invite the Speaker to review it once again, because that is in fact what could happen.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I must regretfully interrupt the hon. member, but the Chair had already looked into this point which was raised before making its decision concerning the grouping of motions. I can no longer listen to the hon. member although I find his remarks quite interesting and relevant.

Is the House ready to vote on Motion No. 39?

[*English*]

**Mrs. Finestone:** Mr. Speaker, in light of the lack of clarity, and I know you say that the Chair has already ruled, if we were to be that finicky about this bill, I can bring three other errors to your attention. I would be pleased to do so, if you would care to have me do so, Mr. Speaker.

Having said that, I would just like to point out that my colleague from Winnipeg and myself withdraw our support of that motion until there is clarity brought to the issue.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The vote is on Motion No. 39 in the name of Mr. Edwards. May I dispense from reading the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**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 yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on Motion No. 39 is deferred.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is it agreed that the motion of Mr. Waddell be moved by Mr. MacWilliam?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (for Mr. Waddell)** moved:

Motion No. 40

That Bill C-40 be amended by deleting Clause 45.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the motion submitted by my colleague from Port Moody—Coquitlam states that Bill C-40 be amended by deleting Clause 45. That clause is the government's proposal to divide the CBC board into English and French standing committees.

• (2010)

I want to point out that we oppose this proposal and are moving its deletion through this amendment for two reasons. First, the CBC itself has strongly opposed this measure. It views it as a direct interference in its affairs and also as being potentially divisive. In its brief, the CBC stated the following:

> This section provides that the CBC's Board of Directors "shall establish a standing committee of directors on English language broadcasting and a standing committee of directors on French language broadcasting, each consisting of the Chairperson, the President and such other directors as the Board may appoint".
>
> In its submission to the Committee formed to study Bill C-136, the Corporation noted its objections to this provision and wishes now to reiterate them. In Section 3(1)(1) of the Bill, the Corporation is called upon to serve the interests of all Canadians, by reflecting Canada and its regions and contributing to shared national consciousness and identity.
>
> In our view, the creation of such committees would run counter to the spirit of those objectives and, as well, counter to the programming independence provided in Section 44(4). We believe it should be left to the Board of the CBC to determine the most appropriate means of meeting the goals set for the CBC and that this provision of Section 43 of the Bill represents an infringement of that necessary freedom. Further, we feel that the exercise of responsibility for French and English language programming by these committees would run counter to the proper responsibilities of the Board as a whole. Accordingly, we make the following recommendation:
>
> Recommendation 1: That Section 43(1), requiring the creation of standing committees of Directors on English and French language broadcasting, be deleted from the bill.

Those were the comments made in the brief by the CBC.

In carrying forth that argument, the second reason we oppose this proposal is that it is part of the government's plan to divide the CBC and to remove its role as a unifying instrument in the country.

As was said before by my colleague from Port Moody—Coquitlam, the government is meeching and leeching the CBC. First, it contends to strip the corporation's mandate to promote Canadian unity. Second, and this is the subject of this motion, it divides the CBC unto itself. This, combined with its massive budget cuts of some $130 million annually over the next four years, is serving to destroy the CBC and to transform it into a public broadcaster that is essentially indistinguishable from its private sector competitors.

First, it divides the board into two standing committees. Then, it creates two corporations; one in French, the other in English. Finally, as a result of this and other policies of this government, we have two Canadas. This is what the government has been doing with VIA Rail and Petro-Canada, and now this is what it is doing with the CBC. We are committed on this side of the House to fighting for a single Canada.

I want to end by quoting a recent comment in *Cross Current* by Stephen Godfrey. He states:

> The proposed changes are a sad commentary on the fact that there remains no area in which the very words "national unity" can be spoken without inviting attack from members of the federal government itself. There is no longer the imagination or the will to accept two concepts: that Quebec is a distinct society; and that there still might be an over-all plan and vision for the country that we still—so haltingly—refer to as one.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, that last debate warmed me up so much, I was able to remove my House leader's sweater. I can now perhaps box a little bit better with our stubborn colleagues across the floor, and they might see the light of day at least in this amendment.

We are at a time of great uncertainty in Canada, a time of division, and this is not the time to destroy the infrastructures that are in place.

With respect to the board of the CBC, any of you in this House who have ever served on a board of directors, be it of a voluntary association, a business corporation, mergers that take place, know that there is one head and they have a board of directors who have a common interest and concern in the well-being of that corporation.

As, if and when they need to address particular subjects, they split the board up according to the internal needs of that particular organization, organism, company or corporation, as the case may be. Could you give me a reason, Mr. Speaker, why within the standards and

norms of the functioning of an organism, one would expect a corporation of this size, having to deal with unequal balance throughout this country in French and English services—language sensitive issues—for, Mr. Speaker, you must recognize that within the English and French strata, there is not one mould.

There are French-speaking people from all over the world in this country of ours, and they are spread across the country. Whether they came from Belgian, French or North African, or Quebec stock does not matter. The same thing goes for the English constituencies. There is no homogeneity within the structures of the roles and responsibilities that this board must address.

The board of the CBC which handles radio and television in English, French and northern services that were in Inuit languages before they got cut had to be sensitive to all these issues. They had to be sensitive to the race, language and creed and try to portray the interests and concerns of Canada to the three coasts so there would be better understanding.

Now, what do you want to do? You want to take this board and divide it in half so that never the twain shall meet. They should become rubber stamps when serious financial concerns are facing this board.

Mr. Speaker, you realize that we are close to $240 million cuts within the CBC. You heard my question to the minister this morning with respect to the parliamentary channel when he made it very clear that this government, House, Parliament is not going to finance the parliamentary channel.

I invite the members opposite to take part in the debate. It will not be very long before they will not get their faces on the picture screen, because there will not be a parliamentary channel. It is not one of the mandated services of the CBC. It has other responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, you heard the debate last week on Radio Canada International at a time when we are so interested in having our values and democratic procedures explained, become part of and help what is going on in the Persian Gulf and in Iraq where the Kuwaiti and Iraqi people only hear the voice of Saddam Hussein and listen to a middle world voice like ours with a great deal of respect. No, we are going to cut that off too.

We are cutting off our nose to spite our face. The real problem is not splitting the board of the CBC. The real problem is putting some money in so that it can do the job it was mandated to do.

I refer back to a woman who I knew and admired. I think everyone in this House who knew Judy LaMarsh knew that she was a woman of great principle regardless of party or affiliation. She knew her business. She was a hard working person who was very sensitive to the country in which she lived.

She looked at the question of dividing the CBC into statutory committees. She said almost 23 years to the month, on November 1, 1967: "A statutory requirement that the board should split itself up into two would in the opinion of this government be undesirable. If the CBC is to be an instrument for the development of national unity and the continuing expression of Canadian identity, it must have a clear identity of its own that is neither English nor French, it's just plain Canadian".

• (2020)

Does that not make good sense? If they want to look at the problems internally, they will set up their own committees. Why should we dictate the disrupting of what is a very important structure?

Let me just tell you what Patrick Watson, speaking for the CBC board, had to say.

> This is perhaps the most outstanding and strongly felt concern of our board on the proposal that there be created a French and English programming standing committee within the board of the CBC.

He spoke to us at committee in a very strong way saying that they disagreed, that each of those directors, whether they were French speaking or English speaking, felt that the honour conferred on them by being nominated by Order in Council through the recommendation of the Minister of Communications to the Prime Minister were there *in persona* for Canada. They did not come to represent a language structure, they came to represent Canadian programming, Canadian content, Canadian ingress, Canadian music, song and dance, Canadian artists, Canadian intellectual property, not to speak in a tongue dissimilar one from the other.

Gerard Veilleux said: "I do want to tell you that I do not look forward with a great deal of enthusiasm to

having to split my staff, the staff of CBC Radio-Canada. I say to you that this is very dangerous."

Keith Spicer, and these are the people who are running this public sector, said: "I spent a good part of the last 25 years working on both French and English networks and I am touched by what you say." He was answering a question I had asked him. "Personally I would not be in favour of creating two separate committees. Therefore I think that at some point, in addition to a very strong secure representation of the English and French side of things, we have to have a national view as well".

I could go on and on. I could indicate to you the cuts and the way the money is spread between the English language network and the French language network, particularly on the TV side. On the English side we have $576 million being spent, in round figures $577 million, and on the French side about $406 million. Mr. Speaker, there is not that much difference when you look at the percentage of difference of French speaking people, both in Quebec and in the rest of Canada, and English speaking people, both in Quebec and in the rest of Canada.

That is not the way you want to measure the service. You want to measure the service: "Is the program good? Is the content good? Will it sell? Is it world-class?" because that is what Canadians want and should expect.

Mr. Speaker, it is not to say there is not schlock both on the American and Canadian side. There is. But I think that CBC has a quality and a voice of its own and I think there is nothing worse that we could do than divide it up at this very sensitive time in the history of Canada.

I suggest, I recommend, I plead, I cajole, I ask the backbench, I ask the minister, speak to the minister, speak to the parliamentary secretary, get them to see the wisdom of not splitting it at this sensitive time.

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair):** Mr. Speaker, I am tempted to try again. I know there is a prohibition against referring to the absence of a member or minister from this House. I do not know whether there is a particular regulation that prevents reference to the absence of a minister's brain from this House.

As the member for Okanagan—Shuswap was talking about the issue of national unity, the hon. minister, who has demonstrated his contempt before, showed even more contempt. His back was turned to the hon. member. If he was engaged in any active mental activity at all, it must have been telling jokes because he was laughing vigorously, as were those around him. We have called attention to the fact that this bill refuses to endorse national unity. Here we have an amendment that would attempt to stop a deliberate attempt on the part of this minister and of this government to enhance national division.

I think it is about time this minister had his brain present here, that he turn his face to those of us who question the reasonableness of this provision and give an explanation, a justification, for heaping this new division upon this country by a government that is already going to be known in history as the government that was possibly responsible, if not for the destruction of the basic unity of this country, perhaps for the destruction of the country itself.

This is only a small part of it. It would seek to be able to justify dividing the board of directors at CBC. Let the minister get up on his feet and justify it.

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James):** Mr. Speaker, I must admit that my colleagues for Mount Royal in Montreal and Windsor—St. Clair are very hard acts to follow.

I want to point out something, and perhaps this has not been recognized by those of us in this Chamber, particularly those Canadians watching on television from coast to coast.

I want the record to show that this debate started shortly after three o'clock eastern standard time this afternoon. It is now about 8.25 eastern standard time and not one Progressive Conservative, not one Tory, has deigned, has condescended to stand up and say anything in this debate. You people have not come to the defence of this bill.

You have not used one word. The minister sits there stoically without flinching, without moving anything. Is he dead? Maybe we should call in the doctor. He has not moved an inch. None of them have moved. Can you imagine five hours of debate and the Tories have not said one word?

**An hon. member:** Shame.

**Mr. Harvard:** Shame on the whole lot. It really is a despicable non-performance.

We know that this government has made it abundantly clear and has told Canadians over and over again that it is their way or no way, that it is not going to listen to Canadians. It said that in spades. It said clearly in the free trade debate that it was not going to listen to Canadians. It certainly was not going to listen to Canadians when it came to Meech Lake. It certainly has not listened when it comes to the GST.

Bill C–21 is another example. Here we have the broadcast bill. It never listened. I think we should conduct some kind of investigation. Maybe Tories have all gone deaf. Maybe their ears are not operative any more. Is it possible that we have over 160 MPs elected who were once human beings? Who actually had blood in their veins, people who actually listened, who had ears, but somehow after the 1988 election they all went stone deaf? Is it possible?

The evidence would suggest it. There is the minister. He has not flinched an inch. He has set some kind of a record.

Let me get to the substance of this section of Bill C–40 because if Tories on that side of the House cannot listen to us on this side of the House, maybe they can listen to the people who are in their employ, especially those people who are major figures in communications in this country.

My esteemed colleague for Mount Royal has already pointed out the comments made by the president of the CBC, the chairman of the board of the CBC and Mr. Spicer. They have all expressed deep concern. In fact, it is more than concern. They have expressed alarm about taking the CBC board and splitting it in two. They do not listen. At least one thing you can say is that Tories are consistent. They are consistently deaf. They are consistently non-listeners.

• (2030)

If you take the CBC board and divide it into two, it is like taking two horses and sending one this way and the other that way. That is the beginning of the end of the CBC. If you split the corporation in two, one part will go that way and one part will go the other way.

We should be, particularly at this juncture in our political history, doing things to bring us closer together, to tie us together, to bind us together. But, no, this government is absolutely hell-bent on doing the opposite. It does not matter how many alarm bells you ring or what you say: you can yell, you can bring forward the best kinds of arguments, you can beg, you can beseech, you can employ.

There is the minister, sitting stoically. I am afraid we are going to have to call in some kind of medical doctor because the man has not moved an inch.

In conclusion, let me say that this is a terrible mistake that the government has made. If we want to keep this country together, if we want a public broadcast system that can work on behalf of national unity, the last thing we want to do is to take the board of directors and divide it into two. I rest my case.

**Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie):** Mr. Speaker, as I sit here and listen to the hon. member for Winnipeg—St. James, I cannot help but feel that he is perhaps exaggerating, that there is perhaps a bit of rhetoric in what he says. We in the NDP have compassion for the minister. I am starting to feel a bit sorry for some of the things that have been said about him and some of his colleagues who also have remained somewhat stoic, but they are flinching.

Rather than continue the onslaught, I would like to ask the minister if it is of his own volition that he says nothing, or has he been told or ordered not to say anything. That is what I would like to know.

**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. 40 standing in the name of Mr. Waddell. 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 be 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 Motion No. 40 stands deferred.

**Hon. Marcel Masse (for Mr. Edwards)** moved:

Motion No. 44

That Bill C-40 be amended in clause 62

(a) by striking out in the English version line 41 at page 39 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) A report";

(b) by striking out line 3 at page 40 and substituting the following therefor:

"(ii) any quantitative information in the Corporation's annual report in respect of which the Board has requested the auditor's opinion is";

(c) by adding immediately after line 19 at page 40 the following:

"(3) The Treasury Board may make regulations prescribing the form and manner in which the report referred to in subsection (1) is to be prepared."

Motion No. 45

That Bill C-40 be amended in the French version in clause 64 by striking out line 21 at page 42 and substituting the following therefor:

"prochain rapport d'activité de la Société—au".

Motion No. 46

That Bill C-40 be amended in the French version in clause 69

(a) by striking out line 30 at page 43 and substituting the following therefor:

"dans le rapport d'activité de la Société et";

(b) by striking out line 35 at page 43 and substituting the following therefor:

"c) examiner le rapport de vérifica-".

Motion No. 47

That Bill C-40 be amended in the French version in clause 71 by striking out line 30 at page 44 and substituting the following therefor:

"(3) Le rapport d'activité contient notamment".

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, this is just a perfect example of the arrogance of this government and particularly at this time of the minister. I cannot believe that they are not feeling the responsibility, not one single member across the floor. Most particularly, the minister is not prepared to explain the reason for his amendments that direct how reports should be written, how the annual report should be done, and how Treasury Board should make its voice heard and have its decisions looked at.

It is interesting that the government does not and is not prepared, through its minister, to defend this particular motion. In a sense this indicates why the government did not accept an amendment and a discussion which I had with the minister and the parliamentary secretary during the course of the debate, during the course of this legislative procedure, without forgetting the fact that this bill was brought into the House in March. We could have had this debate any time from March 20 on. This is December. The government decided not to bring this bill in until the very last moment.

**Mr. Milliken:** What a disgrace.

**Mrs. Finestone:** Not only did it delay bringing in this bill, which is supposedly a key and important bill, the parliamentary secretary made phone calls all around to the constituencies to say that we were delaying the bill.

**Mr. Milliken:** What rubbish.

**Mrs. Finestone:** He never once acknowledged that his own government House leader, his own government Whip, and his own ministers were not interested in bringing in this bill. He tried to dump responsibility on the Official Opposition. That did not wash with the constituency. The CAB did not buy it. The CCTA did not buy it. The Media Watch people did not buy it. I heard from all of them.

I know what the government across the way tried to do. Let the public know that this government had this bill and the prior Bill C-136 available for debate for months and months and months. It chose to bring in Bill C-136 two or three days before the House adjourned. It then prorogued, so the bill died on the Order Paper. That was the government's fault; no one else's.

**Mr. Milliken:** It tried to blame the Senate. It did before.

**Mrs. Finestone:** Again in this bill it is the same situation. Now the government wants to dump on the Senate for holding up the bill when it decides to prorogue or do whatever it plans to do after the Senate finishes its work.

This indicates the conundrum that I was in. The government did nothing to allay the fears of the CBC. It has given journalistic freedom to the CBC, but it gave no management rights. What it did was interpret the responsibilities of the CBC in clause 35 to protect and enhance the freedom of expression and the journalistic creative and programming independence enjoyed by the

corporation in the pursuit of its object and in the exercise of its powers, but it forgot to give it managerial freedom of the corporation in pursuit of the objects and exercise of its powers.

The managerial freedom has been removed from the CBC. Cuts, yes, $240 million. It will bring about closing of stations. It will bring about the loss of all kinds of important roles for the CBC, both in radio and television but particularly in television. Then, in this amendment, which is supposedly a technical amendment, it ends up determining how it will do its bookkeeping, how it will make reports, and how the Treasury Board can make its voice heard and make its decisions felt. This government knows, as anyone who knows anything about Parliament, that the CBC has to go to Treasury Board. It cannot borrow. It cannot invest. It has to get permission.

These are important amendments. Not one person on the government side has been prepared to defend or speak out or support of his or her own vision of the radio broadcasting system for Canada. It just sits there mute, dumb, struck dumb by a minister who will not allow a word. Obviously the House leader, the Whip, and the Prime Minister support this on the government side.

• (2040 )

I find this totally reprehensible, certainly a mockery of democracy, and quite strange in a broadcasting bill which talks about freedom of expression and the freedom of speech in, what is supposed to be, an important democracy on the world scene. Shame on the government in this particular instance.

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, I want to stand to reflect on the comments that have been made a number of times in this House.

I find it nothing short of incredible that not a single government member has stood to give any reason or rationale as to the proposed amendments which are before us. This is an extremely important bill, not only for the future of broadcasting in Canada, but for the future of the identity of Canada itself. The minister responsible for this legislation has the audacity and the arrogance of power to walk out in the middle of this debate, to refuse to comment in this debate, or to have any of his colleagues comment in this debate. It has made an absolute mockery of the entire legislative process. It is simply, completely, and utterly unacceptable that this minister be allowed to get away with this kind of mockery of participatory democracy and to play the kinds of antics that he has played in the House tonight. He has turned into the Marcel Marceau of the House and he has become a clown. It is absolutely despicable that he has been allowed to do that.

The fact is that this is a piece of legislation that has over 50 detailed and complex amendments, some of which are technological amendments. It takes time to digest, to rationalize, to debate, and to come to an understanding of the details of this legislation. That minister, across the way, has refused to allow us the opportunity to participate and to understand the very reasons for making the kinds of proposals that the government has made.

This is an abuse of the House. This is an abuse of the system. It is a demonstration of the total arrogance of power of the government and it will do it no good in the long run.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I have not participated in this lengthy debate yet and I am delighted to take the opportunity to do so.

I am equally delighted that the silent Minister of Communications is in the House to hear my remarks because as my hon. friend, the hon. member for Mount Royal, has stated, this debate has turned into a somewhat contemptuous mockery of Parliament. The minister has failed to participate in it and any members of the House who support the minister have failed to participate in it. They have simply indicated an unwillingness to agree to any reasonable amendment to this bill, proposed by anyone on this side of the House.

Needless to say, there are 50 proposed amendments and the only ones the government appears willing to accept are the ones moved by the parliamentary secretary. No one is willing to stand up even to say what those amendments mean, explain their purpose to the House or, in any way defend them. It really is a shocking example of contempt. The hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap has made similar comments and I appreciate them because I think they are deadly accurate.

What I wanted to talk about was the government's contempt for the Canadian people in this. It is not just the ignoring of the wishes of members of the House that is at stake here, but it is the dismantling of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation by legislation.

What we had expected in Bill C–40, especially in light of the serious constitutional crisis that Canada found itself in this year, was some effort on the part of the government to infuse something into Canada that would lead to national unity. The CBC had a mandate in Canada to foster national unity in the country and that mandate is being removed from the act so that the CBC is free to go its own way. What is worse is the division of the board of directors. The resultant damage to the CBC is going to be irreparable.

It is a deliberate attempt, in my submission, by the government to further dismantle the portions of the administrative structure of Canada that are designed to help hold Canada together. This government is the worst government in Canadian history when it comes to issues of national unity. It has failed Canadians at every turn. It is dismantling Canada's national structure. It has weakened the federal Government of Canada at the expense of the provinces, at the expense of the Canadian people. It is continuing to destroy the Government of Canada as a national institution by its continuation in office.

The sooner this government gets out of office, the better off Canadians are going to be from coast to coast. There is not a single province in Canada that has benefited from the policies of this government. Every single province, the whole of Canada, has suffered because of its incompetence and its inability to provide effective national leadership in Canada.

This bill is only the tip of the iceberg, but it is a very important tip. This bill is supposed to support a national institution, an institution that supported Canada's cultural industry, the cultural diversity of Canada from coast to coast. It was mandated specifically—and it still is today, before this bill gets through, if it ever does— to foster national unity in Canada. That is what we need in Canada.

This government has been so effective in dividing Canadians and pitting region against region, that it has seriously weakened the national unity of our country. Never before have we been in such a mess as has been brought about by this incompetent group. Now, instead of supporting a body that was mandated to foster national unity in Canada, this government is trying to break it into two pieces at least, and weaken its authority in dealing with national unity issues.

I call on the minister to come out here and defend these policies that are so rotten, fix this bill up and agree to some of the amendments that try to improve it, even in limited ways. He should accept some of them instead of this absolute silent, sphinx–like approach. The inscrutable minister sits there and says, "I am not agreeing to anything but my own proposals". That is what is going on here. I say it is a contempt of Parliament. It is a contempt of the people of Canada. It is typical of a government that has shown itself totally unfit to govern in this country.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** This question is on Motion No. 44, standing in the name of Mr. Edwards. I wish to draw your attention to the fact that the vote on Motion No. 44 will apply to Motions Nos. 45, 46 and 47. May the Chair be dispensed from reading the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion carried on division.

Motion agreed to on division.

[*English*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (for Mr. Edwards)** moved:

That Bill C–40 be amended in Clause 85 by striking out lines 11 and 12 at page 52 and substituting the following therefor:

"work feed, by virtue of copyright ownership or a licence granted by a copyright owner,".

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the government decided on this Motion No.

49 which opens up the whole question of piracy, of stealing intellectual property. This is a very good amendment. What we are doing here is looking at the serious problems we have in this country concerning the stealing of intellectual property through the piracy of stolen signals.

I have a private member's bill before the House concerning what is happening. What we are trying to do in this clause is to tighten up the kinds of infractions that are taking place on a daily basis across this land by TVRO companies which install master antennae systems of one kind or another or direct broadcast signals.

• (2050 )

They are bypassing the cable companies and thereby bypassing the Canadian broadcast undertakings such as CBC, CTV, Global and other independents which have an obligation to provide, through profits hopefully, new investments and therefore Canadian products for our television screen.

The programmer, through the programming rights—this is a copyright issue in a sense—are being deprived of the kind of income which they essentially could have from this very fine system if only we had some controls within the CRTC, within the broadcasting milieu, to define adequately those who are stealing signals and presenting programs that are in competition with Canadian programs. HBO is an example against Super Écran, First Choice, Super Channel.

These are companies that have tremendous financial obligations, but their revenues have been falling steadily as their signals are being stolen from the satellites with these little black box converters. It is being done knowingly and in complicity with the people who are doing the installation.

I will recall for the minister and the parliamentary secretary the group who appeared before us and who felt that they were doing nothing wrong. They are not doing anything wrong except that they are depriving the CBC, CTV, Global, the independent stations, the sports network, Much Music, the movie channels. What they are doing is beaming from that satellite into these tens of thousands of homes the products of American companies who pay absolutely nothing into the Canadian system.

It is important what we are doing here. There are legitimate private cable SMATV suppliers, I know, but there are too many multi-unit suppliers who are absolutely ignoring the law. These penalties should be applied through the Federal Court and should allow companies to take these people who are stealing to court.

I have a letter from Multi-Unit Cable Corporation which brings this to our attention. Mr. Ronald Bothwell said, "I visited many multi-unit properties on a weekly basis and unfortunately I can show you that not only do properties consistently proliferate satellite delivered American premium and specialty services by circumventing the coding process, but further, they do not bother to carry local Canadians off air broadcast services, such as Global, CBLFT or TV systems. Rather they install home satellite systems which are proliferating hundreds of American services, including HBO, Showtime, Cinemax, Playboy, Family Channel, ESPN, et cetera.

Less than six months ago, satellite dealers were scrambling to purchase old video cypher boards. It is a mechanism that can unlock the satellite cyphered code.

As I write this letter, a local distributor in Tillsonburg is selling what is commonly called the black box that defeats all scrambling methods without infringing on video cypher systems, on video cypher technologies. Each and every box sold defeats not only the scrambling system, but further, and more importantly, the Canadian Broadcasting System itself.

Under this you will have the right to charge for committing an offence and it will be subject to summary conviction. In fact, we go on to even further convictions of a stronger nature for this signal theft, this piracy, these unlawful black box decoders that take the encrypted signals and make them available to people. Many of these people do not even know that they are using an illegal system.

Satellite trade magazines report monthly the progress of this bill because they are very concerned. I am regularly in contact with the CRTC, with the culture and communications department, and most, if not all, our Canadian pay and specialty programmers. The common comment to the signal theft problem is that they need this bill. If we do not pass this bill, if we can defeat this bill, or if this minister would listen a little bit and make the proper amendments, then I would not have to bring forward my private member's bill.

**Mr. Milliken:** Use his head.

**Mrs. Finestone:** Mr. Speaker, there is a very serious issue out there. There is a very serious problem.

I have some interesting figures here coming from the remarks of the vice president and general manager of Alacom Pay Television, who spoke to the B.C. and Yukon regional cable people at a luncheon in Vancouver on Thursday, October 18. He said: "We have seen the growth of a TVRO industry that is totally unregulated and untaxed. In spite of the fact that it competes with your industry, that is the broadcasters and the cable people, for subscribers or viewers, it continues to make absolutely no contribution whatsoever toward cultural and industrial objectives that must be supported by licensees".

This industry has now begun to speak about itself as an important part of the Canadian broadcasting system. I recall at a House of Commons committee the TVRO industry said that about two million Canadians watched their satellite system every night. There was no mention of the fact that more than 95 per cent of these viewers are using their satellite systems to watch programming that cannot be offered by licensed cable exhibitors to Canadians. There was no mention of the effect on the ratings and the bottom lines of licensed broadcasters. Broadcasters have watched helplessly as each year the BBM and Nielson surveys record the viewing habits of these two million Canadian households.

For example, in the Edmonton 1989 fall BBM ratings, a large number of respondents wrote in in their viewing of HBO and Showtime even though the American premium services were not even listed on the survey ballot. The survey showed that the total number of viewing hours dedicated to the United States premium services were just slightly less than the total viewing hours of licensed Canadian premium services.

We know what that does when it comes to selling advertising so that our broadcasters can produce proper Canadian programming. In total, the viewing habits of residents in these bulk buildings have deleted even basic service in favour of a menu of exclusively foreign satellite signals.

The government should be speaking to this issue.

**Mr. Milliken:** That's right.

**Mrs. Finestone:** It should make Canadians understand so that they can complain to the CRTC, understand why it is impossible for our broadcasters to perform the way they should perform. People go out, buy a $700 dish and a decoder from Sears or from one of the people who install these systems and then they just steal, steal, and steal the intellectual property of many American performers and certainly Canadian performers.

The result is that the TVRO industry announces that it now provides service to four or six million people, instead of the current two million. Just add up what the cost of this—

**An hon. member:** Time.

**Mrs. Finestone:** You don't like to hear the reality of what you are doing? Well, that is just too bad. It is a problem of a matter of balance, Mr. Speaker, and I think that we really must do something.

I therefore support the government's initiative in this area but if the bill does not pass my private member's bill will.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The question is on Motion No. 49 standing in the name of Mr. Edwards. May I dispense from reading the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**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.

**Hon. Marcel Masse (for Mr. Edwards)** moved:

Motion No. 50

That Bill C-40 be amended in Clause 91 by striking out lines 35 to 45 at page 56.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, if this minister and some of the government members would speak on behalf of their own bill I would not have such a sore throat and be so tired.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Milliken:** They are quite useless.

**Mrs. Blondin:** Speechless and useless.

• (2100 )

**Mrs. Finestone:** What is so sad about all this is the fact that the government could have brought in this bill and these amendments by no later than the month of April. The broadcasters and the cable people would not have had to lose revenue because of the way the government has delayed this bill. It has expanded, and we have caused tremendous loss in this industry, particularly to pay-TV.

In this particular instance, we have another example of the fine stewardship of the government in the interests of keeping a Canadian broadcasting system. This amendment takes us back to the free trade agreement that was not supposed to touch culture. Culture was supposed to be exempt. We were not going to have anything that was going to hurt our cultural industries. Not much!

So many things are related to free trade. In this particular instance, we are talking about retransmission rights that were negotiated in the free trade agreement and were given to the government through Order in Council to determine the regulations that would set the fees that were to be paid through retransmission.

I am sure that everyone in the House and in TV land knows that cable has to pay close to $50 million to American intellectual property, because we did not use a proper definition. We avoided using the definition that the Americans are using, saving themselves millions and millions of unnecessary dollars flowing out in duplicate funds.

No one wants our creative artists, our intellectual property, and the people who produce, direct, create, think, and speak for us as Canadians not to get their just due. That is not the object. Its object was to throw away our money unnecessarily and diminish our own resources, because the government was so foolish in the way it defined retransmission rights. There are two tests on retransmission. They are the grade B contour plus 30 kilometres, and whether or not there is a significant local viewing that can be received off-air. That is called the local signal. That is the American definition, and that is what we left out.

It is just a shame, because the amount that we are paying out is over twice as much as American cable systems pay for the same thing. U.S. cable systems pay approximately 2 per cent of gross revenues to the copyright collectives. The copyright decision means for ourselves, here, that the Canadian cable systems will pay approximately 8 per cent of gross revenue to copyright holders.

It is like the spread on our money and why we have got such a growing debt. The government does not know how to manage. It is doing the same thing to our cable people, causing them all kinds of unnecessary costs.

Over 85 per cent of the money that is going out will go directly to U.S. copyright holders. Canadian copyright holders will receive only $7 million out of the $51 million collected from cable companies this year. That is going to go up. The Canadian cable consumer will eventually bear this expense. It is unfortunate that they will have to pay such a high price to the Americans in order to remit such a proportionately low amount to Canadian talent and copyright holders, because the government did such a rotten job in defining this whole bill.

I have a letter here from Mountain Cablevision, sent to me on November 26, which explains what is happening in this situation. It states, among other things, that this decision of Consumer and Corporate Affairs with respect to copyright tariffs being imposed, would have the Canadian cable industry pay almost $51 million to retransmit distant television signals to subscribers.

> As a result of this decision, my own cable system will be faced with a royalty burden of over $330,000 per year for the next two years, after which the rates may increase. This amount is greater than our after tax profit for the last three years, as our company is in the midst of a major system rebuild in order to improve the technical quality of the cable service we provide to our customers. Mountain Cablevision is also in the process of expanding Cable TV service to less economic and sparsely populated rural areas in our vicinity.

This burden is absolutely unacceptable:

> We do not take issue with the principle of providing fair compensation to copyright holders. Do take issue with royalties which, on a per subscriber basis, will be more than double what American Cable Operators pay to retransmit distant signals.
>
> The Free Trade Agreement provides that distant signal copyright liability should be "equitable and non-discriminatory". The Copyright Act states that our liability should be "fair" and "equitable". We believe, however, that the Copyright Board's decision ignores both the spirit and the letter of these governing documents. For this reason we are asking for your support in our appeal of the decision.

> We wish to make it clear that this economic burden will have a significant impact upon the Cable Industry's financial health, and place many Cable companies, including ourselves—

—the small ones in particular—there are only about 10 or 12 biggies in the whole field, so the small ones are really going to suffer. He says that placing them—

> —in a position to apply and be successful in obtaining a rate increase based upon economic need. Many cable companies, including Mountain Cablevision, are presently in the process of preparing these applications.
>
> The CRTC regulations stipulate that all subscribers must be notified of the components and reason for any rate increase.
>
> The result of the pass-through to subscribers of these copyright fees (over $9 per year) will place Cable TV beyond the reach of some senior citizens and low income families.
>
> This no doubt will result in tremendous subscriber outcry which we would prefer to avoid.

Furthermore, I think it is going to involve a lot of disconnects.

The implication is that they are going to have to cut their staff and freeze new hiring. Based on the American formula, they are going to have to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars a year. The money that it will have to pay for copyright will come from the company, reducing the rebuilding of its system. The cable system is presently a full-channel capacity. It cannot improve that because it is going to have an impact on its copyright payments.

Mountain Cablevision states:

> It will impact on our bottom line to make us eligible for a rate increase due to special economic circumstances.

It is ridiculous if it has to go to that extent.

If 85 per cent of this money goes directly to U.S. copyright holders, the Canadian copyright holder will receive only $7 million out of this $51 million. Unfortunately, it will have a very deleterious effect on the whole industry.

I would ask that the copyright decision be reviewed once again. The two yardsticks of measure that are used by the Americans in this instance should be applied in Canada. Let the government, through its cabinet, take the responsibility for what it has done.

It would very much like to see itself as the wonders of the television industry of the Canadian broadcasting system for all the wonderful things it has done. Well, much of it has been smoke and mirrors. That is what we have been talking about here today. It is unfortunate that the silent crew across the floor has not seen fit to defend the minister's bill. If I were the minister, I would feel very badly.

I have been honoured by the support and collaboration of the members on this side of the House who have participated actively to explain to the minister, to the government, and to the people of Canada, particularly in this industry, why changes had to be made. However, the minister has zipped the lips of all members of his side of the House. It has been a disservice to the Canadian broadcasting system and to Canadian subscribers. I do believe that the government should feel a great sense of discomfort for its behaviour. I would say, shame on the government.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, at the express request of the minister, I would like to say just a few words to thank my colleague and good friend from Mount Royal. She has made a remarkable contribution to the debate on this very important issue. I agree with her, this is a matter of concern for all Canadians. On behalf of the Liberal caucus, I would like to thank her for a job well done, and to also thank her guardian angel and dedicated assistant, Nancy Jean Wah, who was such great help in this debate.

• (2110)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The question in on Motion No. 50 in the name of Mr. Edwards.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to the order adopted earlier today, the deferred recorded votes at the report stage of Bill C-40 still stand deferred until three o'clock tomorrow.

*Adjournment Debate*

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Mr. Speaker, when I rose in the House on March 5, I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs what steps he had taken to obtain a guarantee that, subsequent to German unification, post World War II borders between Germany and Poland would be respected.

Since that day Chancellor Kohl has offered assurances that seem to be satisfactory to Poland. For those assurances that were very important to Poland, I would like to congratulate Mr. Kohl, not only on his conciliatory position, but also on his decisive victory on Sunday, December 2 which will allow him an opportunity to see the historic unification through a successful transition.

For all the internal turmoil and economic challenge of restructuring that some experts are speculating will cost approximately $1 trillion, Germany has still offered some $13 billion of assistance to the Soviet Union this year, and is said to be ready to extend credits to Poland in context of a general framework treaty expected to be signed earlier next year.

This is all happening amidst the movement towards a new Europe of 1992. In time for Europe 1992, each east European country will be expected to get involved, to contribute, and to be an active member of the new community. For this they are going to need the support from the west.

Last week I attended a conference on the changing Soviet Union where, among other distinguished speakers, we had the honour to hear Mr. Brzezinski, a former adviser to President Carter, speak to the state of the economy of the Soviet Union. I must say that the one positive statement he had to make on the situation was on the creation of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Mr. Brzezinski felt that this was a first sign that the west was treating the economic reality of eastern Europe seriously.

Yet, Canada's commitment to the bank remains confusing. We know what the figures are in terms of our monetary contribution. We know what our contribution is in terms of our proportion of the total commitment. What we do not know is the extent of our commitment. We throw a few words and a few dollars around hoping that at least our gestures will keep the real issues at bay.

In his speech at the conference I referred to earlier, the Secretary of State for External Affairs talked about the bilateral relationship launched by the Prime Minister's visit to the Soviet Union last November. He talked of formal treaties for more co-operation. He talked of less restrictive trade agreements. He talked of environmental co-operation in the Arctic. All these initiatives have been talked about at length. In fact, that is all that has happened to date, talk and more talk about the talk.

We have yet to hear how these initiatives will come about when we face budget cutbacks to almost all our programs. We have yet to hear how they will be followed through with the limited and, in fact, decreasing budget of the Department of External Affairs.

The paradox in the government is woefully apparent when one reads the text of some of the speeches given by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. On one hand, he offers no real support. On the other hand, he uses, and I must add in this case, appropriate dramatic language to describe the dire needs of east European countries. In speaking about the Soviet Union at the conference, for example, the Secretary of State for External Affairs said: "The Soviet Union is at a profoundly important point. That point can be a turning point or a breaking point. Opportunity is present, but so too, is danger. It is Canada's profound interest that opportunity become accomplishment—".

Let us take the opportunity. Let us take the bull by the horns and follow through with our commitments. For a start, how about considering the suggestion made by the vice-president of Barclays Bank of Canada—U.S.S.R. Business Council's first annual meeting. Charles Attard suggests that the risks of doing business in the Soviet Union are getting worse. There is a general consensus about this statement. Instead of throwing bits and pieces here and there, let us consider joint action with the federal government and the Export Development Corporation. Make it easier for banks to invest by simply

insuring their investments. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this makes better business sense.

The problem with this government is that it lacks creativity, it lacks the political will, and its commitment is weak.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Vincent Della Noce (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue):** In reply to my colleague for Parkdale—High Park, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer him to page 87 of the *Hansard* of March 5, 1990. Not to take up the time of the House, I will not repeat what was said then, but that is where he will find the Secretary of State's reply. May I take this opportunity to remind him that the unification of the two Germanys took part on October 3. It was the happy ending to the 2 plus 4 negotiations which took place in Moscow on September 12 which brought the four powers to forego their rights over Germany and give it full sovereignty. Previously, in June 1990, the Parliaments of both the Federal Republic of Germany and the Democratic Republic of Germany had passed a resolution which recognized the existence of the Oder-Neisse border. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Poland had taken part in the 2 plus 4 negotiations concerning the borders with Poland and the conditions connected with a treaty in that regard.

The treaty between Poland and the united Germany was signed in Warsaw on November 14. It was to be ratified in due time by both parliaments. Canada is very pleased with the conclusion of the November 14 treaty relating to the German-Polish border, as well as with the success of the German union which took place calmly, in consultation with all interested parties, including Poland and Canada, and in full respect of international law.

[*English*]

## HOUSING

**Mr. Bill Attewell (Markham—Whitchurch—Stouffville):** Mr. Speaker, on October 29, 1990, I rose in this House to ask a question of the Minister of State for Housing regarding the federal co-operative housing program in Canada. When I rose in the House,in October to address the need for changes in the income qualification rule of the co-op program, I raised the issue of MPs such as the NDP member for Trinity—Spadina and the NDP member for Edmonton East who are living in federally-subsidized housing. The fact that well paid politicians are living in government-subsidized housing illustrates the urgent need for changes in the housing program.

When the non-profit co-operative housing program was introduced to Canada about 25 years ago, assistance was associated with rent-geared-to-income subsidies for low-income households who were unable to find affordable housing. Studies show that 15 per cent of Canadians must rely on some form of government assistance to meet their shelter needs. I am talking of families, of women with children, the elderly, and the handicapped who, through no fault of their own, do not have decent affordable housing. Many are paying 40, 50, 60 and even 75 per cent of their income each month for rent and heat.

There is an enormous demand for affordable housing. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation estimates that the demand for co-op units is between 164,000 and 400,000 renter households. Furthermore, there are over 40,000 names on co-op waiting lists across Canada, and co-ops have virtually no vacancies. Yet there are examples of well-to-do Canadians living in subsidized housing units, shutting out those most in need. High income earners should not be taking advantage of these funds. For example, the NDP member for Edmonton East is a resident of the Sundance Housing Co-op of Edmonton.

• (2120)

Sundance was given a federal cash grant of $280,000 when built and enjoys a special preferential mortgage rate of 8 per cent for 50 years, well below the current rate.

The member for Edmonton East shares the five bedroom apartment with four other people. The member's share of rent is less than $200 a month. There is a list of more than 30 people waiting to get into the Sundance development.

Does the leader of the New Democratic Party approve of her NDP members depriving lower income Canadians from much needed shelter? Would Premier Bob Rae approve? Would Bob White or Shirley Carr approve?

In Toronto, where more than 17,000 people are on lists waiting for public housing, the NDP member for Trinity-Spadina lives in subsidized housing.

According to the research compiled in the greater Toronto area by the Ontario Ministry of Housing, an activist member of the NDP is almost nine times more likely to live in a co-op than any other renter. NDP supporters appear to take generous advantage of the very government housing programs they fight for on behalf of the poor.

Surely politicians who earn $88,000 a year, with $26,000 of that being tax-free, should not be taking advantage of the federal Co-operative Housing Program, as well as taking units away from those in greater need.

All federal members of Parliament are barred from personally participating in any federal programs. The members from Edmonton East and Trinity-Spadina, as public officials, are benefiting through low-cost housing resulting from public funds. I firmly believe that these public officials must comply with the legislation which bars federal MPs from participating in federal government programs.

Co-op housing serves low and moderate income families who cannot afford home ownership. It is deplorable that with such an obvious demand for affordable housing, politicians such as the named NDP members are taking space from the needy.

I understand that one of the arguments in favour of high income earners in the co-ops is to promote social integration. In fact, a CMHC evaluation notes:

> —that co-operatives had been highly successful in achieving income-mixing without polarisation of income groups. Mixes of family types, age, race and people with various backgrounds were perceived as healthy and a strength of co-operative living.

However, I believe that this type of social integration can still be accomplished even if the high end income earners, those making over $60,000 a year, were denied occupancy in federally supported housing programs.

The latest figures show that 65 per cent of the households currently living under the co-operative program have incomes below $30,000 a year and 31.3 per cent of the households have incomes between $30,000 and $60,000. Only 3.7 per cent of the households have incomes in excess of $60,000.

The point I wish to make is that the social integration which co-op housing achieves through income-mixing would still occur if the high-end income earners were dropped from the program. The fact is, only 3.7 per cent of the households have incomes over $60,000, hardly a substantial figure, a figure which the NDP members trying to justify their occupancy would like us to believe contributes greatly to social integration.

I am certain that by dropping high income earners from federal co-op housing programs, social integration will not be threatened. Instead, it will help alleviate the shortage of affordable housing we are facing in this country. A 40,000 name waiting list speaks for itself.

I also point out that the middle income group, those making between $30,000 and $60,000, now occupy 31.3 per cent of co-op housing and this rather high percentage would still ensure the goal of mixed income is met.

I want to make clear I am not advocating strictly low income public housing. We must get away from the concept of the old poverty ridden public housing ghettos of the 1950s and 1960s. However, there needs to be a cut-off point. Is it right to have high income earners taking away availability in co-op units from families in greater need? Surely politicians should not abuse and take advantage of a federally subsidized housing program.

I very much hope that the minister, who is going to reply shortly, will take this issue under control and bring in some type of legislation that would bar politicians at any level of government from participating in co-op development.

**Hon. Alan Redway (Minister of State (Housing)):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised a concern which is on the minds of a great many Canadians these days. The hon. member is not alone in raising this concern. Mr. Speaker, you may be aware that a great number of people have been quoted with respect to this issue. One of them, for instance, a retiree by the name of Freddie Caplan has said: "Get them out now and let the needy in".

Another resident of public housing, Gail Grieve, has been quoted as saying: "Evicting the politicians is not enough. They should be heavily fined. Retroactive back rent might be a good idea, too.

An unemployed man by the name of Mark Carter said: "Throw them out and put me in there—there's too many homeless people on the street".

Those are examples of some of the comments that have been coming to me with respect to this issue. I might say as well that I have also heard people suggest that even the co-op housing movement itself might be a lot better off and that there could very well be a greater groundswell of public support for co-op housing if all politicians were in fact banned from co-operative housing.

I think it is important at the same time for you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member and all of us, all Canadians, to understand that the federal government has been formally involved now in various co-operative housing programs since 1973. Prior to 1973 there was, of course, co-op housing that was being built. It was inspired to a large extent in the maritimes by St. Francis Xavier University. At that time it was on the basis of self-help and self-financing and there was no subsidization by the public or by Canadian taxpayers.

However, since 1973 we have had three separate programs that have been assisted by the public at the federal level, two of them under the previous Liberal government and one of them under the present government. The first two generated some 45,000 or more units of co-op housing and the most recent one, some 13,000 of co-op housing. In each of those there was an income mix, as the hon. member has referred to.

In the earlier two programs, there was only a minimum of some 15 per cent of those units that were targeted for low-income people. In the present program up to 50 per cent of the units can be targeted to low income people. I am sure that the hon. member and all Canadians realize that it is very difficult to change the rules in the middle of the game for programs that have already been put in place. It is very difficult to put a ban on politicians, very difficult to enforce rules retroactively.

However, I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, and I want to assure the hon. member and all Canadians that as I go forward with recommendations to the cabinet very shortly, I will be taking all of those concerns into very serious consideration.

## CAMECO

**Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, I suppose, to be able to rise in the House and pose again a question I raised on November 21 to the Minister of Energy. However, I have to say that I am not pleased with the fact that this is probably the fifth or sixth time that I have raised this particular question in the House of Commons and I still do not have a satisfactory answer.

The question I asked on that date had to do with the spill of radioactive waste into Wallaston Lake about a year ago, in fact more than a year, the first week of November 1989. What happened since then has been indicative of a lot that is wrong with our whole environmental process in this country. Certainly, we still have not seen the facts come to light in this case. The reason I asked that question was because Cameco, the operating company, on that day pleaded guilty in court in Saskatoon. It changed its plea from not guilty to guilty with regard to provincial environmental charges that were laid in the province of Saskatchewan.

• (2130)

The reason I raise that question is, first of all, the minister turned down our request for a public inquiry, so there was no way the issues would be laid before the public in a public forum through the mechanism of an inquiry. There had been federal charges laid but the company pleaded guilty to those as well. When the company pleaded guilty to provincial charges, it meant there was no longer any mechanism whatsoever whereby the important questions that had been raised along the way could be raised again.

I did regret that day the fact that I had listened to some colleagues before whom I had raised the question of how I should pose my question. I wanted to ask, since the minister turned down an inquiry, how we get the answers to all these other questions. Instead, I asked the question in the form of these questions: Would the minister reconsider an inquiry? Of course, the minister simply said no to that, leaving the question dangling. I should have asked: How will we ever find out what was the role of the regulators in this fiasco? What impact will this industry have on northern people and their environment? Does the 1946 legislation which governs this industry have any relevance in today's world? I think those are the key questions here.

I do not particularly care how we get answers to those questions as long as we get them because, with respect to the role of the regulators, we have heard a lot said about the role of the company but very little about the role of the AECB under whose jurisdiction the inspection of this facility fell during the period of time that this whole safety system was unravelling.

It raises a whole series of conflict of interest questions because there is a perception in this country, if not a reality, that the industry, the regulators and the government are all too close together, that there is an interchange of personnel and ideas.

I do not want to call into question the integrity of the minister. Even he is in a peculiar situation in that both Cameco, the company in this case, and the AECB, the regulator, answer to the same minister.

Then there is the question of the impact on northern people in their environment. That question has never been satisfactorily addressed although the minister indicated to the chief of the Wollaston band that it had. The chief wrote back and the minister, in fact, conceded that this huge question, which is before the Supreme Court in other forms of the role of aboriginal peoples in the control of the environment, has not been addressed.

There is the fact that we are proceeding under a 1946 act of Parliament, the Atomic Energy Control Act. Certainly technology has evolved a long, long way in our ability to monitor technology since 1946. In fact, the question remains, what are we going to do with this obsolete regulatory regime that we have in this country? The people want answers to these questions. It is not just me.

I would like to quote from the *Prince Albert Daily Herald* of November 28, where it states in an editorial: "Ray Funk is correct over uranium probe". This is a Thomson paper, not a house organ of my local constituency organization or anything like that. It states:

> Ray Funk is absolutely correct in saying there should be a public inquiry into the safety of uranium mining in this country.
>
> Funk has been pressing Energy Minister Jake Epp for the inquiry since the accident. Epp, so far, has refused, leaving Funk and many other people frustrated by the lack of answers to a number of questions.
>
> Funk's has been a lonely voice in Ottawa on this issue. However, the MP should know he carries the support of much of his constituency, in particular its northern reaches, in this fight.

I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, and pleading to the parliamentary secretary, through you, to please answer the questions. What is the role of the regulators? What is the impact on northern people? When will we receive new legislation on this very important industry? We need these answers. People are demanding them and I hope that the parliamentary secretary will be forthcoming.

**Mr. Vincent Della Noce (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for giving me this opportunity again on behalf of the government to answer the question recently raised in the House by the hon. member for Prince Albert—Churchill River.

As the hon. member reported, Cameco pleaded guilty on November 21 to the charge under section 17(a) of the Saskatchewan Environmental Management and Protection Act. It was alleged that Cameco had allowed the discharge of mine water without a permit in circumstances where there was a reasonable possibility that the discharge could result in a change in the water quality.

The maximum fine under this legislation is $1 million. The prosecutor for the provincial Crown recommended that a fine of $50,000 be given. The judge reserved his decision until Tuesday, November 27, 1990. On that date, the provincial court judge Albert Lavoie announced his decision to impose a fine of $50,000 on Cameco relating to the charge to which Cameco had pleaded guilty.

The hon. member for Prince Albert—Churchill River has repeated his call for a public inquiry into uranium mining in Canada since the prosecution of Cameco. He says that there is no longer a forum to answer the remaining questions on the issue. What question, I ask, Mr. Speaker?

The situation is very clear. It is clear that fortunately there has been no environmental damage as a result of the Rabbit Lake mine water spill. Reports prepared by Saskatchewan Environment and by Saskatchewan Research Council have each come to this conclusion, as did the Atomic Energy Control Board after it completed its investigation of the spill. The people have their answer.

The role of the regulators is clear. They investigated the incident, laid charges and followed up by reviewing their licensing and inspection practices. Follow-up action included the frequency of inspections, adding more task to the inspections such as checking the log book of the company operators and increasing the lines of communication with members of the public, especially with the natives of the Hatchet Lake band.

In addition, the Atomic Energy Control Board has recognized the need to update the 1946 Atomic Energy Control Act. As part of the revision to update this act, consideration would be given to increasing the fines and penalties to make them comparable to those in current legislation such as the federal Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

Legal procedures have made it clear that Cameco was negligent in executing certain operations related to the protection of the environment. The AECB instructed Cameco to clean up the spill; the company has spent several millions in carrying out clean-up operations. In addition, the AECB instructed the company to install a new alarm system to detect any spill of mine water and to train its staff in proper inspection practices.

With regard to the hon. member's request for a public inquiry into uranium mining, I re-emphasize that in view of the several public inquiries already conducted on uranium mining in Canada, of the negligible environmental impact of the Rabbit Lake spill, of the tightening of licensing and inspection practices of regulators, and of the opportunities for public input into the Environmental Assessment Review Process for any new uranium mining facilities, the government still considers that another public inquiry into uranium mining would not be in the best interest of Canada at the present time.

No, the minister has not changed his mind.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** A motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been moved. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned, pursuant to Standing Order 24(1), until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The House adjourned at 9.39 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Tuesday, December 4, 1990**

The House met at 11 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

### EMPLOYMENT EQUITY ACT

TABLING OF ANNUAL REPORT

**Hon. Monique Vézina (Minister of State (Employment and Immigration) and Minister of State (Seniors)):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) I have the honour to table in the House the annual report for 1990 on the Employment Equity Act, in both official languages.

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

* * *

[*English*]

### ORDER IN COUNCIL

TABLING OF APPOINTMENTS

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, a number of Order in council appointments which were made by the government.

Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 110(1), these are deemed referred to the appropriate standing committees, a list of which is attached.

* * *

### PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government response to 29 petitions.

### STRIKING

57TH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 57th report of the Striking Committee.

This report deals with the membership of legislative committees and, pursuant to Standing Order 113(1), upon presentation such reports are deemed adopted.

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

* * *

### PETITIONS

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, I have the duty to table an important petition today, signed by several dozens of Canadians, objecting strongly to the government's intentions to impose the GST on books.

Hope springs eternal with all Canadians that the government will come to its senses and abandon its project to tax reading. These petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to reaffirm the historic principles embodied in the tax-free status for the printed word by retaining the zero rate in the GST legislation and regulations.

These petitioners and I would plead with the government to come to its senses and to not tax reading.

**An hon. member:** Let's do it now.

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing order 36, I, too, have the honour and duty to table more petitions from Canadians protesting against the government's intention to tax magazines, books and newspapers through their GST legislation, presently being debated in the Senate. We hope that is as far as the bill will get and that it will be defeated.

The petitioners are from remote areas in Saskatchewan where reading is very important. These petitioners call upon the government to reaffirm the historic principles embodied in the tax-free status for the printed word by retaining the zero rate in the GST legislation and regulations.

• (1110 )

**Mrs. Diane Marleau (Sudbury):** Mr. Speaker, today I stand to table petitions signed by residents of Toronto, Ontario against the proposed goods and services tax to be applied to books and magazines.

The petitioners feel that this will make the industry very hard-pressed and that the dissemination of Canadian literature, in particular, to Canadians will be far costlier. It will prevent education and it goes against all principles of democracy and our own principles of educating our own people.

I would ask that the government please reconsider its stand and alter its goods and services tax or, perhaps, not pass it.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester):** Mr. Speaker, thank you for your kindness. I must say I appreciate your smiles of encouragement. As a former journalist, you will agree it is an absolute aberration to tax newspapers or any reading matter, whether we are talking about Canadians with a good education or even worse, Canadians who are trying to learn to read.

I got in touch with people in the Kitchener area, where this petition was circulated, and I spoke to a member of the library committee in Brantford, Ontario, who reminded me that now fines for overdue books would be taxed and explained that this would make the system very complicated. It is already a problem to recover overdue textbooks and books, but if we now have to collect a tax on fines—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please. I appreciate the hon. member's kindness, but speaking objectively, I must remind him that tabling of petitions should be more or less succinct, without engaging in debate. The hon. member for Carleton—Gloucester, very briefly, so that he can finish his petition.

**Mr. Bellemare:** Once again, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your kindness, and in concluding, I want to say that the obligation to collect a tax on fines for overdue books will be incredibly complex and a disastrer for Canada's libraries.

[*English*]

**Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception):** Mr. Speaker, it is my honour and duty to rise, in accordance with the relevant standing order, to present a petition from 49 Canadians from across the country.

They feel that after 123 years of Confederation we have had some strange taxes in the country, but this is the first time we have ever contemplated taxing education and culture which are the corner-stones of democracy.

These petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to abolish the GST but, if that is not possible, at least to abolish the GST on reading materials.

NATIONAL HOCKEY LEAGUE

**Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of presenting a petition containing several dozens of names which were very readily attained by a constituent of mine, Mrs. Margot Downing of Woodstock.

The petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to support Ottawa and Hamilton in their applications to obtain an National Hockey League franchise.

[*Translation*]

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, speaking on behalf of the hon. member for Mount Royal, I have the honour and the privilege of tabling a petition in this House from thousands and thousands of Canadians who want to ensure that reading is not taxed, and who humbly pray and call upon the government to read these petitions, if it can, before they are taxed as well. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I hope this petition will have a decisive impact on the government and cause it to reverse its decision.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to urge this government to give serious reconsideration to the tax on reading. I say to the government as the thousands and thousands of petitions continue to flow in that it really has to start to listen to the people. We have set up all kinds of commissions so that we know what the people think. Well, here is a perfect example. They want the Government of Canada not to tax books, to apply a zero rate of tax to magazines, books and newspapers and to exclude them from the GST. The dissemination of the printed word as a cornerstone of democracy, culture, and education in a literate and productive society will be negatively affected by the GST.

I am reading. I hope you are listening on the other side. I would reaffirm the historic principles they say are embodied in the tax-free status of the printed word by retaining the zero rate in the GST legislation and regulations. The petition is signed by hundreds of petitioners, and I shall send copies to the members across the floor, particularly the ministers, so they can see that it was read *fidèlement*.

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, I too rise pursuant to Standing Order 36. It is an honour, duty and privilege to present to this House a petition certified correct by the Clerk of Petitions. These four petitions contain the signatures of over 100 concerned Canadians from the constituencies of Kitchener, Cambridge, and Guelph. In part of this petition we have heard about the tax the government wants to impose on the printed word. But the interesting part at the beginning of the petition where it states that the Government of Canada has seen fit since Confederation and without hiatus to apply a zero rate of tax to magazines, books and newspapers, and now proposes to include them in the goods and services tax is totally shameful.

These petitioners call upon Parliament, but in particular the government, to not tax the printed word.

## URANIUM MINING

**Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River):** Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and duty pursuant to Standing Order 36 to present this petition signed by people from communities in Saskatchewan such as La Loche and Saskatoon, people from Winnipeg, the Northwest Territories; Yellowknife, Rankin Inlet, and Lake Harbour.

These people are not happy with the answers so far with regard to the spill of radioactive waste water at Wollaston Lake last November. They think the major questions have not been addressed. Therefore, they ask the Parliament of Canada to immediately convene a comprehensive independent public inquiry into uranium mining in Saskatchewan in Northern Canada and to effectively involve aboriginal peoples and northerners in this inquiry and provide them with the resources to do so.

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I have a petition which I would like to present pursuant to Standing Order 36. It is against the taxing of books and urges the government to abandon the GST, at least with regard to books, but preferably to abandon the GST altogether. Why stop there? Let us go all the way.

I am pleased to present this petition in view of the fact that the Minister of Supply and Services is listening attentively and I know that he cares about people who are functionally illiterate and who need to improve their education. He has expressed an interest in that issue in the past and I know, of course, that he will want to associate himself with me and other members of Parliament who want the GST to be removed from books.

As I said, why stop at books? Why not just abandon the GST altogether? It is a lot simpler.

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston):** Mr. Speaker, I too would like to present a petition. I would like to read it. It is a short petition addressed to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled.

The petitioners indicate in the recitals that the Government of Canada has seen fit since Confederation, without hiatus, to apply a zero rate of tax to magazines, books and newspapers and now proposes to include them in the goods and services tax.

• (1120)

The petitioners go on to say that whereas uninhibited dissemination of the printed word as a cornerstone of democracy, culture, education and a literate and productive society will be negatively affected by the GST application, wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to reaffirm the historic principles embodied in tax-free status for the printed word by retaining the zero rate in the GST legislation and regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I was able to read this because while I was growing up there was no tax on books, there was no tax on reading. Future generations of Canadians might not be able to stand in this House of Commons to read because this government is hell-bent on taxing reading. It ought to be ashamed of itself and it ought to withdraw the GST immediately.

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise pursuant to Standing Order 36 and present another petition, giving the earlier intervention of the Minister of Supply and Services. I am particularly pleased to note that this petition contains signatures from Dunrobin, Woodlawn, Kanata and various other community names with which you, Mr. Speaker, will be very familiar.

This petition is based on the fundamental belief that to enjoy one's free participation in a democratic society, access to information, knowledge and understanding are essential, and that the GST is simply another death blow on top of cutting grants to women's organizations to disseminate information and cutting grants to native broadcasting and newspapers to disseminate information.

The zero tax rate on reading is a democratic measure and the petitioners ask the government to return the zero rate to reading materials.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, the persons who signed this petition must be cheering on the valiant Liberal senators who are fighting the government's goods and services tax in the other place. The senators are having a tough go of it having to sit night and day, but they are doing their best in the face of insuperable odds that this government has made by stacking the Senate with a bunch of Tory hacks.

What I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is these petitioners have signed this petition objecting to the tax on books and the printed word. They are opposed to that aspect of the goods and services tax.

I find it intriguing that I have not heard one petition in support of the goods and services tax presented in this House by one of the members opposite, and none against either. They obviously have been told by the government House leader that they are not allowed to present such petitions. Therefore, it falls on us on this side of the House to defend the interests of these thousands and thousands of Canadians who object to this tax and have signed this petition asking Parliament to reject the goods and services tax.

* * *

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, Question No. 385 will be answered today.

[*Text*]

### CHALLENGE GRANTS

Question No. 385—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Since its inception, has money been given for Challenge Grants in British Columbia by the Department of Employment and Immigration, and if so (a) what amount (b) which electoral districts received funds?

2. For each electoral district receiving funds, what was the (a) total amount (b) name of organizations receiving funds (c) amount given to each organization?

**Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of State (Youth), Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** 1. Yes, Challenge grants have been given to the British Columbia region. Grants through the Challenge program are provided through its Business Drive for Jobs component.

a) $44,780

b) Nanaimo–Cowichan, Richmond, Vancouver–Centre, Delta and Vancouver–East

2. a, b, c)

| Electoral District | $ | Organization |
|---|---|---|
| Nanaimo–Cowichan | $5,600 | Duncan–Cowichan Chamber of Commerce |
| Richmond | $4,800 | Richmond Chamber of Commerce** |
| Vancouver–Centre | $5,680 | Pacific National Exhibition |
| Delta | $15,000 | Delta Chamber of Commerce* |
| Vancouver–East | $13,700 | Kiwassa Neighbourhood House** |

* Project to begin January, 1991.

** Proposal withdrawn by organization after EIC approval of funds.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The question as enumerated by the parliamentary secretary has been answered.

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Friday, November 30, consideration of the motion of Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) that Bill C-88, an act to provide for the membership of Canada in the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to participate in this bill. I do want to thank my colleague from Northumberland who, on Friday, when this bill was introduced gave our party's response and our willingness to support the bill in principle.

I notice that the bill was introduced on Friday by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. I do not know what the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs has to do with the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Again this shows the lack of commitment that this government has to many of the proposals put forth in this House.

Although we support this bill in principle, there are many questions that need to be answered before we would consider full and unequivocal support for Canada's participation in the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. We have yet to be told who will be making the final decisions, who will be accountable to the contributing countries, what Canada's role will be in terms of our contribution to the bank, where the money will come from, how this money will fit in with other programs directed at Eastern Europe and whether our contribution will affect our already deficient aid in the Third World.

Yesterday and today we have the Prime Minister of Latvia in Ottawa and tomorrow we will have the President of Lithuania in Ottawa. I am pleased that this time the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs are not afraid to meet these people. They still have not clarified whether they will be meeting these people officially or just as parliamentarians; I hope it is in an official capacity. These countries will be asking if they will be able to benefit from this bank. I notice in the bill in annex "A" the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is listed under recipient countries category "c" but we have no clarification whether the republics will be able to negotiate directly with the bank or will they have to go and negotiate everything through the Supreme Soviet in Moscow? When the world finally wakes up and recognizes that the three Baltic states should be given back their independence which they did have and which was taken away from them illegally, what will be their status in relationship to this bank because this is the kind of assistance that these countries can use.

These questions ought to be answered at the outset of our involvement so that mistakes that have been made are not repeated and changes can be made that would improve the over-all effectiveness of this initiative. We should be fielding questions and inviting comments from organizations and individuals who are already involved in ventures in Eastern Europe or those who at least have some knowledge of the cultural and social differences between east and west. We have those resources right here in Canada and although the Secretary of State keeps referring to Canadians of Eastern European origin in his press releases, we have yet to see any of the input taken seriously.

I should clarify at this point that I am not referring to those officials at External Affairs who carry out the minister's instructions. Considering what they have to deal with, they do an excellent job. I am referring to the vague rhetoric that these people get as directives, rhetoric that they somehow have to translate and finely juggle without additional budgets and without additional personnel into real programs. Where is the commitment?

This is not the first time that Canada has joined an organization simply to get the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs the headlines. Much fanfare surrounded our membership in the Organization of American States. What do we hear about that now? Absolutely nothing. There was no consultation prior to the decision and some nominal moneys were spent on joining. What have we done with our membership? Are we making an impact? Are we making a difference? Are we playing a more effective role in Latin America and the Caribbean since we joined? No we are not. And if we are, we certainly are not hearing about it. Canadians are not hearing about it. We are simply cutting budgets across the board and rendering the department impotent in every area for the sake of a few headlines. I wish this was not the case, but I am afraid if one looks at the confusion that already surrounds the existing programs for development aid for Eastern Europe, it is undeniable that this government is not interested in making a difference.

• (1130)

Look at what we have done to our Official Development Assistance. Not only have we cut back on our prior commitments, but we have imposed on the remaining funds conditions that are starving whole populations.

We impose structural adjustment. We insist they balance their books at the expense of food, shelter and health care. We tell them to modernize, to industrialize and to export. Then we have the audacity to tell them that we do not like what they are doing to the environment and threaten to cut back even more.

We suggest as an afterthought the concept of sustainable development and expect attitudinal and program changes overnight. Maybe we in the west are learning that this type of attitude is not working and that we are at the very heart of the cause of the increased poverty and political instability in these countries.

We cannot afford to make those same mistakes again, but if we look at the mentions made regarding basic human rights and sustainable development, we find only passing reference somewhere in the heart of the text versus being built right into an uncompromisable condition.

I know the presenter of this bill stressed how it would cover sustainable development in all transactions, but why was that not built into the purpose of the bill? Why is it hidden in section 1(7), one little phrase pertaining to sustainable development?

What we need is commitment. As is obvious to each one of us, that requires not only money but foresight, well thought out strategies, and objectives. Most of all we need follow through. How long will this bank be in operation? During its existence, do we envision its role expanding to embrace the co–ordination of the various aid programs?

Recently in this House we debated the future role of the Conference for Security and Co–operation in Europe. We talked about the scope of the conference and how it included, among other things, an economic dimension. How will we avoid a duplication of the role carried out by the CSCE, the OECD, the IMF, and the World Bank?

Maybe the bank should be incorporated with the conference. It would seem that in this way duplication may be avoided. In fact a central forum for discussion and responsibility may clear up some of the confusion caused by other initiatives of other economic institutions.

I cannot help but feel that a streamlined, managed process would be much more effective not only in directing the funds, but in monitoring, evaluating and, if necessary, reconstructing aspects that may prove inefficient.

These types of suggestions should be made at the committee level, before the decision for joining the bank is made. I am sure many members of this House, especially members of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade, would make very constructive suggestions.

Ideally those suggestions would then be tabled in a report to the government, which would receive serious consideration and would subsequently be acted upon as we as a country consider joining this bank, but that is of course in a perfect world, especially where this government is concerned.

This government seldom consults with Canadians before making major policy decisions. In the event that it would ask for opinions from the public, it has been purely for political reasons, not paying any heed to the recommendations made.

I would like to conclude by urging the government, at the very least, to commit to this House that forums and round tables will be held on a regular basis so that there can be ongoing discussions to try to put some sense into all the various initiatives that we are involved with in Eastern and central Europe, hopefully with the result that there will be some real benefit from the Canadian contribution to the bank.

As I said, our party supports this bill in principle but, before giving it final passage, we would like many of the questions raised by my colleague from Northumberland on Friday, raised by me, and then raised further by my colleague from Mount Royal to be answered. I hope, unlike yesterday in the debate on Bill C–40 when the minister refused to get off his butt and speak to his own bill, that today the government will stand up and participate in the debate on Bill C–88. If it does not, we should then pull out of all activities in central and Eastern Europe and not make false promises to the people who are trying to get on their feet, people who have changed from communist forms of government to democratic forms of government, people whose economies for 50 years have been downtrodden and now want to make it. They do not want handouts. They want to become self–sufficient.

If the entire western world looks seriously at a proposal such as this bank, I think we can help the economic recovery in the Soviet Union and in central and Eastern Europe come to fruition much more quickly. And who will be the beneficiaries? Every person on this globe.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The hon. member for Shefford on a point of order.

**Mr. Lapierre:** Mr. Speaker, I was so impressed by the speech my hon. colleague made that I would call for a quorum count. I note there are not only ministers, but also members missing on the government side.

*And the count having been taken:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** There being a quorum, I shall now give the floor to the hon. member for Mount Royal.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I am really quite pleased to rise this morning to speak to a very creative and innovative approach to enabling the newly emerging democracies of Europe to flourish and grow. To do so is really in the self–interest of Canada at the same as it expands and expounds on our humanitarian interest in the growth and development of this area.

There is a strong linkage between this bank and Canada's help and Canadian long–term interests with those of the newly emerging democracies to see them succeed and succeed well in the gigantic task of rebuilding toward tomorrow.

One of the things that Canada and these newly emerging democratic societies will have to take into account is that they will have to be able to compete effectively with the newly industrialized countries of the world, particularly Korea, Singapore, and Taiwan.

I have been privileged to be involved at the international level through the interparliamentary union with many of these countries in terms of policy decisions and political, economic, social and cultural developments. Those acronyms have become part of the lexicon of language to those of us who have an interest, not only in Canada but Canada's relationship with the rest of the world, the NEDS and the NICs of the world.

If that language creeps into the remarks I am about to make, I hope it will be quite clear that the NEDS are the newly emerging democratic societies in Europe, not to say that we are not interested in those that are happening in Latin America, Africa, Asia, and the other parts of the world. Of course the NICs are the newly industrialized countries of the world.

I also want to point out that I was particularly privileged to be on a private trip to Germany to visit my son in northern Germany, in Wolfsburg and Brauschweig, where he works with the Volkswagen people. The day I landed in Germany was the day the wall fell. I can only express my impression of the euphoria in that nation. I happened with my husband to get on a train.

• (1140 )

By the way, we should only have such a wonderful train system. If we had not broken down our VIA Rail system, we could all have enjoyed the incredible transportation facilities that linked that country from east to west and north to south. It is true that one may compare quite well the size of that country, but if each one of our districts had that infrastructure we might be better served too.

**Mr. Blais:** And the population too?

**Mrs. Finestone:** It is too bad the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is so sensitive this morning. Go out and have a sweet cup of coffee.

**Mr. Dick:** He is not here.

**Mrs. Finestone:** Are you supply and services? He might be sweetened by this whole process.

**Mr. Dick:** You don't know much. You're cantankerous.

**Mrs. Finestone:** Mr. Dick, I do not know what portfolio you have, but go and have a cup of coffee and a little sweet sugar. It might help your personality this morning.

I was talking about taking this train with my husband. One of the things that was so personal—and I think it is so important to recognize it—was the impact of the breaking down of that wall.

There was a gentleman sitting beside us who was coming from Zurich, Switzerland. He was quite agitated and quite excited at the same time. He kept saying: "We've got to see where the wire starts, where the wall starts". As we were looking out of the window going north of Frankfurt, we could see that high barbed wire fence. We could see the towers with manpower overlooking these particular parts of the German landscape. Just the sense of the separation of people and families was difficult for me. This was my first trip to Germany and I had some personal problems, but I also had a sense of participation in history unfolding before our eyes.

Tears sprang to this man's eyes as he looked at that frontier. He said: "I am going to go to visit my family in Hamburg. I have had a call from them. I haven't seen them in 40 years". I could sense the emotion of this man.

Then, when I arrived in Brauschweig the following day with my son, daughter-in-law and grandchildren, we went into the centre of town. There were these cars, the Treblinkas I think they call them, little trebs, coming through by the hundreds from this northeast corner. We went to see the border crossing point and could see this huge wall that extended for hundreds and hundreds of yards and then the barbed wire fence that was linking this place. I chatted with the guards on both sides. We could see friendship between the two sides, even though they had been enemies just the day before. It was a very moving experience.

I went back just this past month to revisit for a second trip. There were no rights to cross just outside Wolfsburg. There was nothing in its way. We went to East Berlin, and the shops looked like those of West Berlin. It is true one could see the traces and one could feel that there was tremendous work to be done, but one could also sense that feeling of hope for a people.

It is very important that we use caution and care as we move in this direction. It is a very important role that we have as Canadians, as do other western democracies, to ensure that this is not just a pipe dream, that this is not just an euphoric moment in the history of time, but that we put behind it the substance and the thinking that is required to help these emerging democracies. Life is not easy there.

As I drove through the countryside of East Germany and through the countryside of Hungary, I could see that it was like the 1920s. The infrastructure was not there. The technology was not there. The buildings were ancient and in need of repair. By the way, we can also see that in other parts of the world, that is true, but we are concentrating our efforts and our hopes on implementing those matters which mean so much to us as a nation, as a people, and as written into the Helsinki Accord, with which I will deal in a moment.

This founding of the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development represents a very important step for Canada in terms of its economic support for these newly emerging countries. These kinds of initiatives are very rare in the history of nations and in the history of our world. Some examples are the Marshall Plan after the Second World War, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. We should be proud that Canada is playing a role in solidifying the foundations of freedom and economic opportunity with this bill.

I listened with great care to my colleague from Malpeque the other day. She pointed out that, as a Liberal Party, we have some reservations about the soundness of the over-all government's approach to this new and very challenging region and world economy.

I listened to the member from Parkdale—High Park as he raised some additional issues of concern. The government should pay attention because it is very important. Without question, the principle of support for Bill C-88 has been enunciated quite clearly by these colleagues. This bank will help spur economic opportunity and economic freedom. It goes a long way to renew human and political freedoms in Europe.

One just has to pick up this bill and read the introduction which is set out in the European banks' schedule. It is an agreement to establish the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. It states who the contracting parties are, and I will come to that in a moment.

This bill, developed by the European nations and ourselves, states that we are committed to the fundamental principles of multi-party democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights and market economics. That is very important. Where have we heard that before in a monetary situation and as a banking bottom-line principle? It is very exciting. It is interesting that we are going to be sending our Minister of Finance, rather than the Minister for International Trade to sit on the board representing Canada. That is also a new initiative.

The second paragraph of the Schedule says:

> Recalling the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, and in particular its Declaration on Principles;

There are four baskets in the Helsinki Accord. One of those baskets is significantly, that to deal with human rights. You would not deal with a country unless it respects and upholds individual rights, freedoms and liberty. I think that that is wonderful. To see this in a banking act is quite extraordinary.

It goes on to say that:

> Welcoming the intent of Central and Eastern European countries to further the practical implementation of multiparty democracy, strengthening democratic institutions, the rule of law and respect for human rights and their willingness to implement reforms in order to evolve towards market-oriented economies;

That means there has to be the kinds of communications and literature that will enable that to happen. I do not think they will be taxed like this government is doing with our literature.

It goes on:

> Considering the importance of close and co-ordinated co-operation in order to promote the economic progress of Central and Eastern European countries to help their economies become more internationally competitive and assist them in their reconstruction and development and thus to reduce, where appropriate, any risks related to the financing of their economies;

This is very unique legislation. I am very excited to read this in a banking act.

The shackles of communist rule have been crumbling throughout most of Eastern European. Countries like Canada, who have benefited for more than a century from such freedom should help and support these newly emerging democracies. It is in our long-term interest to continue in this vein.

As well, we have incredible talent here in Canada which can give help and support to these countries, so that while we are pursuing the economic needs, we can take some comfort in the political gains that have already been won.

While we pursue the economic freedom of these people from Eastern Europe, we must remain optimistic by remembering just how far they have come in terms of the political freedom they have already won. There seems to be a tendency to forget the political gains that have just been won: political freedom, the right to speak one's mind, the right to associate, the right to disagree and, increasingly, the right to practise one's own religion. As we move forward and pursue the economic needs, we should keep that in mind. We have to remember that we cannot remain silent on any of the issues that would fight against the principles found in the Helsinki Accords. Silence might mean condoning actions which are unacceptable in the west.

• (1150)

Let us remember that up until a year ago we were still making the case for the kind of political freedom being enjoyed today on so many street corners in so many cities, towns and villages, behind that barrier we now hear so little about these days, the Iron Curtain. Although the need for jobs in factories, technology, and education, remains great, let us hope that building a strong economic foundation will banish into memory the days of stifling censorship, secret police, and underground movements which kept the hope of freedom alive.

Surely we can do nothing but support economically and politically the changes that create competing publications, a marketplace for ideas, the end to secret police arresting anyone with an opinion and the movement for more freedom, organization of elections and running in elections.

With the establishment of this new bank, the economic link between the Government of Canada and the governments of Eastern Europe, we will start to look at the relationships that our two peoples, through families and friends, have had for generations. In fact, I am told that one in 10 Canadians has origins in central and Eastern Europe.

Certainly that is the case in my riding, Mr. Speaker. We have people from all corners of the globe but, in particular, one will find people from Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, The Ukraine, Armenia, Germany, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. I hope that this government is profiting from the presence of these people, who came here mostly after the Second World War, and will be using their expertise, not just in language which enables communication, but in culture and in business expertise because that is what these people have developed. They have brought the desire to succeed to this country, at all levels. They are to be found at every level in this country, political, economic, and social. They have enabled this country to grow and flourish. Now they can bring that expertise to the Canadian government, to this bank, and to the industry which will be developed. I hope we do not forget these people or ignore them.

My colleague, the hon. member for Malpeque, has pointed out that there are some serious areas of scattered government approach. My experience has been with very consolidated approaches in the cultural domain and in communications. Radio–Canada International has been very helpful in assisting the communication industries of the newly emerged democracies of the east. It has hosted their broadcasters here, and has shown them how the public and the private sector works and, to them, we owe a great vote of thanks. You, Mr. Speaker, the Table, and the House, have helped the political process, in terms of the work that is done by Mr. Philip Laundy and the Speaker's Office, in enabling the officers of the House to help those newly emerging democracies function. We have had groups here from Romania, Hungary, and Poland and we are helping establish that kind of work. I know that the parties are helping them to understand how political parties function, from the grassroots up and how one proceeds in the democratic process to have multi–party systems.

All these are very important initiatives and efforts. However, when it comes to loans, there is a problem. We commit food on the one hand, which is money. We commit money to the International Monetary Fund. We work through the World Bank and now we are going to work through this bank.

Canada does not have a lot of money, we have a lot of goodwill. Those banking institutions reflect the constituents' dollars, the dollars of people who live and work in Canada. The banks do not manufacture money; the banks use the money from the ordinary citizen to aid these efforts. It is in our interest, that is true, because when we have a stable world then we have a stable democracy and we can grow and prosper. In the meantime, these are dollars from Canadians, through Canadian banks, which will enable these things to happen.

I would sincerely hope that the concerns raised so eloquently by the hon. member for Malpeque and other speakers to this bill will be taken into account as well as the concerns about the government's scattered approach.

It is my sincere hope that what we are doing will make sense, that we will enable the economic, political, and social development and the rebuilding of the infrastructure in those countries that will help all the world, not just ourselves.

As I looked at the buildings in the east that need so much and as we hear and know about the initiatives that will be required, I hope that this creative expression in terms of culture, new enterprises and economic links with the west will provide the channels for ideas and help so the strong roots of democracy will develop in this region. This is why the Liberal Party supports this kind of initiative in principle, to help these countries and their economies come back to life after nearly half a century of stagnation and in many cases decay. We hope, as this process moves forward at legislative committee, that a more comprehensive plan will emerge from this government to help Eastern Europe today. It is only then that Canadians can be proud to lend their money with great

pleasure and joy so that the role we play in the emerging of a new Eastern Europe will reflect that of our own history of commitment to social justice, economic opportunity for the individual, freedom and human rights around the world.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a very short comment and ask a question of my colleague.

I have two concerns. The first is to ensure that as we direct, in whatever form, more assistance toward central and Eastern Europe, as we should, that at the same time we do not forget the other needy people of the world. There is a concern in the Third World that this might happen.

I am a member of *l'Association internationale des parlementaires de langue française* and when we go to Europe, this is often a subject raised by our colleagues from the poorer nations. Those Third World nations need our assistance so very much. I think particularly of some of the African countries. I want to express first of all that concern and invite my colleague to comment. Second, if we can come back to the central and Eastern European region, these new emerging democracies—and some of them are not quite democracies yet, some are well on their way and others might get there—and I thinking of Romania, for instance, on which the jury is still out on whether or not it has succeeded. We hope, of course, that it still can. Romania, in particular, is one of the poorer nations of the new group of countries and very much in need of assistance. It certainly has not satisfied me yet that it is a democracy but hopefully, it will be on its way there.

The thought I had about central and Eastern European countries is that there is a responsibility incumbent upon all of us in the western democracies to ensure that we do everything we can to make those countries into democracies and to provide assistance so they do not fail in the process, particularly economically.

I cannot help but think of what is going on right now in the Soviet Union in respect to food rationing. I heard a comment recently on the radio about an interview with a Moscow woman who had gone to no fewer than 10 drugstores to find cough medicine for her child and had not been able to find any.

• (1200)

If we fail to provide assistance, and hopefully this will not happen, but one wonders if, through our non-assistance if we do not provide help, we are giving the opportunity for some other totalitarian group to seize power in those countries on the pretext that: "Democracy is obviously not working. Look at how badly it has failed you so far and the prospects of improving are no better."

Those are the two concerns that I had and I invite my colleague to comment on those.

**Mrs. Finestone:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Glengarry—Prescott—Russell. He always has both interesting remarks and intelligent questions to pose.

With respect to Eastern Europe, as a last closing remark on that particular issue, one of the concerns on the scattered approach that the government has developed is the fact that it will not know which door to knock on. Should it be the IMF door, the door that leads to the World Bank, or the door that is going to lead to the European Bank.

Yes, there are some problems and certainly we are well aware of what is going on in terms of food, medicine, and infrastructure, and it is a growing concern. It is such a new phenomenon that we are mobilizing as best we can and I hope as effectively as we can.

With respect to the Third World countries, it is very interesting to note that Canada became a partner of the Organization of American States and took up its seat which would enable our better input into the Latin American scene. I was pleased to note that.

I know quite well that excellent programs are going on and our help is being given through the IDRF, which is the International Development Research Fund, headed by Mr. Ivan Head.

I personally visited in the barios in the slums of Chile and saw an incredible project which is funded by Canadians on children's diarrhoea. The dehydration and the diarrhoea which is of long-term effect is one of the major causes of the high death rate among children in Third World countries. The research being done, funded by Canada and others, is very important and I hope we will keep that up. It was a very interesting look at how Chile and how Canada, in this instance, have worked together in the interest of the people *malgré, comme on dit*, given the political situation at that time.

I have visited and am well aware of the CIDA programs in places in Africa. When I was critic for the status of women and in Nairobi for the 10th anniversary, I saw some incredible projects which Canada is financing with respect to agriculture, with the integration of young women into the decision-making processes at different levels. I saw the work being done by Match-International which is a wonderful volunteer agency that builds wells, and helps small projects such as tie-dying in marketing and merchandising the products of women in those countries.

Yes, there is lots to do. There is lots to do here in Canada so that we can be economically stronger, so that we can then add more and help more, both through example as well as in concrete goods and services.

I think we are trying our best. There are still things to be done. The world is far from perfect and on this planet of ours some day, perhaps—

[*Translation*]

like the Little Prince, we will see a beautiful garden blossom.

[*English*]

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Mr. Speaker, the member for Mount Royal mentioned her involvement in IPU. Could she share with us her position on the IPU and whether the IPU has discussed how to help the Soviet Union and eastern Europe in its recovery?

Briefly, I have a second question. She mentioned that in her riding, like mine, she has Canadians of Russian, Polish, Ukrainian, Yugoslav, Bulgarian, Hungarian descent and made an excellent recommendation to the government. Why not use their expertise because they know the culture and they speak the language? In her many years in the House, does she recall any examples of where the government of the day has actually used that expertise from her riding?

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The hon. member for Mount Royal. You have two minutes.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Finestone:** Mr. Speaker, with respect to the member's last question, yes, I do know of some. Particularly in relation to Poland, one of my constituents has been very involved and very helpful as a matter of fact. Other constituents came during the elections to help in Romania, in particular, and in Poland and in Hungary. I do not know that we used their expertise in that case.

With respect to the international organization, I have been fortunate enough to have the support of my colleagues of the House and am the vice-president of the Canadian Interparliamentary Union. I take very seriously that commitment and I thank my colleagues for their support in that regard.

At what is known as the western caucus, the 12-plus, we have spent two full meetings looking at how we can collaborate and co-operate together in the interest of the emerging democracies. That is where I hear the word NEDS, the newly emerging democratic societies, and where I hear the new word NIC, the newly industrialized countries.

It has been my particular privilege to chair two committees. One was on the Bulgarian-Turkish situation, in fact, where I was asked to come back and monitor the borders because we did such a good job.

I have also chaired the decolonization committee on the world level, which has not been an easy thing to do, but I must say we have had great forward movement. We have seen Namibia, South Africa, and we are looking at the Malvinas in terms of the islands off of Argentina. There was an agreement on the western Sahara by Algeria and Morocco which was very moving and important. The nomination came from Turkey, supported by Indonesia and Iran.

I find all this ironic and wonderful. Yes, I have enjoyed very much IPU and yes, it is very interested in this issue.

**Ms. Catherine Callbeck (Malpeque):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to be able to speak in favour of seconding reading of Bill C-88 and referring it to a legislative committee.

This bill would ratify Canada's participation as a founding member in the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. This legislation raises many important issues and many important questions dealing both with economic policy and foreign policy. Today, I want to deal generally with the economic or financial issues raised by Canada's membership in the bank. I will leave foreign policy questions to other speakers from this side.

I want to say from the outset that we in the Liberal Party strongly support the principle of helping Eastern Europe reconstruct and develop. In this respect, we support the principle in Bill C-88. However, we are not satisfied with the government's approach to explaining to the opposition and to Canadians what this new regional bank will do for Eastern Europe and how it will change Canada's economic policy on this region.

The issue of keeping parliamentarians informed is crucial, because we have a duty to ensure that our approach to helping Eastern Europe is the best and most efficient one possible. The urgency and seriousness of the problems there require nothing less than our best effort. The government's financial situation also requires nothing less than a well thought-out plan.

Certainly, the events which have taken place in central and Eastern Europe over the past year or so have been remarkable. The year 1989 will long be remembered as the year of European revolution. The Berlin Wall crumbled, the Iron Curtain disintegrated, authoritarian governments collapsed, and a new Europe was born.

• (1210)

New democracies are being created as we speak. These new democracies require new political, social, and of course economic institutions if they are to fulfil the promise held out by those remarkable events of 1989. Canada has a special relationship with the people of this region. We want to see them succeed in their task of building a strong and prosperous Europe.

Eastern Europeans themselves, to be sure, are working hard to realize their vision of a free and prosperous land. Internationally, countries such as Canada have a role to play in helping them to their feet, especially economically.

The Canadian approach has been somewhat scattered with respect to helping Eastern Europe develop and rebuild. With the establishment of this new bank, there will be no fewer than four different sources of Canadian funds flowing into this region: through the bank itself; through the G-24 group of countries; through the G-7 group of countries; and through bilateral programs.

The G-7, as we know, includes not only Canada and the U.S., but also Japan and other major industrialized economies. The G-24, of course, is a larger group and generally includes European, North American, and other countries that belong to the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development.

There are many questions that must be raised about the effectiveness of using such a scattered approach to development funding, such as how do we maintain control and co-ordination of these efforts.

We certainly have a lot of questions about this legislation. We are looking forward to reviewing it when it gets to a legislative committee. I must say that one of the reasons that we have so many questions is the government's apparent reluctance to inform adequately the opposition with respect to the bill. No effort was made on the government side to offer the traditional briefing for opposition members of the legislature. We had to ask for one. There was very little information that we received by way of background notes, and we also had to ask for those.

We understand that the creation of this new bank has occurred very quickly. Just one year ago, it was only an idea. Departments involved have been very busy co-ordinating Canada's participation, but there is really no excuse for not keeping the opposition informed.

As I said earlier, we certainly support the principle of the bill, of helping reconstruct and develop central and Eastern Europe. Nevertheless, we have a number of questions about this legislation. These questions deal with the reasons for creating a new bank specifically for that region and the government's approach to Canada's participation in that institution. I believe that these

questions must be answered, and the best possible approach must be taken by the government because of the tremendous importance that I attach to our efforts in Eastern Europe.

The remarkable events of this region are intensely personal for millions of Canadians who have roots there. Many have ties of language and family. Few other nations possess the web of intense personal connections to Eastern and central Europe which we have in Canada and, to some extent, in my province of Prince Edward Island.

In my riding alone, there are families who come from Poland, Ukraine and Hungary. In fact, one in 10 Canadians have origins in central or Eastern Europe. This gives us a special interest and a special capacity in helping these countries become prosperous and free.

We also have a large social and economic interest in the success of central and Eastern Europe. Canada's prosperity and our peace of mind depends to a large extent on this success. As a trading nation, for example, we are dependent on trade for 30 per cent of our economy. While most of this trade is with the United States, the markets of both Eastern and western Europe will be important to Canada's economic future. The unifying market of western Europe and the vast and untapped markets of Eastern Europe both hold immense economic potential.

This is why I raise many questions about this legislation, not because we oppose the spirit of helping the reconstruction and development of Eastern Europe, but because Parliament has a right to be informed and to debate fully Canada's economic strategy for this region.

The government's share of this new bank is worth about $460 million. Although the government says it will only have to pay about $150 million over five years, Parliament should be aware that we are looking at a potential investment of close to half a billion dollars.

These dollar figures themselves should highlight the importance of getting complete answers to these questions and others that Parliament may wish to raise.

The first question obviously is "Why a new bank"? Before Canada commits itself to participating in a new institution, with an expected bureaucracy of anywhere from 250 to 1,000 employees, dependent on your source, Parliament should ask why existing institutions cannot do the job.

There are several international banks and other financial institutions already established, such as the International Monetary Fund, the European Investment Bank, the Bank for International Settlements and the World Bank, which would seem to serve the purpose given to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development which this legislation is setting up.

The World Bank is actually the short name given to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, a name which suggests a purpose similar to that of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

I have heard several reasons why this separate bank is required. Some argue that these other international bodies are often dominated too much by the United States, while they note that in this new bank, the United States will only hold 10 per cent.

Some also say that this new European Bank will be able to develop an understanding and expertise with respect to Eastern European banking that no other commercial or outside institution could hope to match.

Finally, the argument is raised that institutions like the International Monetary Fund deal mainly with Third World countries and that their expertise is not really adapted to Eastern Europe.

I would like the government to explain, in the context of a legislative committee, why it thinks a new bank should be started from scratch. I want it to explain why an institution like the European Investment Bank, which is already operating in Europe, could not have a better understanding of the local economy than an institution like this European Bank, which is starting from scratch. As for American influence, the United States will be the largest single shareholder of the new bank. The American government has already played the central role in writing the bank's constitution.

• (1220)

A second question is not just why a new bank, but why a bank at all? In other words, now that Eastern European countries are opening up to private investment, could western companies and financial institutions not help these countries jump-start their economies? It is interesting to note that even before the dramatic effects in this region in 1989, official aid to the region, for example, loans guaranteed by government and government-established institutions had started to decline and the level of loans which were not guaranteed by governments started to increase. We are also seeing increases in the private sector investment in the region. As recently as the beginning of 1988, there were only 165 joint ventures involving western businesses in central and Eastern Europe. By the fall of 1989, there were 2,100. That is a large increase. In 1988, it was 165 joint ventures but in 1989, we had 2,100.

Now that Poland and Hungary have allowed foreign companies to own a majority of the shares in a project they are involved with, the number of joint ventures and private investment should increase.

Clearly, the government must explain to Parliament why some combination of these existing institutions and private investments would not be sufficient to help Eastern Europe before we give them the okay to create another institution with its large bureaucracy.

I would now like to briefly summarize and conclude. Not long ago, we observed Remembrance Day. Canadians could reflect on what is happening now all across Europe. In doing so, they could not help but acknowledge the historic role our war veterans played in making possible what we see today.

I would like to repeat my party's support for the principle of Bill C-88. I want to emphasize that we in the opposition have a number of important concerns about how the government is going to participate in this new bank. We would like to see these concerns addressed in a legislative committee.

We believe that Canada has a special role to play in Eastern Europe and that our participation is necessary, not only for that region's success but for our country's long-term prosperity as well. I look forward to a thorough and productive examination of this bill in committee.

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the hon. member for Malpeque for such an in-depth analysis of this proposed bill.

We heard how the government side refused to share any information with the opposition. Yet, it wants speedy passage. I do not understand its strategy because if it wanted speedy passage, surely it would have shared full information with both parties on the opposition side.

My question is: Why does she feel the government wants to railroad this bill through so quickly? It was brought in on a Friday and there was no minister to introduce or explain it. There were no speakers put up and no questions were answered today. They are all sitting there like bumps on a log.

I do not know why they are sitting here. They should not collect their pay for yesterday and today. That is what taxpayers sent them here for, to debate important bills like this. Not one has opened his or her mouth. As I say, when they sign that monthly salary sheet, I hope they will deduct the appropriate salary for themselves in all honesty and credibility.

I ask the hon. member why she feels there is this urgency to pass this bill through and her frustrations of not receiving the information. Does she have any other concerns such as some of the money siphoned off for Third World countries? She mentioned all the existing financial institutions already. What about the loans to Eastern Europe that are outstanding?

I know she only has eight minutes to answer all of these, but I would appreciate her views on some of these questions and concerns.

**Mrs. Callbeck:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question.

As I said earlier, it certainly has been very difficult to get information on this legislation. This is why I am really looking forward to getting it into a legislative committee. I have many questions that I want to get answers for. I look forward to that.

I also have some concerns. He has asked me if I have other concerns. Yes, I have, but I did not have time to address them in my main speech. I will address some of them now.

Certainly, I know that the government has said that the $150 million will not come out of the official development assistance budget. Does it represent $150 million that Canada cannot invest in regional banks that help poor countries in Latin America and Africa?

I think that question is very important, because the standard of living in those regions has actually decreased during the 1980s by 10 per cent in Latin America and 25 per cent in Africa. If we look more closely at Latin America, we see that its debt problems are sometimes far worse than Eastern Europe, except for countries like Poland and Hungary.

Some Latin American countries have debt to GNP ratios of four times those of Eastern European countries. That is a very high level of indebtedness combined with a reluctance to lend by private banks which lost a great deal of money in the regions during the 1980s making Latin America a region which appears to need our help at least as much as Eastern Europe, if not more.

That certainly is one of my main concerns that I want to address in the legislative committee.

Another question that I certainly will want to propose is what effect Canada's participation in this bank will have on our existing loans to countries in central and Eastern Europe. I think before setting up a new bank that will lend even more money to these countries, we have to ask how they are going to manage the old debt, and what is their capacity to handle new debt.

I think these are important questions because these countries already have incredible debt loads. As a whole, Eastern Europe has a gross debt of almost $100 billion. Poland alone has a gross debt of at least $40 billion and Hungary, more than $20 billion; Bulgaria, $9 billion.

Canada with at least $3 billion outstanding is Poland's fourth largest creditor. Canada also has agreed to reschedule part of this debt, representing a loss of hundreds of millions of dollars in forgone payments.

Certainly the extreme economic problems in Poland and in these other countries demanded such extreme measures. I think before we go ahead and lend hundreds of millions more, Parliament should ask about the state of our existing loans to countries of this region.

• (1230 )

We recognize the change of government in many of the east European countries but we also have a duty to Canadians to ensure that good money does not follow bad. When we are looking at the issue from the point of view of the lenders, we have to ask how Canada will manage and co–ordinate its aid to Eastern Europe.

As I noted earlier, there were at least three different ways, and with this bank four different ways, in which this government is giving aid to countries in this region. This scattered approach with regard to various types of departments and organizations is quite evident, for example, when one reads the press clippings put out by the governments of Eastern Europe. We had a press clipping on May 25, 1990 wherein the government announced participation in the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and that the Minister of Finance and the Secretary of State for External Affairs were to play key roles.

Then, on May 29, we had a statement about the line of credit established between Canada and the U.S.S.R. Canada's trade minister announced a new agreement. There we had the involvement of another minister.

On July 4, 1990, we had the statement that Canada expanded assistance to central and Eastern Europe. Canada's external affairs minister announced new funding for this region through the G–24 group of countries.

Here we have ministers from three different departments and two different organizations, all making announcements that affect Eastern Europe. This seems to be typical of the government's scattered approach in this area.

I repeat, as I said earlier, my agreement with the principle of helping the newly freed countries of Europe to get on their feet, but I must say that before the House gives permission to create another level of aid to central and Eastern Europe, the government must explain how well its current system is working and how it fits into the setting up of this new bank. We should also ask how much of an investment the government thinks that our participation is going to be.

I know my time is running short. The hon. member asked if I had any other concerns about this legislation. I hope that what I have outlined here has answered his question. I have other points which time does not allow me to elaborate on, but I will look forward to raising them in the legislative committee.

**Mr. Joe Fontana (London East):** Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a unique opportunity for me to stand in this House to speak on a very important matter such as the development and reconstruction of central and Eastern Europe. It is for each and every one of us to play a part in seeing something come to reality such as the economic rejuvenation of central and Eastern Europe.

Many of us in our constituencies across this country have people who have come from Eastern and central Europe, namely Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria. They have come here at various times in our history to contribute much to the multicultural fabric of this country. Of course we have been pleased with the fact that they have brought their unique cultures and their energy to help us build our own country. We have been very fortunate.

I have been very fortunate in London, Ontario to have people from across central and Eastern Europe come who have come to our various communities to help build the country. Yet all of us, over the past number of years, know about the conditions their families and friends have had to put up with in Eastern and central Europe, the kinds of politics they have had to put up with, and the kinds of undemocratic principles that their governments essentially put upon them.

This really is a unique opportunity not only to help our own citizens in this country and their families and friends, but it is a unique opportunity for this country to do essentially what it did for western Europe. It is another opportunity to help, to put out a helping hand to Eastern and central Europe.

Therefore, it is a pleasure for me to stand and support Bill C–88, which will ratify Canada's participation as a founding member in the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. With the historic crumbling of the east bloc military alliance and the fall of modern communism in the east central and Eastern European nations, Canada welcomes the creation of a new bank which we hope will finance the transition of Eastern Europe from communism to capitalism. Now that we have taken down the fences that have divided us for so many decades, we must not turn our backs on our neighbours during this crucial and critical time in their existence.

Economic problems will plague central and Eastern European nations as they struggle to make the transition from a command economy to a totally private economy. This bank will not be the panacea, but it will be the spark toward international co–operation and development for Eastern and central Europe. Each and every person in Eastern and central Europe has gone through many difficult years. The road to recovery and economic prosperity, as we understand it in Canada, will not be an easy one for them. That is why it is essential to see this new financial mechanism in terms of being able to provide support to the governments that have now renounced their political and economic philosophies and to the people who overturned these autocratic and dictatorial regimes, in their efforts toward economic prosperity for themselves and their families. A strong Eastern and central Europe will make for a stronger world and a stronger Canada, because we will do an awful lot of trading and business with people from Eastern and central Europe.

Economic difficulties should not sabotage the historic changes that are currently taking place in central and Eastern Europe. The developed countries of the world are creating a bank that hopefully will act as the catalyst toward the evolution of economic development. Canadians welcome the opportunity to be part of this endeavour to aid central and Eastern Europe.

Bill C–88 is the enabling legislation for Canada's participation in the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The bank will be capitalized, as we understand it, at $12 billion, contributed by 40 countries. Canada would contribute $30 million each year for five years. Even though this is not clear, hopefully the legislative committee, when it has the opportunity to study the bill, will ask some very pointed and direct questions of the government in terms of our true contribution.

That $30 million each year for five years will represent 3.4 per cent of the EBRD's capital base. This will ensure Canada at least a seat on the board of directors of the bank.

The EBRD is really the first major international capitalist institution that includes the Soviet Union as a full member. The bank is the only institution of its kind in which shareholders include governments of both east and west. Therefore it is a unique endeavour by the international community to co-operate in the reconstruction of central and Eastern Europe. Perhaps this may be a model by which the world can deal with other areas of the world in terms of bringing forward economic development and prosperity. It is an important first step toward integrating reform-minded eastern countries into the world economy.

• (1240 )

The EBRD will direct investment dollars to the development of private business in those central and Eastern European countries that are reforming their political institutions. Only 40 per cent of the funds available from the bank will be available to government borrowers, as we understand it. This money can be used for the development of infrastructure, such as road, rail, telecommunications, and construction, especially transportation infrastructure necessary to carry their food to the marketplace so that the people of eastern and central Europe have food at the table.

By limiting the amount available to the government planners, the EBRD is trying to avoid the problems that arose in the 1970s when central and Eastern European countries directed their loans to unproductive enterprises that left them crippled with debt. As has been previously mentioned, Hungary and Poland are still struggling under the burden of these debt payments. Poland has the worst debt load, with payments on principal and interest accounting for 88 per cent of that country's exports in 1989.

Given that the debt problem in these countries is serious, it is heartening to see that 40 nations are willing to pool their resources in order to finance the economic changes that are taking place in central and Eastern Europe. I will give one example. Mexico, a country with a significant debt problem of its own, is one of the 40 investing nations that will participate in this European bank.

The goals of Bill C-88 are worth-while ones. However, there are a number of questions and concerns that this government has failed to answer. As members on this side of the House have tried to point out to this government, it is rather curious that the government has had only one speaker on this bill. It essentially wanted to ram it through the House, without consideration by a legislative committee.

Let us hope that it is not this government's intent to pull the wool over Canadians' eyes with respect to their hard earned tax dollars going into this European bank. Hopefully the government really wants to get on with moving this legislation through in the most expedient way.

However, it is rather curious that the government has not at least answered some of our questions and concerns. As we have previously indicated, this House is in favour of this bill because it has some fundamental principles that we agree with. It is rather curious to see that the government has not tried to help us support it, but in fact it has tried to pull the wool over our eyes and in turn over Canadians' eyes.

The sole function of the bank, as we understand it, is to finance Eastern European countries and their fledgling markets. Canadians accept that such a financial institution will develop a specialized expertise and knowledge of the region which no other commercial bank or financial institution can match.

As my friend from Parkdale—High Park indicated, perhaps we ought to use the unique characteristics of our own country and the contacts of people living here who have bridges in Eastern Europe. In this way we can make sure that the dollars Canadians are contributing to this bank and through that bank to the people will go toward helping the men and women in those countries in terms of their own private economic development or private sector development which will hopefully provide the necessary jobs that eastern and central Europeans will need.

What is not clear is whether the work of the EBRD will be matched by work that has already been undertaken on a bilateral basis and by a number of other financial institutions. I think that point has been made over and over again. There needs to be a discussion as to whether or not we are creating another massive bureaucracy and whether or not we can truly co-operate and co-ordinate our activities in a number of ways to ensure that the dollars in the bureaucracy will not be eaten up by duplication and triplication of function and purpose.

A number of financial agencies are actively involved in lending in the central and Eastern European region, as we know, today. The World Bank plans to lend up to $7.5 billion over the next three years. The International Monetary Fund is prepared to provide $1.5 billion U.S. in loan and stand-by agreements to address the debt problems. The OECD countries have pledged billions of dollars in financial aid to central and Eastern European countries. Therefore, we have a number of questions. Will the EBRD's activities interfere with these efforts in any way? Will the EBRD's activities affect the the amount of aid being made available by these other organizations? Is the EBRD simply a European-run financial institution that will mimic the functions of other international organizations?

These are serious questions which should be answered before Canada commits millions of dollars to this bank. If the government knows the answers to these important questions, why is it operating in a closet and keeping Canadians uninformed about their own investments? Hopefully the legislative committee will give the government and the people an opportunity to look through this window of opportunity in Europe that we all seem to agree is absolutely necessary.

The bank, as we understand it, with the staff of 1,000, will be located in London, England. A full time 23-member board of directors will manage the day-to-day operations of the bank, and will represent the shareholders.

As now planned, salaries paid to the directors and their staff will represent fully 25 per cent of the bank's salaries. Surely we want some definite answers to questions with respect to this area of the bill.

It would be a waste of time and money to create the EBRD if the aid from all 40 nations could just as easily have gone through one of the already existing international financial institutions. Guarantees should exist that the organization's mandate will ensure no duplication of effort.

As I said before, this is a unique instrument and a unique opportunity. Perhaps one could clarify and even use it as a role model in the future.

Canadians want guarantees that the functions of this financial institution will not be identical with any other already existing institutions. In providing this aid to central and eastern European countries, are we taking away much-needed assistance that would have gone to the developing countries.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, while this country talks generosity and caring, this government over the past four or five years has reduced its commitment to the developing countries around the world. Let us hope that the $150 million which has been pledged over the next five years is not going to be taken away from our programs and policies for helping those in the developing world.

Therefore, why is the government not being clear on this issue? We would hope that the government will be forthcoming during the committee hearings and address this important issue also.

Canadians also want to know where this money is coming from. Is this aid being taken at the expense, as I indicated before, of other countries?

Another issue that has not been addressed even though it is in the functions of the bill is sustainable development. I think my friend for Parkdale—High Park has indicated that if we are serious about the environment, if we are serious about the kinds of development dollars that will go to central and Eastern Europe, then surely the idea of sustainable development should be in the purpose of the bill, and not necessarily as No. 7 on the functions of the bill.

Surely we have matured to the point that sustainable development must be key in terms of development. Therefore, it must be made clear that any dollars that this bank will be lending to central and Eastern Europe will support a sustainable environment.

Currently central and Eastern Europe have a number of serious environmental problems. Those problems endanger the health of its own citizens and in fact of other citizens of the world.

Economic development of these countries cannot continue if it will ignore the environmental issues that are currently being addressed internationally. Economic development cannot occur at the expense of good health. Economic development cannot occur at the expense of the environment. Investments and loans should be tired to sustainable development. Hopefully, our person on the board of directors will carry that message strongly and firmly. Mr. Speaker, despite certain clarifications that I am sure will be addressed by the legislative committee, we have a unique opportunity to support the people and the grassroots movements across eastern and central Europe in the countries that in fact brought about the political changes, the changes to the governments of these countries.

• (1250)

The people of eastern and central Europe have suffered for 45 years under undemocratic, dictatorial governments. They need to be shown that the rest of the world is behind what they have done. It is these people who have borne the brunt of political and economic philosophies that have failed miserably over the past 45 years. One only has to witness the long lines to get food for the table of most of these central European countries. One only need look into the eyes of the people who have been deprived of hope, dreams and freedom for years.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see that the bill addresses and ensures that the contracting parties must be committed to democratic principles, multi-party democracies and human rights and other principles that this country believes in and was built on.

In addition, the bill in purpose and function addresses those certain principles that are absolutely important to the proper and orderly function of this particular bank.

Mr. Speaker, that purpose and those functions talk about sustainable development. I hope it is not merely the small print but really is the philosophy that will be taken seriously by the board of directors of this new bank.

It is important for us to offer that helping hand, not to make these countries and the people yet dependent on another group, but to provide them with the necessary assistance to help them help themselves. If they were denied freedom, hope, and dreams before, let them understand and know that we are there so that they can believe in hope, believe in dreams, and believe in freedom and democracy. This may be one small way of showing we are serious and are with them and are prepared to help and fight with them.

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the hon. member for London East for his excellent speech. The member has indicated in clear and unequivocal terms the reasons why he is supporting Bill C-88, an act to provide for the membership of Canada in the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Unfortunately, due to arrangements that have been made by representatives of all three political parties not all of us will be permitted the opportunity to indicate the reasons why we individually support Bill C-88.

In the few moments I do have prior to members of Parliament dispersing to have their lunches in the opulent parliamentary restaurant, I would like to associate myself with the comments of the hon. member for London East and perhaps to put a very brief question to him with respect to this bill.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, and you are in another life associated with the Conservative Party, the government has chosen for some inexplicable reason not to participate in this debate. This bill was given first reading on October 22, 1990. Here we are on December 4, 21 days to Christmas, about 15 shopping days left to Christmas, and—

**Mr. Boudria:** And a partridge in a pear tree.

**Mr. Nunziata:** —the government is anxious now to have this bill sent to a legislative committee. Over the period of time since this bill was introduced in the House, the government has not provided the opposition with information necessary for the opposition to formulate its position.

Granted the opposition will have opportunities at the legislative committee stage to consider the full ramifications of this bill.

The government has in a very deliberate and inexplicable fashion failed to provide essential and vital information to the opposition. In order to secure the support of the opposition, the government ought to be more forthcoming not only with the Liberal Party but also with the New Democratic Party and the Bloc quebecois, the Reform Party, and the independent members in the House. They have the prerogative not to put up any speakers. We see a number of Conservative members in the House today. They have chosen to remain silent and not to contribute.

I would like to ask my colleague from London East, who has articulated my views to a *t* on this particular bill, to explain why the government is not participating, contributing, or co-operating in the passage of this legislation. As he put it, it is a significant step forward in showing how Canada is ready, willing, able and prepared to assist in the reconstruction and development of Eastern Europe. Canada has a significant role to play.

Canada has always been at the forefront in the democratization of Eastern Europe. Now Canada, with this bill, will provide for its membership in the European Bank for the Reconstruction and Development. Perhaps the member can, in the 30 or 40 seconds that he has, explain why the government is not co-operating.

**Mr. Fontana:** Mr. Speaker, I sometimes would like to be a fly on the wall of the caucus room of the government to see exactly how it thinks and operates. I am sure a number of Canadians would also like to do that. In fact, I wish I was their group therapy counsellor from time to time. I am sure that I could help them out.

There are two ways of looking at the question. One is that the government is very supportive and therefore, does not feel that it needs to do anything but allow this to go to a legislative committee, even though we were told that it did not want to do that.

Second, if we wanted to be cynical, some of us might think that this government is embarrassed by this bill and it really does not want to talk about it because it silently does not support the bank, and therefore support the people of central and Eastern Europe.

I tend to think that the government is very supportive. It has been curious that it has not stood up and really talked about this great opportunity for this country to wave the flag in central and Eastern Europe. You would have thought the members would be very proud to do so. I am hopeful that they will see the light, and at third reading, a great number of them will speak very proudly about their own bill and about the fact that Canada will stand with the eastern and central European people as they develop into a strong and democratic society.

**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 referred to a legislative committee.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

---

## AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

# STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*English*]

### PUBLIC SERVICE

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, the President of the Treasury Board is producing a white paper on Public Service 2000 to be released in the near future and a new round of consultations will begin. The glaring question is: Will this round be the same one-sided, cynical, dictatorial exercise the task force process has been?

I want to remind the government that any initiative to overhaul the Public Service will only be successful if the employees are on side, and if they are allowed to take their rightful places as partners in reform. PS 2000 is doomed to failure if the government continues to charge ahead with its own agenda, imposing on employees what it thinks is good for them. The government's patronizing "trust us, we know best" attitude only feeds employees' cynicism.

Since the Prime Minister sees such benefits in setting up committees, I suggest he turn over the white paper on Public Service 2000 to a special committee of Parliament for third-party review, as recommended by the Public Accounts Committee. Only then will PS 2000 be a truly democratic process.

* * *

[*Translation*]

### VISUALLY IMPAIRED

**Mr. Marcel R. Tremblay (Québec Est):** Mr. Speaker, I trust you will forgive this departure from my usual modesty if I inform my colleagues in this House of an idea that, though I say so myself, is original, useful and humanitarian.

*S. O. 31*

On November 26, I had the pleasure of launching my new business card which has the distinction of being printed in French, English and braille. When I saw the reactions of the people at the Louis-Hébert Centre, a rehabilitation centre for the visually impaired in my riding, and especially after hearing their comments, I realized how moved they were by this gesture.

Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues would do well to follow this example and help the visually handicapped become more independent.

* * *

[*English*]

## MADAM JUSTICE BERTHA WILSON

**Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and sadness that my caucus colleagues and I pay tribute to outgoing Supreme Court Justice, Madam Justice Bertha Wilson.

Time and time again this crusader used the law to benefit those Canadians who most need it, the traditionally discriminated against. She did not apologize for helping to feminize those aspects of Canadian law in which she found "gender-based myths, biases and stereotypes", and there are many. The flurry of sexist remarks recently spouted by male judges from the Northwest Territories to the Maritimes only bears out Madam Justice Wilson's observation.

That is why, whether or not the Prime Minister appoints a woman to fill her shoes—and he would be wise to do so—I call on him to see Madam Justice Wilson's retirement as an occasion to announce mandatory gender-sensitization training for all Canadian judges. This would be a real tribute to a woman of real vision.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Yvon Côté (Richmond—Wolfe):** Mr. Speaker, for a long time the GST has been criticized and treated with contempt, and this was largely because of a slur campaign conducted by Jean Chrétien and his party members, in the Senate and the House of Commons, and the scare tactics they used.

However, we have seen some positive reversals of positions on the GST quite recently. For instance, the Consumers Association of Canada has just recognized the benefits of a tax that is both visible and fair. Furthermore, the Federation of Automobile Dealer Associations of Canada is circulating petitions asking Mr. Chrétien and his followers to end the filibuster in the Senate because of the substantial savings they will enjoy under the GST.

And finally, quite recently, several senior citizens federations from Eastern Quebec have been circulating petitions in support of the GST. The idea is gaining ground, Mr. Speaker, that the GST will be good for everyone, for Canadians and for Canada.

* * *

[*English*]

## IRAQ

**Mr. Rex Crawford (Kent):** Mr. Speaker, in Chatham, Ontario, yellow ribbons are being tied on trees and placed in restaurants until the Canadian hostages are home from Iraq.

Linda Titus from my riding has a brother, Jim Squire, who is a hostage at the Canadian Embassy in Baghdad. Linda is urging us not to forget the human element in the Persian Gulf crisis. She has written the Prime Minister and President Bush to do whatever it takes to help our hostages home.

We also praise the mercy mission by the three MPs whose fine efforts got five hostages out, while more than 40 remain.

As the world community combines forces to see a resolution, the yellow ribbons in Chatham signify to Jim Squire and the other hostages that "we haven't forgot about you". As the military build-up continues, I urge the government to remember the human side, the families and people like Linda Titus, who are personally affected by this crisis in a far off land.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## TEXTILE AND GARMENT INDUSTRY

**Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond):** Mr. Speaker, I was glad to hear that an agreement is expected in the textile and garment sector, at the GATT talks. This is a very important area, because the textile and garment industry, which is considered extremely vulnerable to international competition, generates 160,000 jobs in this country. It is the driving force of the economy in my riding, with 5,000 jobs involved.

Mr. Speaker, during these talks we must ensure that the Canadian position is harmonized as much as possible with that of the United States, since the industry faces three major trade challenges. It is already at a disadvantage because of our exchange rate, interest rates and inflation.

As a result of the Free Trade Agreement with the United States and elimination of the Multi-Fibre Arrangement by July 1991, the degree of integration of the textile and garment sector achieved at the GATT talks should guarantee producers a climate of stability so that we can safeguard our investments and attract new investment to Canada.

* * *

[*English*]

## FORESTRY INDUSTRY

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, logging practices in British Columbia are so bad that a few months ago a forester from Europe was prompted to say that if such practices were adopted there, foresters would be put in jail.

Forests are not there to be plundered, leaving wildlife suddenly without food and shelter, and leaving rain to wash away topsoil and property, threatening human lives and highways. Forests are more than just supplies of lumber. Once cut, new forests take a long time to grow again and under certain conditions do not renew themselves at all.

When will decision-makers in forestry practise what they preach about sustainable development? When will governments learn to manage Canada's forest resources for future generations? When will the "cut and run" philosophy at last be replaced by the "manage and sustain" philosophy?

[*Translation*]

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mrs. Monique Tardif (Charlesbourg):** Mr. Speaker, at a press conference yesterday, the Consumers Association of Quebec acknowledged that the Canadian and Quebec GST and the accompanying tax credits will make the tax system fairer to many families.

For instance, a family with two incomes totalling $30,000 will spend $1,125 less in 1992.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, in a letter to Jean Chrétien, Mr. Pierre Ratté, assistant manager of Qué-Bourg Auto in Charlesbourg, focussed on the reprehensible attitude of Liberal senators and stressed that this legislation must come into force on January 1, 1991, as planned.

In the present economic situation, the delays caused by the Liberal senators have increased the level of uncertainty among business people and consumers and seem to make light of the substantial investments already made to conform to GST requirements.

[*English*]

Let the message go directly to the Liberal senators. It is the last chance for them to get back to Charles Dickens' *Christmas Carol* and, like Scrooge, stop blocking the delivery of GST rebate cheques worth $600 million to some eight million low and middle-income Canadians. It is time to act now for the economic benefit of all Canadians.

* * *

## THE CONSTITUTION

**Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians are disgusted by the tactics used by the Prime Minister in trying to impose his constitutional solutions on the country. The scare tactics, the back-room dealing, the blackmail that was used to pressure Canadians into accepting a deal on which they had never been consulted—all of these have brought about the cynicism that we see in Canada today.

Yesterday's exchange between the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition only reinforces this sense of malaise. The sight of two old buffaloes trying to gore each other makes me sad.

The old parties have never trusted Canadians to give them a say on their own Constitution. For 123 years Liberal and Tory executive federalism has assumed that only the elite count in this country. We have progressed from the royal decrees that used to issue from Pierre Trudeau to the Atlantic City tactics of the present Prime Minister.

The Liberals and Conservatives have played out their favourite games, one guy hiding under the pool table while the other one rolled dice. It is time they started to stand up for Canada first ahead of their schoolyard games.

* * *

## CHILD POVERTY

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, the Social Planning Council of Ottawa-Carleton released stunning statistics this fall. These statistics are based on the 1986 census before we entered this made-by-the-Tories recession. Things are worse than in 1986.

Fourteen per cent of all children under the age of 18 years in Ottawa-Carleton live in poverty without enough money for basic requirements. This figure rises to 24 per cent in the city of Ottawa and 31 per cent in the city of Vanier in my riding. Almost one in every three children lives in poverty in the city of Vanier.

• (1410)

Further, 29 per cent of all single-parent families in Ottawa-Carleton are poor, and among single-mother families, 33 per cent are poor.

As a long winter approaches and storms begin to howl around us, it is necessary to take steps to help these children and their families who live in poverty in the Ottawa area. To combat child poverty, the federal government should, first, reform policies to better support working families; second, establish a national day-care system; third, fully index children's benefits, including refundable and non-refundable child tax credits and the family allowance; and last, change its regressive child care expense deduction into a tax credit.

[*Translation*]

## TRIBUTE TO MARTIN NOËL

**Mr. Gabriel Fontaine (Lévis):** Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to our young university students, especially those in business administration, commerce and accounting.

I particularly wish to congratulate Martin Noël, of the municipality of Bernières in the riding of Lévis, who ranked first in Quebec on the examination of the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants.

My congratulations also extend to those who, directly or indirectly, helped him achieve this level of excellence.

* * *

[*English*]

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the government a report by the accounting firm of Ernst and Young released yesterday which states something I and other New Democrats have been saying for a long time—the GST will be particularly harmful to Canada's north.

In conjunction with the Brunelle commission which will eliminate the northern tax allowance for thousands of northern communities, the effects of the GST will make living in Canada's north a very difficult task.

In case the Minister of Finance did not know, the cost of basic goods and services is much more expensive in northern Canada, which means that the GST will cost more to residents of the north.

In light of this report, I call on the government to scrap plans to eliminate the northern tax allowance for many northern communities effective January 1, and to scrap the GST altogether.

* * *

## HOUSING

**Mr. Bob Hicks (Scarborough East):** Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that housing is the corner-stone of a decent and liveable city. I do not have to tell you that in the city of Toronto, we do not have enough decent housing that people can afford. Demand for housing has far outstripped the supply, particularly the supply of modest housing the people of metro can afford to buy or rent.

I am pleased to say that the federal government, through Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, along with the Ontario government, are each giving the Housing Exposition Corporation, Housexco, a $40,000 grant to examine the feasibility of organizing a world housing exposition to be held in Toronto in 1997.

With the $80,000 in grant money, Housexco proposes to work with community leaders, builders, and architects to explore the idea that in 1997 Toronto could be the site of a world housing exposition that would show creative and innovative housing designs drawn from Canada and throughout the world.

Who in the world could question Toronto as the site of a world housing exposition?

* * *

## PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

**Mr. Harry Chadwick (Bramalea—Gore—Malton):** Mr. Speaker, landing fees at Pearson International Airport are a bargain compared to their international counterparts which charge from two to four times our price. But space, after all, is an airport's most valuable resource.

Several of my colleagues have recently risen in the House to ask the minister to decrease landing fees so that smaller aircraft from other regions of Ontario can continue to fly into Pearson. Where should the priority lie? It is not a question of big business rolling over the little guy. It is about common sense and developing alternatives. It is time to accept that Pearson can no longer accommodate all air traffic in the region.

I encourage the Minister of Transport to look toward the development of airports outside of Pearson, which will create an efficient aviation system and will generate additional benefits for the region. These airports are willing and, with the right development, capable of accommodating the air traffic that Pearson International can no longer serve. It just makes sense.



## SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, the deceptive practices of the government are disgraceful. Since tabling the Supplementary Estimates on November 23, the government has consistently stated that extra moneys were required to fund the gulf war.

The President of the Treasury Board has tried to suggest that everything in the Supplementary Estimates had been planned, including over half the money, $2.5 billion required to pay the additional interest on the public debt. Why was this required? Because the Minister of Finance in his budget speech ignored opposition advice that high interest rates would continue throughout this year.

Manpower Temporary Service, which prepares employment forecasts, says that predicted hiring trends in January, February, and March 1991 present the most dismal picture in its 13 years of conducting its employment outlook surveys. This government-induced recession, which the minister seeks to conceal behind a shower of press releases, is a disgrace that should be consistently exposed.

---

# ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

## THE CONSTITUTION

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

In his announcement last Sunday, the Prime Minister indicated that he intends to set up a special joint committee of the House and Senate to look into changing the formula for amending our Constitution. Just a few weeks previous, the Prime Minister in this House announced the creation of a royal commission, headed by Mr. Spicer, to hear Canadians on the whole area and manner of constitutional change.

Does the Prime Minister's announcement last Sunday about setting up a new special joint committee of the House and the Senate mean that Canadians will not be able to express their views to the Spicer commission on the matter of constitutional amendment and the commission will not be able to consider this aspect of constitutional change? If so, is this not contrary to the spirit in which the Prime Minister spoke in this House when he created the commission headed by Mr. Spicer?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Not at all, Mr. Speaker. In fact, when the Spicer commission was appointed, I think I discussed in the House a number of fundamental questions that I thought the commission would be interested in considering, some of the most fundamental questions of Canadian values and the matters that continue to bind the nation together. They ranged from institutional change which was strongly requested from western Canada to the appropriateness of the existence of a notwithstanding clause in a constitutional document which is designed to protect minority rights. These were fundamental questions that I thought, among others, would be examined by the Spicer commission.

There is nothing at all in that mandate which precludes the possibility of consideration there or opinions expressed there relating to section 38 of the Constitution Act, 1982. But I always felt that it would be appropriate that that problem be given special attention. The idea of appointing a joint Senate–House of Commons committee to consider the matter and to invite participation, criticism, and observations from Canadians across the country surely is consistent with what my hon. friend and, I think, all members want, namely, the greatest degree of public participation in the parliamentary and constitutional process.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** The Prime Minister speaks of public participation. Will he assure this House and the Canadian people that Canadians will be able to appear as witnesses before the special joint committee of the House and Senate that he has proposed and that it will not be another closed–door operation? Furthermore, will he assure this House and the Canadian people that if Canadians are able to appear before the special joint committee and they wish to express their views on constitutional change, in addition to the matter of amending the Constitution and the formula for it, they will not be limited to that narrow question and will be able to express their views on the whole area of constitutional change and development for this country?

• (1420 )

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary committee will be established with a difficult question in mind. For those of us who have been through it, the question of amending a constitution during the three–year time period raises a great deal of difficulties. This has been expressed by most, if not all, of the participants in constitutional reform over the last seven or eight years.

The object of the exercise is to deal specifically with this very serious problem, but committees of the House can establish their own rules. I know that no one is interested in cutting off anybody's input in regard to improvements to the Constitution or to the parliamentary process.

I understand that the House leader is meeting this afternoon with other House leaders to agree upon its composition and the manner in which it might operate. I am sure that all parliamentarians would welcome the input of Canadians both on this and on other matters.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, since the procedure for changing the amending formula for our Constitution requires the unanimous consent of all the provinces, how does the Prime Minister intend to go about obtaining this unanimous consent once the joint committee's report is tabled? Furthermore, does the Prime Minister promise to act on this report, in addition to giving it his approval, or is he going to shelve it as he did with the Charest Committee's report?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** How, Mr. Speaker? I assume there are several ways to obtain unanimity. In 1987, we obtained unanimity when 10 provincial premiers, the Prime Minister and the three major parties in the House of Commons agreed to support the Meech Lake Accord. So it was practically unanimous.

The problem at the time was not how to obtain unanimity but how to preserve that unanimity over a three–year period, during which provincial governments might change. In fact, new premiers came on the scene and rejected the agreement approved previously by their predecessors. This is a serious dilemna for anyone who wants to see Quebec become part of the Canadian Constitution, on reasonable and honourable terms. Obviously, a different procedure is required. We obtained unanimity on the Meech Lake Accord in 1987. The problem was to preserve it, as changes occurred at the provincial level, and that is what the parliamentary committee will have to deal with.

**Hon. André Ouellet (Papineau—Saint-Michel):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. The new initiative announced by the Prime Minister on the weekend did not, unfortunately, meet with the kind of unanimous support he hoped to see. In some circles there was even a certain amount of scepticism about this new government initiative. I realize the Prime Minister either did not have time or did not think it appropriate to consult the Leader of the Opposition or the Leader of the New Democratic Party on creating this new committee.

However, I would like to know whether he took the time to consult with some of his provincial counterparts, and more specifically, whether he received some indication from the Government of Quebec of its political will and its support for this new initiative by the government.

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, our decision was based on a number of recommendations and observations that have been made by provincial premiers and members of this House for quite some time regarding the strictures of Section 38 of the present Constitution. For years, many parties have stressed the paralysis that ensues as a result of implementing this provision.

We had an example quite recently, and I am referring to last June, when we had a quasi-unanimous consent. One of the premiers refused to put the question to a vote before his legislative assembly. Hence the consequences we see today. We must avoid this in future, if at all possible. Because of this concern, which I am sure the hon. member shares, the parliamentary committee will start sitting as soon as possible.

**Hon. André Ouellet (Papineau—Saint-Michel):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister knows full well that over and above the amendment formula issue there is another basic question in the minds of Canadians from coast to coast, in Quebec, out west or elsewhere in the country: changing the distribution of responsibilities, dealing now with a new distribution of powers between the central government, the provinces, and even the municipalities. That is where the problem lies and I wonder why the Prime Minister would establish a parliamentary committee to debate the amending formula when he should strike a parliamentary committee to look into the real, problem, which is the distribution of responsibilities. Why did he not appoint such a committee? Will he not reconsider his decision and make sure that the parliamentary committee tackles the real issue, that is the redistribution of powers between the federal government and the provinces?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I agree with my friend that indeed the country has to come to grips with a new and very important question of distribution of responsibilities. I share my friend's point of view. Still we must not lose sight of the fact that hardly a few months ago the five modest and minimal conditions spelled out by Quebec were considerd by some Canadian leaders as being much too revolutionary to be acceptable to the central government or to other provinces, and therefore that minimum was rejected at the time.

So we are looking at two issues, one fundamental, the other procedural. First of all we must deal with the procedural matter in the coming days, and I quite agree with my friend that in due time in the not too distant future the Parliament of Canada will have to deal with a much more pressing issue. Those people who barely a few months ago said that the Meech Lake Accord contained overly expensive conditions will now have to re-examine the problem from a different perspective.

* * *

## POVERTY

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Prime Minister. Yesterday the Prime Minister said the number of children living in poverty has gone down. Yet ever more people across Canada rely on food banks to be able to feed their family until the end of the month.

Mr. Speaker, whatever the Prime Minister may suggest, one out of six children in Canada still lives in poverty. In Montreal, St. John's, Halifax, Winnipeg, the number of people lining up at food banks has increased since summer's end.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister, because this situation is alarming. What will the Prime Minister do to avoid this catastrophy?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, my friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party raised this issue yesterday, and I would suggest that the statistics I gave concerning the downward trend in poverty in Canada are encouraging. Some 956,000 Canadians have benefitted from government policies and now live above the poverty threshold—333,000 women and 299,000 children. Can we do more? Yes, of course. As far as I am concerned, one Canadian child living in poverty is one too many. Our national commitment should be to do everything we can to make sure that our children grow up in economically sound conditions, and this can be done by eliminating problems associated with poverty.

* * *

• (1430 )

[*English*]

## THE ECONOMY

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with the Prime Minister that there is a need to have a plan to fight poverty in this country and to fight the recession in this country that this government's policies have created.

About a year ago I stood in this House and brought to the attention of the government that it must act immediately on behalf of Canadian farmers who at that time were facing economic devastation. Agriculture Canada has predicted a 25 per cent decline in farm incomes and a staggering 68 per cent decline in Saskatchewan alone.

If we are to attack poverty in this country and if we are to attack the recession in all of the sectors of this economy, will the Prime Minister start by committing his government today to a permanent sensible income support program for farmers, including debt restructuring? In the event of the collapse or the breakdown in the GATT talks for farmers, will he tell this House if he has a contingency plan for farmers as the U.S. does?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture)):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague raised an important question, but I must remind her that a federal-provincial conference was held in Winnipeg a few weeks ago to look at all aspects of the Canadian farmers' income. In that regard, we have already put in place a plan for the Advance Payment Enhancement Programs and the farmers will receive money very soon.

We also launched two programs, Mr. Speaker: the GRIP and the NISA, that had been more than a year in the making as part of the comprehensive review of agricultural policy.

We had discussions with the provinces and we are about to sign agreements with each of the provinces that have agreed to share with us the long term financing of the programs, for the benefit of the Canadian farmers.

You must realize that agriculture is a divided jurisdiction. By that we mean that the provinces have to do their fair share. Over the past few years, we responded very positively to the farm producers' requests, Mr. Speaker. As we speak, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of State for Grains and Oilseeds are defending the interests of our farm producers in Brussels.

[*English*]

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Prime Minister.

There is a serious question about child poverty in this country. There is a serious question about the fate of farmers, whether we are even going to be able to have food self-sufficiency in this country. There is no question that the recession is deepening. Unemployment rates are predicted to climb to over 9 per cent.

When the Prime Minister looks at the figures which indicate that we could even be in a worse position now than in the Liberal-created recession of 1981-82, what is he going to do? What kind of a plan is he going to propose to get us out of this recession? Will he consider establishing an all-party committee to attack the recession in this country and to talk about a real economic plan for this country?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to my hon. friend that if she has any concrete ideas in regard to the manner in which the economy can be improved, the House and the government would be more than delighted to hear from her.

**Mr. Murphy:** Stop the GST.

**Mr. Mulroney:** My hon. friend says: "Stop the GST". That is typical NDP. Anything to modernize the economy and to make Canada more competitive internationally, the NDP is against. That is why it is going to stay in opposition forever.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Mulroney:** Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend does a very serious disservice to the House by suggesting that the difficult times we are in have equalled or surpassed the recession and depression of 1981–82.

We are talking right now about an 8 per cent or an 8.5 per cent unemployment rate, which compared with some 13 per cent or 14 per cent then; a 4.2 per cent inflation rate, which compared with 13 per cent or 14 per cent then; and a 12.5 per cent bank rate, which compared with 22 per cent and 23 per cent then.

What we have going now are some difficult economic times that we are in the process of working our way out of, while maintaining a non-inflationary climate. It is very important that inflation be wrung out of the economy because otherwise, if we followed some of the ideas of my hon. friend, the people who would be most hurt—

**Mr. Speaker:** I think it is time. We should go on.

* * *

## THE ECONOMY

**Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Supply and Services.

The unemployment rate in the city of Cornwall has risen to 15.5 per cent. We all know that the Canadian economy is in a recession, the deficit is soaring, interest rates are high, and the GST will boost inflation further.

I want to ask the minister who represents eastern Ontario what new programs he is prepared to announce to help the people of this region who lost their jobs through the economic mismanagement of his government.

**Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that in eastern Ontario alone over $20 million have been put into that region this last year for Community Futures.

We have had expansions at various areas in northern Ontario and eastern Ontario; northern Ontario thanks to FEDNOR and eastern Ontario thanks to a series of initiatives that have been taken by the department of industry, for example. We have the Goodrich expansion. We have high-tech expansion along the suburbs of the Ottawa perimeter. Above all, we have also created in eastern Ontario more jobs in the last two years than were created in the first two years of the 1980s.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas):** It is a disgrace, Mr. Speaker!

I will try again to ask a question of the minister responsible for eastern Ontario. We asked the government repeatedly to come up with an economic development plan for eastern Ontario. Given the 15.5 per cent unemployment rate in Cornwall, the loss of over 3,000 full time jobs in the communities of Cornwall, Hawkesbury and Renfrew in the past two years, will the minister tell us when his government is going to implement an economic recovery plan for eastern Ontario?

[*English*]

**Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asks about Cornwall specifically. Under the Community Development Program and the Community Futures Program, approximately $12 million have been earmarked for Cornwall, Hawkesbury, Prescott, Russell, Renfrew, and the Smiths Falls area.

I can be more precise about ISTC programs. The department of industry has committed in the last year more than $18 million toward economic development in eastern Ontario. This is a good record, a record that this government can be proud of.

## CIDA

**Mr. David Walker (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs, in the absence of the minister responsible for international aid.

In its annual report CIDA has long claimed that its relationship with non-governmental organizations is based "on mutual respect and equality". Yet today one of its major suppliers, one of its major partners, the World University Services of Canada, was forced into receivership.

Since CIDA knew for several weeks of the difficulty this organization was in, will the minister please explain to the House why the government was not able to assist this organization through some difficult times?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, representatives of CIDA did in fact have extension discussions with representatives of the World University Services of Canada. We very much regret that this has happened to the organization.

The hon. member will understand that despite the closeness of our relations with non-governmental organizations and our determination to rely on them and to help them, we cannot take responsibility for the finances of independent organizations.

What we have done is work very closely to ensure that necessary steps are in place to ensure that students in Canada under WUSC auspices and WUSC volunteers overseas are not adversely affected.

• (1440 )

If the hon. member has other practical suggestions as to steps that might be taken which recognize the independent financial status of WUSC Canada and other non-governmental organizations, I would certainly be interested in hearing them.

**Mr. David Walker (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the same minister.

Although there is an independence involved in the organization, there is also a responsibility on behalf of the government to the Canadian taxpayer and a responsibility to the international aid community to protect the reputation of Canadian groups. In this light CIDA failed to do both.

Will the minister reiterate his commitment that people working for this organization overseas will not be stranded and that students studying in Canada will be protected in terms of their incomes, air fares, and other expenses?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I reject the hon. member's observation about CIDA, as I am sure he will on reflection. I repeat the undertakings that I have given.

* * *

## THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment.

The minister knows that the federal government has just slapped massive new closures on the harvest and consumption of fish, shellfish, and waterfowl around six B.C. pulp mills due to dangerous levels of dioxins and furans, costing both jobs and food.

Since it is known that these poisons are dangerous, since there are 106 pulp mills in Canada outside British Columbia pumping the same contaminants into the water, and since these poisons are finding their way up to 1,000 kilometres downstream and in other areas of Canada, would the minister explain why it is that the public in no other province has been given similar health alerts to those given in B.C. last week?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I can tell you that this program has been done co-operatively with the province. It is a program that we are doing elsewhere in the country.

In the case of B.C., the decision was reached after the studies were concluded. We can also say that quite a bit of progress has been accomplished over the last few years, but these studies are coming at this point and we are taking steps to ensure that public safety is maintained.

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, I take it the minister is telling Canadians that the dioxins and furan levels in fish, shellfish, and waterfowl in other areas of the country are safe.

My supplementary question is for the same minister. Since the former Minister of the Environment promised this House on June 16, 1989 new pulp mill regulations "no later than 1990" and that "there would be no concessions for violators", how does the minister justify violating both promises and allowing all pulp mills to continue dumping poison until 1994, and loopholes for some that will carry them beyond 1994?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, we are not doing that.

* * *

## HEALTH

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

In reply to a question yesterday raised in this House on user fees and extra billing, the minister of health failed to assure Canadians explicitly that these were not future options for Canada.

Would the minister now stand and explicitly assure Canadians that they do not have to worry about ever paying user fees and extra medical bills?

No evasive answer, please; just a simple reassurance to Canadians.

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may have missed the answer yesterday. The question was: "Did we have any plans whatsoever to change the Canada Health Act as it related to extra billing?". The answer was no.

What the Minister of Finance assured the House yesterday—and it was the assurance that I gave the House as well—was that there was a continuing, strong federal role for medicare for the future.

We believe that the system of shared responsibility for health care in Canada, where provinces have the priority and responsibility in terms of delivery of services but where national standards are met, is a good system for Canada, something that we are determined to preserve.

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, I am certainly pleased to hear that the minister is equally convinced of the virtues of medicare.

Since the Canadian Council on Social Development in its most recent publication said: "Bill C-69, (forced by this government through this House last June 12), would accelerate funding cutbacks for medicare so that federal money to the provinces for this program would be reduced to about zero by the year 2004", thereby killing medicare, would the minister, to be both convinced and convincing to Canadians, pledge to this House today that he would prevail on his cabinet colleagues to abandon Bill C-69?

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance made it quite clear yesterday, and it was quite unequivocal, that there was a continuing federal responsibility in the funding of medicare. We continue to feel that it is important for the federal government to be present and for national standards to be set. As well, we want to stress the fact that the federal government has shown leadership in a whole range of areas in order to protect the health of Canadians.

I was expecting, frankly, when the hon. member got up today, that he was going to ask a question with regard to the Gemini that was won last night by the Federal Centre for AIDS, among others for the superb video talking about AIDS, as an example of leadership that is shown by the federal government in health care.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. A report commissioned by provincial and territorial ministers and released yesterday confirms what northerners and my colleagues on this side of the House have been saying all along about the GST; the GST will unfairly punish northern residents.

Municipalities, schools, hospitals, small businesses, and consumers in the north will be harder hit by the GST than elsewhere in Canada.

Will the minister admit today that northern Canadians will pay more of this unfair tax, and will he agree to reduce this unfair tax burden on northerners by exempting northern energy and transportation costs from the GST?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the report here and I quote from it: "Most resource and export based industries in the north will gain from the zero rating of exports and the elimination of taxes on business imports".

They go on to say that these gains could, not be offset by inflation induced by the GST, a rise in the Canadian dollar or other matters.

But the conclusion we have come to is that the GST over-all, not focusing in on individual aspects of the GST but taking the over-all impact of the GST, is that it will be beneficial to those people living in the north.

**Ms. Ethel Blondin (Western Arctic):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the same minister. First of all, let us get it straight. There is not exactly booming resource development in the Northwest Territories at this point. Next, we live in a very pre-industrialized area so those tax credits do not really apply to the north.

My supplementary question has to do with the essential expenditures in the north on transportation, energy, and housing which will be more costly. As well, the tax credit is clearly inadequate for northern residents who pay 40 per cent more for the cost of living.

Will the minister admit that the tax will have an extra cost burden on the north, and will the minister take immediate action to exempt the north from this tax?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, there are a number of projects that are quite healthy these days. We are talking about Norman Wells, Cyprus Anvil Echo Mining, and a number of other projects.

I am not suggesting for a minute that everything is going as well as my hon. friend would like it to go. What we are working on right now with the land claims, with the fact that the GST will reduce the cost of new investment, will make it easier to bring on new projects. These projects in aggregate are going to be major beneficiaries of the GST. It will generate income. It will generate new jobs. It will generate even greater activity. That is the impact and the benefit we believe the GST will have over-all on those people who are living in northern communities.

## SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair):** Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Finance. Canada's position with respect to science and technology is already among the worst in the industrial world. Now Roy Woodbridge, who is the president of the Canadian Advanced Technology Association, has said that this government's high interest policy has made investment in new advanced technology almost impossible in Canada, and it is making it necessary for many high-tech firms to consider moving from the country, as many already have.

Now that the Minister of Finance has succeeded in causing a recession, is it also his intention to destroy the scientific and technological restructuring necessary for long-term industrial recovery?

• (1450 )

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I think the statement by my hon. friend would come as a very serious surprise to the 40 members of the National Advisory Board on Science and Technology with whom I spent three or four hours last week. They represent the research and development, business and university communities across Canada. They recognize that while Canada does lag behind some of our important competitors in terms of productivity and in some areas of research and development, they indicated at that meeting the remarkable strides that had been made by this government with Centres of Excellence, the Canada scholars program, and the general funding programs since 1984.

Bill C-22, for example, is a classic illustration where $1.3 billion of new investment will go into the pharmaceutical industries in Canada in research and development simply as a result of an important piece of legislation that passed this House and eventually passed the Senate. They indicated to us their desire to work closely with the government and with all parliamentarians to improve Canada's competitiveness. This is an important factor and I know that I can enlist the support of my hon. friend in that very important national objective.

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair):** Mr. Speaker, it appears we are making some progress. At least now we are getting the top guns on the other side talking about science and technology. We hope that there will be performance.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Is he familiar with the fact that two government reports have pointed out that in the Canadian automobile industry, first of all, there is a $1 billion deficit in the amount of R and D required to make the Canadian auto parts industry competitive and the second report points out that the reason for a lack of investment now has become the high value of the dollar.

Does this government have in place a program or a plan of action that will correct the situation that this government's monetary policy has caused which is hurting the development of research and development in this country?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I did not hear part of that.

**Some hon. member:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Mulroney:** In the part that I did hear, my hon. friend expressed surprise that as Prime Minister I would be dealing with science and technology. I am the first Prime Minister to have created and chaired a National Advisory Board on Science and Technology. In fact, at most meetings they say: "Where's Howard?"

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the right hon. Prime Minister could answer the question.

**Mr. Mulroney:** In point of fact, Mr. Speaker, there are deficiencies in terms of Canada's competitiveness that the National Advisory Board has pointed out. We are working very closely with them and the universities and research centres to correct these. There are areas of deep worry in regard to our productivity enhancement programs across Canada. That concerns all Canadians because it involves our job-creation capacity which is of great importance.

They did point out the fact, and I know my hon. friend would want me to conclude by mentioning this, that in terms of the federal government's fiscal policy, Canada has with the exception of Australia, the most generous fiscal situation for the attraction of investment capital for research and development in Canada.

[*Translation*]

## PORK PRODUCERS

**Mr. Jean Pierre Blackburn (Jonquière):** My question is for the Minister of State for Agriculture. The entire pork industry in the Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean region has fallen upon hard times and some 170 jobs are at stake. The federal government must act to save this industry.

My question is this: How are the discussions with the pork producers coming along? The idea of an exploratory market study was brought up, but it could take three or four months. What is being done to provide support to the producers and to the flour mills pending the results of the study?

**Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture)):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague did indeed submit this question to us a few weeks ago. I have since met personally with producers from the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean. I met representatives—

**Mr. Lapierre:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Blais:** I did. I think that I visited that area of the country more regularly than the members of the Bloc québécois, Mr. Speaker. At any rate, I do not need to take lessons from them.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Blais:** I do visit each area in Quebec and I think that our farm producers were never better represented than they have been by our government in the past six years.

Going back to my hon. colleague's question, representatives from the Department of Industry, Science and Technology, from Agriculture Canada and from the Farm Debt Review Board are presently in the Jonquière area to get together with producers and look at the steps that could be taken in the short term to help them as we did in the past, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

[*English*]

## GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

There has been much talk and attention on the current impasse between the European Community and other countries over subsidy proposals in the GATT negotiations. All Canadians are concerned about the implications for Canada should the current impasse continue.

What action is Canada taking to break the current impasse? What are the government's plans should these talks fail?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture called me this morning from Brussels where these talks are ongoing.

He, like a lot of others, is discouraged somewhat by the attitude of the European Community whose position, put on the table again yesterday, does not vary substantially from the disappointing position that it put out with regard to agricultural subsidies some months ago.

Last night, under the leadership of the Swedish minister who is chairing that subcommittee, there were a number of bilaterals in which our Minister of Agriculture is actively involved. We hope that this will break the deadlock of the unfair trade distorting subsidy attitudes that the community has adopted, which then provokes a counterpoint from the United States and places Canadian farmers in very serious jeopardy.

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture is working very carefully with all of his colleagues from the Cairns group to provoke a new offer from the Europeans which hopefully will get us out of this unacceptable cycle of heavy subsidies with which Canadian farmers and the Canadian treasury cannot realistically compete.

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk):** Mr. Speaker, we have heard nothing about the discussions concerning supply-management, despite the fact that the European Community and Canada seemed to have a basis for agreement.

The European Community has said that it wants to have a definition of Article XI that would allow countries with production quotas to maintain import controls.

Given the similarity between the European and the Canadian positions on supply-management, what has the Prime Minister done to get his American friends on side?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, Article XI was specifically discussed yesterday in Brussels. The Japanese, the Koreans, the entire Cairns group and most of the world's agricultural traders agreed with the position set forward by Canada in respect of Article XI.

That is the position that the Minister of State for Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture worked out in intimate consultation with Canadian agricultural producers. This is the one we have been defending around the world, and this is the one that is now achieving a wide degree of acceptance at Brussels.

If we maintain that degree of solidarity, Canada will prevail with its important position.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## THE CONSTITUTION

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Right Hon. Prime Minister and concerns the mandate of the Joint Committee on the Constitution. Will the committee, to be at all useful, prepare, as part of its mandate, a process for negotiations with a sovereign Quebec? Will the committee consider how one-on-one negotiations would be conducted, as demanded by the Government of Quebec? Will the committee be able to determine who will speak for English Canada when Quebec makes use of its right to self-determination?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, in my answers to the hon. member for Papineau—Saint-Michel and the Leader of the Opposition, I described what I felt was an acceptable mandate for the commitee. It is understood, however, that leaders of the various political parties will meet this afternoon to consider the details. Our purpose is to render more flexible a section in the Constitution which so far has tended to paralyze negotiations in this country. The ultimate goal, of course, for most members in this House is to find a flexible formula for the reintegration of Quebec as a full member of the Canadian family. All members in this House, with a few exceptions, support a united Canada.

• (1500)

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's answer is pretty much the same as Jean Chrétien's would have been.

What I want to ask the Prime Minister is this: Will he be realistic and give this committee a specific mandate to consider a scenario in which Quebec becomes master of its own destiny, to prepare English Canada for the reality he knows is imminent in Quebec?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, personally, as a Quebecer and as a Canadian, my position has always been that the best role for Quebec and for Francophones in Quebec— The best way to protect their aspirations is within a united Canada. That has been the case for 125 years. I think that if everyone showed a little more openness and leadership, this country would be able to find new formulas to protect and respect and promote this French fact which is very much alive and well on this continent.

Personally, with my colleagues from the various parties in this House, I wish to seek an appropriate and acceptable way for Quebec to say yes, of course, to Canada, and a formula that would enable Canada to say yes, once and for all, to Quebec.

* * *

## GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

**Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond):** My question is directed to the Minister of State for Agriculture and concerns the GATT talks. The outcome of the present talks will have a major impact on the economy of this country and especially on agriculture. Some countries have threatened to leave the negotiating table if more substantial progress is not achieved. Could the minister tell us what Canada expects will happen during the next few days which are supposed to be critical?

**Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture)):** Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister mentioned earlier, talks in Brussels have reached an impasse. Only two hours ago, the chairman of the GATT negotiating committee called another meeting of all parties to try and break the deadlock.



Like the Prime Minister, I had a conversation with the Minister of Agriculture a few hours ago, and we are very hopeful, because I believe that all of us, with the support of farm producers— Canadian farm producers were briefed by the Minister of Agriculture a few hours ago and they all support us at this time. The Canadian position is a balanced one that is in line with the expectations of Canadian farm producers, and we all hope the deadlock will be broken within the next few hours, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

[*English*]

## PRESENCE IN GALLERY

**Mr. Speaker:** I wish to draw to the attention of members, the presence in the gallery of Mr. Ivars Godmanis, Prime Minister of the Republic of Latvia, who is accompanied by Mr. Janis Jurkans, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Latvia.

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

* * *

## PRIVILEGE

### POSTAL SERVICE

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Mr. Speaker, according to Standing Order 48(1), regarding a question of privilege, the standing order states, and I quote:

> Whenever any matter of privilege arises, it shall be taken into consideration immediately.

It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I gave you notice this morning about my question of privilege which pertains to two letters which I received this morning, bearing an Ottawa stamp of December 3, 1990. I sent these two letters to my constituents in Parkdale—High Park one year ago less two days, December 6, 1989.

The government boasts about Canada Post being in the black and about its efficiency and yet it took one year for my letters to get to Toronto. The resident had moved. It took one year for the letters to be returned to me.

My question of privilege is that my work as a member of Parliament is being undermined when it takes Canada Post one year to return my letters from my constituents. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to look into this because this clearly is a denial of my privileges as a member of Parliament. Somehow, my frank was being totally ignored on these two letters.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has raised a matter which I think ought to be of considerable embarrassment. I wonder if the hon. member would let me take a look at the material. I may even have to have a further discussion about the matter.

I will take it under consideration and I will return back to the hon. member of the House if appropriate.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

### BROADCASTING ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Monday, December 3rd, consideration of Bill C–40, an Act respecting Broadcasting and to amend certain Acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunication, as reported (with amendments) from a Legislative Committee.

**Mr. Speaker:** It being 3 p.m., pursuant to an order adopted on Monday, December 3rd, 1990, the House will now proceed to the deferred recorded divisions on the motions at the report stage of Bill C–40.

Call in the members.

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Shefford rises on a point of order.

**Mr. Lapierre:** In effect, you are asking the House to proceed to a recorded division under a consent given on December 3rd.

I should like you to look closely at the procedure and the text of this motion which was adopted to the effect that at this time, upon request from the whips of the recognized parties, the result of some divisions would apply to a number of motions, according to the agreement announced by the said whips at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this type of agreement does not reflect at all the reality of the House. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask you to look into this very closely.

It may have been possible at a time when the three whips could get together as a privileged few and speak on behalf of ordinary members who, in some cases, were nothing more than voting machines. But this is no longer possible because there are in the House about a dozen members without any authorized whip to represent them.

Therefore, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to look again at the value of motions of this type within the context of the House and its membership as it is now. I refuse to be taken for granted by the whips of those other parties who are not authorized to speak on our behalf.

[*English*]

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations with the Whips. There will be ample opportunity for every member of the House to express their opinion on each of the motions. What the Whips have dealt with is the sense of the motion and about how many times we would actually have to collectively stand up.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you have called in the members and that we proceed with that 15–minute bell, at the conclusion of which my colleague across the way from the Official Opposition, will indicate the decision which the Whips are recommending to the House. If an argument must take place, that might be the appropriate time for it. I think we should proceed with calling in the members.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Lapierre:** Mr. Speaker, the government whip behaves as though he owned the right to vote of all the members of this House and as though the whip of the Official Opposition represented his party and tried to come to an agreement.

Mr. Speaker, what I am asking you to do is to look into the notion that we have to abide by the arbitrary decision of the Whips. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that I would not want to embarrass the House which is about to vote on such an important bill. I know that the Minister of Communication wants to use his time in Canada doing something other than spending his afternoon in the House. The fact is, however, that I feel this type of motion is unacceptable, in view of the current conditions prevailing in this House and I would not want ever again to be bound by such an agreement between three individuals who do not speak on behalf of independent members.

• (1510)

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, let us not get carried away. Yesterday, in this Chamber, we gave unanimous consent to a procedural order. I will not comment on the attendance of the hon. member, but I know that I was here, Mr. Speaker, and that the House gave its consent, recognizing that there must be some arrangement on the question of voting. The question now is whether or not we should vote, and I think we should. Then, we will have to decide if the vote just held should apply to another one. We will see then, Mr. Speaker, but I remind the hon. member that whips—and I am one of them—are responsible for the orderly conduct of the business of the House.

[*English*]

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I just want to bring to the attention of the hon. member for Shefford the fact that the motion last night is totally consistent with the rules and procedures of the House. Perhaps he would want to read citations 78(1), (2), and (3) of our Standing Orders.

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank the hon. members for their assistance to the Chair. The hon. member for Shefford is complaining.

[*Translation*]

He is complaining about the motions which, yesterday, received unanimous consent.

[*English*]

The hon. member may not be happy about it, but the fact of the matter is that the House passed the motion unanimously and I am not at all sure that there needs to be any further discussion about it. As a consequence I must proceed.

Call in the members.

• (1530 )

*And the division bells having rung:*

**Mr. Dingwall:** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous order which was adopted yesterday, there have been discussions among the Whips of the three respective parties, and there has been agreement that a vote on Motion No. 1 would apply to Motions Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, the amendment to 24, 24, 26, 27, 30, 32, 34, 36, 40, the amendment to 42, and 42.



[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please. The first question is on Motion No. 1. The result of the vote on this motion will apply to Motions No. 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24 and amendment, 26, 27, 30, 32, 34, 36, 40 and amendment, and 42.

• (1540)

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 317*)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Anawak |
| Arseneault | Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Bellemare |
| Benjamin | Black |
| Blackburn (Brant) | Blondin |
| Boudria | Butland |
| Caccia | Callbeck |
| Catterall | Clancy |
| Copps | Crawford |
| de Jong | Dingwall |
| Finestone | Flis |
| Fontana | Fulton |
| Funk | Gagliano |
| Gauthier | Gray (Windsor West) |
| Harb | Harvard |
| Heap | Hopkins |
| Hovdebo | Kaplan |
| Karpoff | Keyes |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) | Langan (Mission—Coquitlam) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | MacDonald (Dartmouth) |
| MacWilliam | Manley |
| Marchi | Marleau |
| Martin (Lasalle—Émard) | McCurdy |
| Mifflin | Milliken |
| Murphy | Nault |
| Nunziata | Pagtakhan |
| Parent | Parker |
| Peterson | Proud |
| Rideout | Rodriguez |
| Skelly (North Island—Powell River) | Skelly (Comox—Alberni) |
| Speller | Tobin |
| Volpe | Walker |
| Wood | Young (Acadie—Bathurst) |
| Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69 | |

NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Attewell | Beatty |
| Bernier | Bertrand |
| Bird | Bjornson |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blenkarn |
| Boyer | Browes |
| Campbell (Vancouver Centre) | Cardiff |
| Casey | Chadwick |
| Charest | Clark (Yellowhead) |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Cole |

Collins
Corbeil
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Gustafson
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hudon
James
Joncas
Koury
Lapierre
Layton
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
McDermid
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Worthy—114

Cooper
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Guilbault
Halliday
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
Jacques
Johnson
Jourdenais
Langlois
Larrivée
Lewis
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Moore
Oberle
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Shields
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Weiner
Winegard

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

I therefore declare Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 6 standing in the name of Mr. Young (Beaches—Woodbine).

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 318*)

## YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Caccia
Catterall
Copps
de Jong
Finestone
Fontana
Funk
Gauthier

Anawak
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bellemare
Black
Blondin
Butland
Callbeck
Clancy
Crawford
Dingwall
Flis
Fulton
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)

Harb
Heap
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Lee
MacWilliam
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Mifflin
Murphy
Nunziata
Parent
Peterson
Rideout
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Speller
Volpe
Wood
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69

Harvard
Hopkins
Kaplan
Keyes
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacDonald (Dartmouth)
Manley
Marleau
McCurdy
Milliken
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parker
Proud
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Tobin
Walker
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)

## NAYS

Members

Anderson
Attewell
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Boyer
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Casey
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Collins
Corbeil
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Gustafson
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hudon
James
Joncas
Koury
Lapierre
Layton
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
McDermid
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet

Andre
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blenkarn
Browes
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Cole
Cooper
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Guilbault
Halliday
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
Jacques
Johnson
Jourdenais
Langlois
Larrivée
Lewis
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Moore
Oberle
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Shields
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van De Walle
Venne

Vézina
Vincent
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Worthy—114
Vien
Weiner
Winegard

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 8 standing in the name of Mrs. Finestone. The vote on this motion applies to Motion No. 10.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 319)*

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Caccia
Catterall
Copps
de Jong
Finestone
Fontana
Funk
Gauthier
Harb
Heap
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Lee
MacWilliam
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Mifflin
Murphy
Nunziata
Parent
Peterson
Rideout
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Speller
Volpe
Wood
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69
Anawak
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bellemare
Black
Blondin
Butland
Callbeck
Clancy
Crawford
Dingwall
Flis
Fulton
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Harvard
Hopkins
Kaplan
Keyes
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacDonald (Dartmouth)
Manley
Marleau
McCurdy
Milliken
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parker
Proud
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Tobin
Walker
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Attewell
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Boyer
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Casey
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Collins
Corbeil
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Andre
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blenkarn
Browes
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Cole
Cooper
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dick
Domm
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Gustafson
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hudon
James
Joncas
Koury
Lapierre
Layton
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
McDermid
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Worthy—114
Dobbie
Dorin
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Guilbault
Halliday
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
Jacques
Johnson
Jourdenais
Langlois
Larrivée
Lewis
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Moore
Oberle
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Shields
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Weiner
Winegard

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare Motions Nos. 8 and 10 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 9 standing in the name of Mr. Waddell.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 320)*

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Caccia
Catterall
Copps
de Jong
Finestone
Fontana
Funk
Gauthier
Harb
Heap
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Lee
Anawak
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bellemare
Black
Blondin
Butland
Callbeck
Clancy
Crawford
Dingwall
Flis
Fulton
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Harvard
Hopkins
Kaplan
Keyes
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacDonald (Dartmouth)

MacWilliam
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Mifflin
Murphy
Nunziata
Parent
Peterson
Rideout
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Speller
Volpe
Wood
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69

Manley
Marleau
McCurdy
Milliken
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parker
Proud
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Tobin
Walker
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)

## NAYS

Members

Anderson
Attewell
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Boyer
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Casey
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Collins
Corbeil
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Gustafson
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hudon
James
Joncas
Koury
Lapierre
Layton
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
McDermid
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Worthy—114

Andre
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blenkarn
Browes
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Cole
Cooper
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Guilbault
Halliday
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
Jacques
Johnson
Jourdenais
Langlois
Larrivée
Lewis
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Moore
Oberle
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Shields
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Weiner
Winegard

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 12 standing in the name of Mrs. Finestone.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 321)*

## YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Caccia
Catterall
Copps
de Jong
Finestone
Fontana
Funk
Gauthier
Harb
Heap
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Lee
MacWilliam
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Mifflin
Murphy
Nunziata
Parent
Peterson
Rideout
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Speller
Volpe
Wood
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69

Anawak
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bellemare
Black
Blondin
Butland
Callbeck
Clancy
Crawford
Dingwall
Flis
Fulton
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Harvard
Hopkins
Kaplan
Keyes
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacDonald (Dartmouth)
Manley
Marleau
McCurdy
Milliken
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parker
Proud
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Tobin
Walker
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)

## NAYS

Members

Anderson
Attewell
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Boyer
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Casey
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Collins
Corbeil
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen

Andre
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blenkarn
Browes
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Cole
Cooper
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau

| | |
|---|---|
| Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Greene |
| Grey (Beaver River) | Guilbault |
| Gustafson | Halliday |
| Harvey (Chicoutimi) | Hawkes |
| Hicks | Hockin |
| Holtmann | Horner |
| Hudon | Jacques |
| James | Johnson |
| Joncas | Jourdenais |
| Koury | Langlois |
| Lapierre | Larrivée |
| Layton | Lewis |
| Littlechild | Loiselle |
| Lopez | MacDonald (Rosedale) |
| MacDougall (Timiskaming) | MacKay |
| Malone | Marin |
| Martin (Lincoln) | Masse |
| McDermid | McDougall (St. Paul's) |
| Monteith | Moore |
| Nicholson | Oberle |
| O'Kurley | Porter |
| Redway | Reid |
| Reimer | Ricard |
| Richardson | Roy-Arcelin |
| Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) | Shields |
| Sobeski | Soetens |
| Sparrow | Stevenson |
| Tardif | Tétreault |
| Thompson | Thorkelson |
| Tremblay (Québec-Est) | Turner (Halton—Peel) |
| Valcourt | Van De Walle |
| Vankoughnet | Venne |
| Vézina | Vien |
| Vincent | Weiner |
| Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia) | |
| Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) | Winegard |
| Worthy—114 | |

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 13 standing in the name of Mrs. Finestone.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 322)*

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Anawak |
| Arseneault | Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Bellemare |
| Benjamin | Black |
| Blackburn (Brant) | Blondin |
| Boudria | Butland |
| Caccia | Callbeck |
| Catterall | Clancy |
| Copps | Crawford |
| de Jong | Dingwall |
| Finestone | Flis |
| Fontana | Fulton |
| Funk | Gagliano |
| Gauthier | Gray (Windsor West) |
| Harb | Harvard |
| Heap | Hopkins |
| Hovdebo | Kaplan |
| Karpoff | Keyes |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) | Langan (Mission—Coquitlam) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | MacDonald (Dartmouth) |
| MacWilliam | Manley |
| Marchi | Marleau |
| Martin (Lasalle—Émard) | McCurdy |
| Mifflin | Milliken |
| Murphy | Nault |
| Nunziata | Pagtakhan |
| Parent | Parker |
| Peterson | Proud |
| Rideout | Rodriguez |
| Skelly (North Island—Powell River) | Skelly (Comox—Alberni) |
| Speller | Tobin |
| Volpe | Walker |
| Wood | Young (Acadie—Bathurst) |
| Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69 | |

NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Attewell | Beatty |
| Bernier | Bertrand |
| Bird | Bjornson |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blenkarn |
| Boyer | Browes |
| Campbell (Vancouver Centre) | Cardiff |
| Casey | Chadwick |
| Charest | Clark (Yellowhead) |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Cole |
| Collins | Cooper |
| Corbeil | Côté |
| Couture | Danis |
| Darling | de Cotret |
| Della Noce | Desjardins |
| Dick | Dobbie |
| Domm | Dorin |
| Epp | Fee |
| Feltham | Ferland |
| Fontaine | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gibeau |
| Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Greene |
| Grey (Beaver River) | Guilbault |
| Gustafson | Halliday |
| Harvey (Chicoutimi) | Hawkes |
| Hicks | Hockin |
| Holtmann | Horner |
| Hudon | Jacques |
| James | Johnson |
| Joncas | Jourdenais |
| Koury | Langlois |
| Lapierre | Larrivée |
| Layton | Lewis |
| Littlechild | Loiselle |
| Lopez | MacDonald (Rosedale) |
| MacDougall (Timiskaming) | MacKay |
| Malone | Marin |
| Martin (Lincoln) | Masse |
| McDermid | McDougall (St. Paul's) |
| Monteith | Moore |
| Nicholson | Oberle |
| O'Kurley | Porter |
| Redway | Reid |
| Reimer | Ricard |
| Richardson | Roy-Arcelin |
| Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) | Shields |
| Sobeski | Soetens |
| Sparrow | Stevenson |
| Tardif | Tétreault |
| Thompson | Thorkelson |
| Tremblay (Québec-Est) | Turner (Halton—Peel) |
| Valcourt | Van De Walle |
| Vankoughnet | Venne |
| Vézina | Vien |
| Vincent | Weiner |
| Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia) | |
| Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) | Winegard |
| Worthy—114 | |

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 14 standing in the name of Mrs. Finestone.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 323)*

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Anawak |
| Arseneault | Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Bellemare |
| Benjamin | Black |
| Blackburn (Brant) | Blondin |
| Boudria | Butland |
| Caccia | Callbeck |
| Catterall | Clancy |
| Copps | Crawford |
| de Jong | Dingwall |
| Finestone | Flis |
| Fontana | Fulton |
| Funk | Gagliano |
| Gauthier | Gray (Windsor West) |
| Harb | Harvard |
| Heap | Hopkins |
| Hovdebo | Kaplan |
| Karpoff | Keyes |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) | Langan (Mission—Coquitlam) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | MacDonald (Dartmouth) |
| MacWilliam | Manley |
| Marchi | Marleau |
| Martin (Lasalle—Émard) | McCurdy |
| Mifflin | Milliken |
| Murphy | Nault |
| Nunziata | Pagtakhan |
| Parent | Parker |
| Peterson | Proud |
| Rideout | Rodriguez |
| Skelly (North Island—Powell River) | Skelly (Comox—Alberni) |
| Speller | Tobin |
| Volpe | Walker |
| Wood | Young (Acadie—Bathurst) |
| Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—*69* | |

NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Attewell | Beatty |
| Bernier | Bertrand |
| Bird | Bjornson |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blenkarn |
| Boyer | Browes |
| Campbell (Vancouver Centre) | Cardiff |
| Casey | Chadwick |
| Charest | Clark (Yellowhead) |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Cole |
| Collins | Cooper |
| Corbeil | Côté |
| Couture | Danis |
| Darling | de Cotret |
| Della Noce | Desjardins |
| Dick | Dobbie |
| Domm | Dorin |
| Epp | Fee |
| Feltham | Ferland |
| Fontaine | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gibeau |
| Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Greene |
| Grey (Beaver River) | Guilbault |
| Gustafson | Halliday |
| Harvey (Chicoutimi) | Hawkes |
| Hicks | Hockin |
| Holtmann | Horner |
| Hudon | Jacques |
| James | Johnson |
| Joncas | Jourdenais |
| Koury | Langlois |
| Lapierre | Larrivée |
| Layton | Lewis |
| Littlechild | Loiselle |
| Lopez | MacDonald (Rosedale) |
| MacDougall (Timiskaming) | MacKay |
| Malone | Marin |
| Martin (Lincoln) | Masse |
| McDermid | McDougall (St. Paul's) |
| Monteith | Moore |
| Nicholson | Oberle |
| O'Kurley | Porter |
| Redway | Reid |
| Reimer | Ricard |
| Richardson | Roy-Arcelin |
| Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) | Shields |
| Sobeski | Soetens |
| Sparrow | Stevenson |
| Tardif | Tétreault |
| Thompson | Thorkelson |
| Tremblay (Québec-Est) | Turner (Halton—Peel) |
| Valcourt | Van De Walle |
| Vankoughnet | Venne |
| Vézina | Vien |
| Vincent | Weiner |
| Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia) | |
| Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) | Winegard |
| Worthy—114 | |

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 15 standing in the name of Mrs. Finestone.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 324)*

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Anawak |
| Arseneault | Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Bellemare |
| Benjamin | Black |
| Blackburn (Brant) | Blondin |
| Boudria | Butland |
| Caccia | Callbeck |
| Catterall | Clancy |
| Copps | Crawford |
| de Jong | Dingwall |
| Finestone | Flis |
| Fontana | Fulton |
| Funk | Gagliano |
| Gauthier | Gray (Windsor West) |
| Harb | Harvard |
| Heap | Hopkins |
| Hovdebo | Kaplan |
| Karpoff | Keyes |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) | Langan (Mission—Coquitlam) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | MacDonald (Dartmouth) |
| MacWilliam | Manley |
| Marchi | Marleau |
| Martin (Lasalle—Émard) | McCurdy |
| Mifflin | Milliken |
| Murphy | Nault |
| Nunziata | Pagtakhan |
| Parent | Parker |
| Peterson | Proud |
| Rideout | Rodriguez |
| Skelly (North Island—Powell River) | Skelly (Comox—Alberni) |
| Speller | Tobin |
| Volpe | Walker |
| Wood | Young (Acadie—Bathurst) |
| Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—*69* | |

*(Division No. 325)*

## NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Attewell | Beatty |
| Bernier | Bertrand |
| Bird | Bjornson |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blenkarn |
| Boyer | Browes |
| Campbell (Vancouver Centre) | Cardiff |
| Casey | Chadwick |
| Charest | Clark (Yellowhead) |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Cole |
| Collins | Cooper |
| Corbeil | Côté |
| Couture | Danis |
| Darling | de Cotret |
| Della Noce | Desjardins |
| Dick | Dobbie |
| Domm | Dorin |
| Epp | Fee |
| Feltham | Ferland |
| Fontaine | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gibeau |
| Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Greene |
| Grey (Beaver River) | Guilbault |
| Gustafson | Halliday |
| Harvey (Chicoutimi) | Hawkes |
| Hicks | Hockin |
| Holtmann | Horner |
| Hudon | Jacques |
| James | Johnson |
| Joncas | Jourdenais |
| Koury | Langlois |
| Lapierre | Larrivée |
| Layton | Lewis |
| Littlechild | Loiselle |
| Lopez | MacDonald (Rosedale) |
| MacDougall (Timiskaming) | MacKay |
| Malone | Marin |
| Martin (Lincoln) | Masse |
| McDermid | McDougall (St. Paul's) |
| Monteith | Moore |
| Nicholson | Oberle |
| O'Kurley | Porter |
| Redway | Reid |
| Reimer | Ricard |
| Richardson | Roy-Arcelin |
| Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) | Shields |
| Sobeski | Soetens |
| Sparrow | Stevenson |
| Tardif | Tétreault |
| Thompson | Thorkelson |
| Tremblay (Québec-Est) | Turner (Halton—Peel) |
| Valcourt | Van De Walle |
| Vankoughnet | Venne |
| Vézina | Vien |
| Vincent | Weiner |
| Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia) | |
| Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) | Winegard |
| Worthy—114 | |

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 17 standing in the name of Mr. Waddell.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

## YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Anawak |
| Arseneault | Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Bellemare |
| Benjamin | Black |
| Blackburn (Brant) | Blondin |
| Boudria | Butland |
| Caccia | Callbeck |
| Catterall | Clancy |
| Copps | Crawford |
| de Jong | Dingwall |
| Finestone | Flis |
| Fontana | Fulton |
| Funk | Gagliano |
| Gauthier | Gray (Windsor West) |
| Harb | Harvard |
| Heap | Hopkins |
| Hovdebo | Kaplan |
| Karpoff | Keyes |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) | Langan (Mission—Coquitlam) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | MacDonald (Dartmouth) |
| MacWilliam | Manley |
| Marchi | Marleau |
| Martin (Lasalle—Émard) | McCurdy |
| Mifflin | Milliken |
| Murphy | Nault |
| Nunziata | Pagtakhan |
| Parent | Parker |
| Peterson | Proud |
| Rideout | Rodriguez |
| Skelly (North Island—Powell River) | Skelly (Comox—Alberni) |
| Speller | Tobin |
| Volpe | Walker |
| Wood | Young (Acadie—Bathurst) |
| Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69 | |

## NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Attewell | Beatty |
| Bernier | Bertrand |
| Bird | Bjornson |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blenkarn |
| Boyer | Browes |
| Campbell (Vancouver Centre) | Cardiff |
| Casey | Chadwick |
| Charest | Clark (Yellowhead) |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Cole |
| Collins | Cooper |
| Corbeil | Côté |
| Couture | Danis |
| Darling | de Cotret |
| Della Noce | Desjardins |
| Dick | Dobbie |
| Domm | Dorin |
| Epp | Fee |
| Feltham | Ferland |
| Fontaine | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gibeau |
| Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Greene |
| Grey (Beaver River) | Guilbault |
| Gustafson | Halliday |
| Harvey (Chicoutimi) | Hawkes |
| Hicks | Hockin |
| Holtmann | Horner |
| Hudon | Jacques |
| James | Johnson |
| Joncas | Jourdenais |
| Koury | Langlois |
| Lapierre | Larrivée |

Layton
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
McDermid
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Worthy—114
Lewis
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Moore
Oberle
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Shields
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Weiner
Winegard

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 18 standing in the name of Mr. Waddell.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 326)*

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Caccia
Catterall
Copps
de Jong
Finestone
Fontana
Funk
Gauthier
Harb
Heap
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Lee
MacWilliam
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Mifflin
Murphy
Nunziata
Parent
Peterson
Rideout
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Speller
Volpe
Wood
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69
Anawak
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bellemare
Black
Blondin
Butland
Callbeck
Clancy
Crawford
Dingwall
Flis
Fulton
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Harvard
Hopkins
Kaplan
Keyes
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacDonald (Dartmouth)
Manley
Marleau
McCurdy
Milliken
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parker
Proud
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Tobin
Walker
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Attewell
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Boyer
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Casey
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Collins
Corbeil
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Gustafson
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hudon
James
Joncas
Koury
Lapierre
Layton
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
McDermid
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Worthy—114
Andre
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blenkarn
Browes
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Cole
Cooper
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Guilbault
Halliday
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
Jacques
Johnson
Jourdenais
Langlois
Larrivée
Lewis
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Moore
Oberle
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Shields
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Weiner
Winegard

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 19 standing in the name of Mrs. Finestone.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 327)*

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Anawak |
| Arseneault | Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Bellemare |
| Benjamin | Black |
| Blackburn (Brant) | Blondin |
| Boudria | Butland |
| Caccia | Callbeck |
| Catterall | Clancy |
| Copps | Crawford |
| de Jong | Dingwall |
| Finestone | Flis |
| Fontana | Fulton |
| Funk | Gagliano |
| Gauthier | Gray (Windsor West) |
| Harb | Harvard |
| Heap | Hopkins |
| Hovdebo | Kaplan |
| Karpoff | Keyes |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) | Langan (Mission—Coquitlam) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | MacDonald (Dartmouth) |
| MacWilliam | Manley |
| Marchi | Marleau |
| Martin (Lasalle—Émard) | McCurdy |
| Mifflin | Milliken |
| Murphy | Nault |
| Nunziata | Pagtakhan |
| Parent | Parker |
| Peterson | Proud |
| Rideout | Rodriguez |
| Skelly (North Island—Powell River) | Skelly (Comox—Alberni) |
| Speller | Tobin |
| Volpe | Walker |
| Wood | Young (Acadie—Bathurst) |
| Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69 | |

NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Attewell | Beatty |
| Bernier | Bertrand |
| Bird | Bjornson |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blenkarn |
| Boyer | Browes |
| Campbell (Vancouver Centre) | Cardiff |
| Casey | Chadwick |
| Charest | Clark (Yellowhead) |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Cole |
| Collins | Cooper |
| Corbeil | Côté |
| Couture | Danis |
| Darling | de Cotret |
| Della Noce | Desjardins |
| Dick | Dobbie |
| Domm | Dorin |
| Epp | Fee |
| Feltham | Ferland |
| Fontaine | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gibeau |
| Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Greene |
| Grey (Beaver River) | Guilbault |
| Gustafson | Halliday |
| Harvey (Chicoutimi) | Hawkes |
| Hicks | Hockin |
| Holtmann | Horner |
| Hudon | Jacques |
| James | Johnson |
| Joncas | Jourdenais |
| Koury | Langlois |
| Lapierre | Larrivée |
| Layton | Lewis |
| Littlechild | Loiselle |
| Lopez | MacDonald (Rosedale) |
| MacDougall (Timiskaming) | MacKay |
| Malone | Marin |
| Martin (Lincoln) | Masse |
| McDermid | McDougall (St. Paul's) |
| Monteith | Moore |
| Nicholson | Oberle |
| O'Kurley | Porter |
| Redway | Reid |
| Reimer | Ricard |
| Richardson | Roy-Arcelin |
| Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) | Shields |
| Sobeski | Soetens |
| Sparrow | Stevenson |
| Tardif | Tétreault |
| Thompson | Thorkelson |
| Tremblay (Québec-Est) | Turner (Halton—Peel) |
| Valcourt | Van De Walle |
| Vankoughnet | Venne |
| Vézina | Vien |
| Vincent | Weiner |
| Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia) | |
| Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) | Winegard |
| Worthy—114 | |

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 20 standing in the name of Mr. Waddell. The result of the division will apply to Motion No. 21.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 328)*

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Anawak |
| Arseneault | Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Bellemare |
| Benjamin | Black |
| Blackburn (Brant) | Blondin |
| Boudria | Butland |
| Caccia | Callbeck |
| Catterall | Clancy |
| Copps | Crawford |
| de Jong | Dingwall |
| Finestone | Flis |
| Fontana | Fulton |
| Funk | Gagliano |
| Gauthier | Gray (Windsor West) |
| Harb | Harvard |
| Heap | Hopkins |
| Hovdebo | Kaplan |
| Karpoff | Keyes |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) | Langan (Mission—Coquitlam) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | MacDonald (Dartmouth) |
| MacWilliam | Manley |
| Marchi | Marleau |
| Martin (Lasalle—Émard) | McCurdy |
| Mifflin | Milliken |
| Murphy | Nault |
| Nunziata | Pagtakhan |
| Parent | Parker |
| Peterson | Proud |
| Rideout | Rodriguez |
| Skelly (North Island—Powell River) | Skelly (Comox—Alberni) |
| Speller | Tobin |
| Volpe | Walker |
| Wood | Young (Acadie—Bathurst) |
| Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69 | |

*Government Orders*

## NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Attewell | Beatty |
| Bernier | Bertrand |
| Bird | Bjornson |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blenkarn |
| Boyer | Browes |
| Campbell (Vancouver Centre) | Cardiff |
| Casey | Chadwick |
| Charest | Clark (Yellowhead) |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Cole |
| Collins | Cooper |
| Corbeil | Côté |
| Couture | Danis |
| Darling | de Cotret |
| Della Noce | Desjardins |
| Dick | Dobbie |
| Domm | Dorin |
| Epp | Fee |
| Feltham | Ferland |
| Fontaine | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gibeau |
| Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Greene |
| Grey (Beaver River) | Guilbault |
| Gustafson | Halliday |
| Harvey (Chicoutimi) | Hawkes |
| Hicks | Hockin |
| Holtmann | Horner |
| Hudon | Jacques |
| James | Johnson |
| Joncas | Jourdenais |
| Koury | Langlois |
| Lapierre | Larrivée |
| Layton | Lewis |
| Littlechild | Loiselle |
| Lopez | MacDonald (Rosedale) |
| MacDougall (Timiskaming) | MacKay |
| Malone | Marin |
| Martin (Lincoln) | Masse |
| McDermid | McDougall (St. Paul's) |
| Monteith | Moore |
| Nicholson | Oberle |
| O'Kurley | Porter |
| Redway | Reid |
| Reimer | Ricard |
| Richardson | Roy-Arcelin |
| Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) | Shields |
| Sobeski | Soetens |
| Sparrow | Stevenson |
| Tardif | Tétreault |
| Thompson | Thorkelson |
| Tremblay (Québec-Est) | Turner (Halton—Peel) |
| Valcourt | Van De Walle |
| Vankoughnet | Venne |
| Vézina | Vien |
| Vincent | Weiner |
| Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia) | |
| Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) | Winegard |
| Worthy—114 | |

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on the amendment to Motion No. 24 standing in the name of Mr. Harvard.

The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 329)*

## YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Anawak |
| Arseneault | Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Bellemare |
| Benjamin | Black |
| Blackburn (Brant) | Blondin |
| Boudria | Butland |
| Caccia | Callbeck |
| Catterall | Clancy |
| Copps | Crawford |
| de Jong | Dingwall |
| Finestone | Flis |
| Fontana | Fulton |
| Funk | Gagliano |
| Gauthier | Gray (Windsor West) |
| Harb | Harvard |
| Heap | Hopkins |
| Hovdebo | Kaplan |
| Karpoff | Keyes |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) | Langan (Mission—Coquitlam) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | MacDonald (Dartmouth) |
| MacWilliam | Manley |
| Marchi | Marleau |
| Martin (Lasalle—Émard) | McCurdy |
| Mifflin | Milliken |
| Murphy | Nault |
| Nunziata | Pagtakhan |
| Parent | Parker |
| Peterson | Proud |
| Rideout | Rodriguez |
| Skelly (North Island—Powell River) | Skelly (Comox—Alberni) |
| Speller | Tobin |
| Volpe | Walker |
| Wood | Young (Acadie—Bathurst) |
| Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69 | |

## NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Attewell | Beatty |
| Bernier | Bertrand |
| Bird | Bjornson |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blenkarn |
| Boyer | Browes |
| Campbell (Vancouver Centre) | Cardiff |
| Casey | Chadwick |
| Charest | Clark (Yellowhead) |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Cole |
| Collins | Cooper |
| Corbeil | Côté |
| Couture | Danis |
| Darling | de Cotret |
| Della Noce | Desjardins |
| Dick | Dobbie |
| Domm | Dorin |
| Epp | Fee |
| Feltham | Ferland |
| Fontaine | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gibeau |
| Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Greene |
| Grey (Beaver River) | Guilbault |
| Gustafson | Halliday |
| Harvey (Chicoutimi) | Hawkes |
| Hicks | Hockin |
| Holtmann | Horner |
| Hudon | Jacques |
| James | Johnson |
| Joncas | Jourdenais |
| Koury | Langlois |
| Lapierre | Larrivée |

Layton
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
McDermid
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Worthy—114

Lewis
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Moore
Oberle
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Shields
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Weiner
Winegard

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the amendment lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 24 standing in the name of Mrs. Finestone.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 330)*

## YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Caccia
Catterall
Copps
de Jong
Finestone
Fontana
Funk
Gauthier
Harb
Heap
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Lee
MacWilliam
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Mifflin
Murphy
Nunziata
Parent
Peterson
Rideout
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Speller
Volpe
Wood
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69

Anawak
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bellemare
Black
Blondin
Butland
Callbeck
Clancy
Crawford
Dingwall
Flis
Fulton
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Harvard
Hopkins
Kaplan
Keyes
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacDonald (Dartmouth)
Manley
Marleau
McCurdy
Milliken
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parker
Proud
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Tobin
Walker
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)

## NAYS

Members

Anderson
Attewell
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Boyer
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Casey
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Collins
Corbeil
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Gustafson
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hudon
James
Joncas
Koury
Lapierre
Layton
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
McDermid
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Worthy—114

Andre
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blenkarn
Browes
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Cole
Cooper
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Guilbault
Halliday
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
Jacques
Johnson
Jourdenais
Langlois
Larrivée
Lewis
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Moore
Oberle
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Shields
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Weiner
Winegard

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 26 standing in the name of Mrs. Finestone.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

*Government Orders*

*(Division No. 331)*

## YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Anawak |
| Arseneault | Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Bellemare |
| Benjamin | Black |
| Blackburn (Brant) | Blondin |
| Boudria | Butland |
| Caccia | Callbeck |
| Catterall | Clancy |
| Copps | Crawford |
| de Jong | Dingwall |
| Finestone | Flis |
| Fontana | Fulton |
| Funk | Gagliano |
| Gauthier | Gray (Windsor West) |
| Harb | Harvard |
| Heap | Hopkins |
| Hovdebo | Kaplan |
| Karpoff | Keyes |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) | Langan (Mission—Coquitlam) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | MacDonald (Dartmouth) |
| MacWilliam | Manley |
| Marchi | Marleau |
| Martin (Lasalle—Émard) | McCurdy |
| Mifflin | Milliken |
| Murphy | Nault |
| Nunziata | Pagtakhan |
| Parent | Parker |
| Peterson | Proud |
| Rideout | Rodriguez |
| Skelly (North Island—Powell River) | Skelly (Comox—Alberni) |
| Speller | Tobin |
| Volpe | Walker |
| Wood | Young (Acadie—Bathurst) |
| Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—*69* | |

## NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Attewell | Beatty |
| Bernier | Bertrand |
| Bird | Bjornson |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blenkarn |
| Boyer | Browes |
| Campbell (Vancouver Centre) | Cardiff |
| Casey | Chadwick |
| Charest | Clark (Yellowhead) |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Cole |
| Collins | Cooper |
| Corbeil | Côté |
| Couture | Danis |
| Darling | de Cotret |
| Della Noce | Desjardins |
| Dick | Dobbie |
| Domm | Dorin |
| Epp | Fee |
| Feltham | Ferland |
| Fontaine | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gibeau |
| Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Greene |
| Grey (Beaver River) | Guilbault |
| Gustafson | Halliday |
| Harvey (Chicoutimi) | Hawkes |
| Hicks | Hockin |
| Holtmann | Horner |
| Hudon | Jacques |
| James | Johnson |
| Joncas | Jourdenais |
| Koury | Langlois |
| Lapierre | Larrivée |
| Layton | Lewis |
| Littlechild | Loiselle |
| Lopez | MacDonald (Rosedale) |
| MacDougall (Timiskaming) | MacKay |
| Malone | Marin |
| Martin (Lincoln) | Masse |
| McDermid | McDougall (St. Paul's) |
| Monteith | Moore |
| Nicholson | Oberle |
| O'Kurley | Porter |
| Redway | Reid |
| Reimer | Ricard |
| Richardson | Roy-Arcelin |
| Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) | Shields |
| Sobeski | Soetens |
| Sparrow | Stevenson |
| Tardif | Tétreault |
| Thompson | Thorkelson |
| Tremblay (Québec-Est) | Turner (Halton—Peel) |
| Valcourt | Van De Walle |
| Vankoughnet | Venne |
| Vézina | Vien |
| Vincent | Weiner |
| Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia) | |
| Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) | Winegard |
| Worthy—114 | |

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 27 standing in the name of Mr. Waddell.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 332)*

## YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Anawak |
| Arseneault | Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Bellemare |
| Benjamin | Black |
| Blackburn (Brant) | Blondin |
| Boudria | Butland |
| Caccia | Callbeck |
| Catterall | Clancy |
| Copps | Crawford |
| de Jong | Dingwall |
| Finestone | Flis |
| Fontana | Fulton |
| Funk | Gagliano |
| Gauthier | Gray (Windsor West) |
| Harb | Harvard |
| Heap | Hopkins |
| Hovdebo | Kaplan |
| Karpoff | Keyes |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) | Langan (Mission—Coquitlam) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | MacDonald (Dartmouth) |
| MacWilliam | Manley |
| Marchi | Marleau |
| Martin (Lasalle—Émard) | McCurdy |
| Mifflin | Milliken |
| Murphy | Nault |
| Nunziata | Pagtakhan |
| Parent | Parker |
| Peterson | Proud |
| Rideout | Rodriguez |
| Skelly (North Island—Powell River) | Skelly (Comox—Alberni) |
| Speller | Tobin |
| Volpe | Walker |
| Wood | Young (Acadie—Bathurst) |
| Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—*69* | |

## NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Attewell | Beatty |
| Bernier | Bertrand |
| Bird | Bjornson |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blenkarn |
| Boyer | Browes |
| Campbell (Vancouver Centre) | Cardiff |
| Casey | Chadwick |
| Charest | Clark (Yellowhead) |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Cole |
| Collins | Cooper |
| Corbeil | Côté |
| Couture | Danis |
| Darling | de Cotret |
| Della Noce | Desjardins |
| Dick | Dobbie |
| Domm | Dorin |
| Epp | Fee |
| Feltham | Ferland |
| Fontaine | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gibeau |
| Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Greene |
| Grey (Beaver River) | Guilbault |
| Gustafson | Halliday |
| Harvey (Chicoutimi) | Hawkes |
| Hicks | Hockin |
| Holtmann | Horner |
| Hudon | Jacques |
| James | Johnson |
| Joncas | Jourdenais |
| Koury | Langlois |
| Lapierre | Larrivée |
| Layton | Lewis |
| Littlechild | Loiselle |
| Lopez | MacDonald (Rosedale) |
| MacDougall (Timiskaming) | MacKay |
| Malone | Marin |
| Martin (Lincoln) | Masse |
| McDermid | McDougall (St. Paul's) |
| Monteith | Moore |
| Nicholson | Oberle |
| O'Kurley | Porter |
| Redway | Reid |
| Reimer | Ricard |
| Richardson | Roy-Arcelin |
| Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) | Shields |
| Sobeski | Soetens |
| Sparrow | Stevenson |
| Tardif | Têtreault |
| Thompson | Thorkelson |
| Tremblay (Québec-Est) | Turner (Halton—Peel) |
| Valcourt | Van De Walle |
| Vankoughnet | Venne |
| Vézina | Vien |
| Vincent | Weiner |
| Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia) | |
| Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) | Winegard |
| Worthy—114 | |

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion negatived.

The next question is on motion No. 30 standing in the name of Mrs. Finestone.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 333)*

## YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Anawak |
| Arseneault | Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Bellemare |
| Benjamin | Black |
| Blackburn (Brant) | Blondin |
| Boudria | Butland |
| Caccia | Callbeck |
| Catterall | Clancy |
| Copps | Crawford |
| de Jong | Dingwall |
| Finestone | Flis |
| Fontana | Fulton |
| Funk | Gagliano |
| Gauthier | Gray (Windsor West) |
| Harb | Harvard |
| Heap | Hopkins |
| Hovdebo | Kaplan |
| Karpoff | Keyes |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) | Langan (Mission—Coquitlam) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | MacDonald (Dartmouth) |
| MacWilliam | Manley |
| Marchi | Marleau |
| Martin (Lasalle—Émard) | McCurdy |
| Mifflin | Milliken |
| Murphy | Nault |
| Nunziata | Pagtakhan |
| Parent | Parker |
| Peterson | Proud |
| Rideout | Rodriguez |
| Skelly (North Island—Powell River) | Skelly (Comox—Alberni) |
| Speller | Tobin |
| Volpe | Walker |
| Wood | Young (Acadie—Bathurst) |
| Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69 | |

## NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Attewell | Beatty |
| Bernier | Bertrand |
| Bird | Bjornson |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blenkarn |
| Boyer | Browes |
| Campbell (Vancouver Centre) | Cardiff |
| Casey | Chadwick |
| Charest | Clark (Yellowhead) |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Cole |
| Collins | Cooper |
| Corbeil | Côté |
| Couture | Danis |
| Darling | de Cotret |
| Della Noce | Desjardins |
| Dick | Dobbie |
| Domm | Dorin |
| Epp | Fee |
| Feltham | Ferland |
| Fontaine | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gibeau |
| Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Greene |
| Grey (Beaver River) | Guilbault |
| Gustafson | Halliday |
| Harvey (Chicoutimi) | Hawkes |
| Hicks | Hockin |
| Holtmann | Horner |
| Hudon | Jacques |
| James | Johnson |
| Joncas | Jourdenais |
| Koury | Langlois |
| Lapierre | Larrivée |

Layton
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
McDermid
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Worthy—114

Lewis
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Moore
Oberle
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Shields
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Weiner
Winegard

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion negatived.

The next question is on motion No. 32 standing in the name of Mr. Waddell.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 334)*

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Caccia
Catterall
Copps
de Jong
Finestone
Fontana
Funk
Gauthier
Harb
Heap
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Lee
MacWilliam
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Mifflin
Murphy
Nunziata
Parent
Peterson
Rideout
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Speller
Volpe
Wood
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69

Anawak
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bellemare
Black
Blondin
Butland
Callbeck
Clancy
Crawford
Dingwall
Flis
Fulton
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Harvard
Hopkins
Kaplan
Keyes
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacDonald (Dartmouth)
Manley
Marleau
McCurdy
Milliken
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parker
Proud
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Tobin
Walker
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Attewell
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Boyer
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Casey
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Collins
Corbeil
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Gustafson
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hudon
James
Joncas
Koury
Lapierre
Layton
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
McDermid
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Worthy—114

Andre
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blenkarn
Browes
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Cole
Cooper
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Guilbault
Halliday
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
Jacques
Johnson
Jourdenais
Langlois
Larrivée
Lewis
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Moore
Oberle
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Shields
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Weiner
Winegard

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion negatived.

The next question is on motion No. 34 standing in the name of Mrs. Finestone.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 335*)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) | Benjamin |
| Black | Blackburn (Brant) |
| Butland | de Jong |
| Fulton | Funk |
| Heap | Hovdebo |
| Karpoff | Langan (Mission—Coquitlam) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | MacWilliam |
| McCurdy | Murphy |
| Parker | Rodriguez |
| Skelly (North Island—Powell River) | Skelly (Comox—Alberni) |
| Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—21 | |

NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Anawak |
| Anderson | Andre |
| Arseneault | Attewell |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Beatty |
| Bellemare | Bernier |
| Bertrand | Bird |
| Bjornson | Blackburn (Jonquière) |
| Blenkarn | Blondin |
| Boudria | Boyer |
| Browes | Caccia |
| Callbeck | Campbell (Vancouver Centre) |
| Cardiff | Casey |
| Catterall | Chadwick |
| Charest | Clancy |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Cole |
| Collins | Cooper |
| Copps | Corbeil |
| Côté | Couture |
| Crawford | Danis |
| Darling | de Cotret |
| Della Noce | Desjardins |
| Dick | Dingwall |
| Dobbie | Domm |
| Dorin | Epp |
| Fee | Feltham |
| Ferland | Finestone |
| Flis | Fontaine |
| Fontana | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gagliano |
| Gauthier | Gibeau |
| Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Gray (Windsor West) |
| Greene | Grey (Beaver River) |
| Guilbault | Gustafson |
| Halliday | Harb |
| Harvard | Harvey (Chicoutimi) |
| Hawkes | Hicks |
| Hockin | Holtmann |
| Hopkins | Horner |
| Hudon | Jacques |
| James | Johnson |
| Joncas | Jourdenais |
| Kaplan | Keyes |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) | Koury |
| Langlois | Lapierre |
| Larrivée | Layton |
| LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) | Lee |
| Lewis | Littlechild |
| Loiselle | Lopez |
| MacDonald (Rosedale) | MacDonald (Dartmouth) |
| MacDougall (Timiskaming) | MacKay |
| Malone | Manley |
| Marchi | Marin |
| Marleau | Martin (Lasalle—Émard) |
| Martin (Lincoln) | Masse |
| McDermid | McDougall (St. Paul's) |
| Mifflin | Milliken |
| Monteith | Moore |
| Nault | Nicholson |
| Nunziata | Oberle |
| O'Kurley | Pagtakhan |
| Parent | Peterson |
| Porter | Proud |
| Redway | Reid |
| Reimer | Ricard |
| Richardson | Rideout |
| Roy-Arcelin | Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) |
| Shields | Sobeski |
| Soetens | Sparrow |
| Speller | Stevenson |
| Tardif | Tétreault |
| Thompson | Thorkelson |
| Tobin | Tremblay (Québec-Est) |
| Turner (Halton—Peel) | Valcourt |
| Van De Walle | Vankoughnet |
| Venne | Vézina |
| Vien | Vincent |
| Weiner | Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia) |
| Winegard | Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) |
| Worthy | Wood |
| | Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—159 |

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion negatived.

The next question is on motion No. 36 standing in the name of Mr. Waddell.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 336*)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Anawak |
| Arseneault | Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Bellemare |
| Benjamin | Black |
| Blackburn (Brant) | Blondin |
| Boudria | Butland |
| Caccia | Callbeck |
| Catterall | Clancy |
| Copps | Crawford |
| de Jong | Dingwall |
| Finestone | Flis |
| Fontana | Fulton |
| Funk | Gagliano |
| Gauthier | Gray (Windsor West) |
| Harb | Harvard |
| Heap | Hopkins |
| Hovdebo | Kaplan |
| Karpoff | Keyes |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) | Langan (Mission—Coquitlam) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | MacDonald (Dartmouth) |
| MacWilliam | Manley |
| Marchi | Marleau |
| Martin (Lasalle—Émard) | McCurdy |
| Mifflin | Milliken |
| Murphy | Nault |
| Nunziata | Pagtakhan |
| Parent | Parker |
| Peterson | Proud |
| Rideout | Rodriguez |
| Skelly (North Island—Powell River) | Skelly (Comox—Alberni) |
| Speller | Tobin |
| Volpe | Walker |
| Wood | Young (Acadie—Bathurst) |
| Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69 | |

*Government Orders*

NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Attewell | Beatty |
| Bernier | Bertrand |
| Bird | Bjornson |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blenkarn |
| Boyer | Browes |
| Campbell (Vancouver Centre) | Cardiff |
| Casey | Chadwick |
| Charest | Clark (Yellowhead) |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Cole |
| Collins | Cooper |
| Corbeil | Côté |
| Couture | Danis |
| Darling | de Cotret |
| Della Noce | Desjardins |
| Dick | Dobbie |
| Domm | Dorin |
| Epp | Fee |
| Feltham | Ferland |
| Fontaine | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gibeau |
| Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Greene |
| Grey (Beaver River) | Guilbault |
| Gustafson | Halliday |
| Harvey (Chicoutimi) | Hawkes |
| Hicks | Hockin |
| Holtmann | Horner |
| Hudon | Jacques |
| James | Johnson |
| Joncas | Jourdenais |
| Koury | Langlois |
| Lapierre | Larrivée |
| Layton | Lewis |
| Littlechild | Loiselle |
| Lopez | MacDonald (Rosedale) |
| MacDougall (Timiskaming) | MacKay |
| Malone | Marin |
| Martin (Lincoln) | Masse |
| McDermid | McDougall (St. Paul's) |
| Monteith | Moore |
| Nicholson | Oberle |
| O'Kurley | Porter |
| Redway | Reid |
| Reimer | Ricard |
| Richardson | Roy-Arcelin |
| Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) | Shields |
| Sobeski | Soetens |
| Sparrow | Stevenson |
| Tardif | Tétreault |
| Thompson | Thorkelson |
| Tremblay (Québec-Est) | Turner (Halton—Peel) |
| Valcourt | Van De Walle |
| Vankoughnet | Venne |
| Vézina | Vien |
| Vincent | Weiner |
| Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia) | |
| Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) | Winegard |
| Worthy—114 | |

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion negatived.

The next question is on motion No. 40 standing in the name of Mr. Waddell.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 337)*

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Anawak |
| Arseneault | Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Bellemare |
| Benjamin | Black |
| Blackburn (Brant) | Blondin |
| Boudria | Butland |
| Caccia | Callbeck |
| Catterall | Clancy |
| Copps | Crawford |
| de Jong | Dingwall |
| Finestone | Flis |
| Fontana | Fulton |
| Funk | Gagliano |
| Gauthier | Gray (Windsor West) |
| Harb | Harvard |
| Heap | Hopkins |
| Hovdebo | Kaplan |
| Karpoff | Keyes |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) | Langan (Mission—Coquitlam) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | MacDonald (Dartmouth) |
| MacWilliam | Manley |
| Marchi | Marleau |
| Martin (Lasalle—Émard) | McCurdy |
| Mifflin | Milliken |
| Murphy | Nault |
| Nunziata | Pagtakhan |
| Parent | Parker |
| Peterson | Proud |
| Rideout | Rodriguez |
| Skelly (North Island—Powell River) | Skelly (Comox—Alberni) |
| Speller | Tobin |
| Volpe | Walker |
| Wood | Young (Acadie—Bathurst) |
| Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69 | |

NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Attewell | Beatty |
| Bernier | Bertrand |
| Bird | Bjornson |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blenkarn |
| Boyer | Browes |
| Campbell (Vancouver Centre) | Cardiff |
| Casey | Chadwick |
| Charest | Clark (Yellowhead) |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Cole |
| Collins | Cooper |
| Corbeil | Côté |
| Couture | Danis |
| Darling | de Cotret |
| Della Noce | Desjardins |
| Dick | Dobbie |
| Domm | Dorin |
| Epp | Fee |
| Feltham | Ferland |
| Fontaine | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gibeau |
| Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Greene |
| Grey (Beaver River) | Guilbault |
| Gustafson | Halliday |
| Harvey (Chicoutimi) | Hawkes |
| Hicks | Hockin |
| Holtmann | Horner |
| Hudon | Jacques |
| James | Johnson |
| Joncas | Jourdenais |
| Koury | Langlois |
| Lapierre | Larrivée |

| | |
|---|---|
| Layton | Lewis |
| Littlechild | Loiselle |
| Lopez | MacDonald (Rosedale) |
| MacDougall (Timiskaming) | MacKay |
| Malone | Marin |
| Martin (Lincoln) | Masse |
| McDermid | McDougall (St. Paul's) |
| Monteith | Moore |
| Nicholson | Oberle |
| O'Kurley | Porter |
| Redway | Reid |
| Reimer | Ricard |
| Richardson | Roy-Arcelin |
| Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) | Shields |
| Sobeski | Soetens |
| Sparrow | Stevenson |
| Tardif | Tétreault |
| Thompson | Thorkelson |
| Tremblay (Québec-Est) | Turner (Halton—Peel) |
| Valcourt | Van De Walle |
| Vankoughnet | Venne |
| Vézina | Vien |
| Vincent | Weiner |
| Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia) | |
| Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) | Winegard |
| Worthy—114 | |

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the amendment negatived.

The next question is on the amendment No. 42 standing in the name of Mr. Flis.

The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 338)*

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Anawak |
| Arseneault | Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) |
| Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) | Bellemare |
| Benjamin | Black |
| Blackburn (Brant) | Blondin |
| Boudria | Butland |
| Caccia | Callbeck |
| Catterall | Clancy |
| Copps | Crawford |
| de Jong | Dingwall |
| Finestone | Flis |
| Fontana | Fulton |
| Funk | Gagliano |
| Gauthier | Gray (Windsor West) |
| Harb | Harvard |
| Heap | Hopkins |
| Hovdebo | Kaplan |
| Karpoff | Keyes |
| Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) | Langan (Mission—Coquitlam) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | MacDonald (Dartmouth) |
| MacWilliam | Manley |
| Marchi | Marleau |
| Martin (Lasalle—Émard) | McCurdy |
| Mifflin | Milliken |
| Murphy | Nault |
| Nunziata | Pagtakhan |
| Parent | Parker |
| Peterson | Proud |
| Rideout | Rodriguez |
| Skelly (North Island—Powell River) | Skelly (Comox—Alberni) |
| Speller | Tobin |
| Volpe | Walker |
| Wood | Young (Acadie—Bathurst) |
| Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69 | |

NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Attewell | Beatty |
| Bernier | Bertrand |
| Bird | Bjornson |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blenkarn |
| Boyer | Browes |
| Campbell (Vancouver Centre) | Cardiff |
| Casey | Chadwick |
| Charest | Clark (Yellowhead) |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Cole |
| Collins | Cooper |
| Corbeil | Côté |
| Couture | Danis |
| Darling | de Cotret |
| Della Noce | Desjardins |
| Dick | Dobbie |
| Domm | Dorin |
| Epp | Fee |
| Feltham | Ferland |
| Fontaine | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gibeau |
| Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Greene |
| Grey (Beaver River) | Guilbault |
| Gustafson | Halliday |
| Harvey (Chicoutimi) | Hawkes |
| Hicks | Hockin |
| Holtmann | Horner |
| Hudon | Jacques |
| James | Johnson |
| Joncas | Jourdenais |
| Koury | Langlois |
| Lapierre | Larrivée |
| Layton | Lewis |
| Littlechild | Loiselle |
| Lopez | MacDonald (Rosedale) |
| MacDougall (Timiskaming) | MacKay |
| Malone | Marin |
| Martin (Lincoln) | Masse |
| McDermid | McDougall (St. Paul's) |
| Monteith | Moore |
| Nicholson | Oberle |
| O'Kurley | Porter |
| Redway | Reid |
| Reimer | Ricard |
| Richardson | Roy-Arcelin |
| Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) | Shields |
| Sobeski | Soetens |
| Sparrow | Stevenson |
| Tardif | Tétreault |
| Thompson | Thorkelson |
| Tremblay (Québec-Est) | Turner (Halton—Peel) |
| Valcourt | Van De Walle |
| Vankoughnet | Venne |
| Vézina | Vien |
| Vincent | Weiner |
| Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia) | |
| Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) | Winegard |
| Worthy—114 | |

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion negatived.

**Mr. Jean-Pierre Blackburn (Jonquière):** Mr. Speaker, considering that it was decided that some motions should be grouped for the question, I have no choice but to respect that decision. However, if Motion No. 14, which deals with an all-news service in French, had been put separately, I would have voted in favour of it.

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, since that same procedure prevented us from voting directly on some of the motions, I wish to advise you that I had to vote the way I did—and not specifically because of the national unity amendment—when, in fact, I would have voted in favour of Motions No. 8, 13, 14 and 15, as well as Motions No. 18 and 24.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Lapierre:** Mr. Speaker, I know they do not like it, but they should be glad to see democracy in action. I would have also voted in favour of Motion No. 42, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

**Miss Grey:** Mr. Speaker, I also would like to express my regrets at not being asked as a member of the House about what I would feel.

I would like to change my vote. In the interest of saving time, I would like to have it on the record that I would have voted yes for Motions Nos. 19, 26, 27, 32 and 42.

**Mr. Dingwall:** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the discussions which have occurred with the whips of the three parties, I think you would find that there be disposition to move to Motion No. 33 at this time for a vote.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The next question is on motion No. 33 standing in the name of Mr. Waddell.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 339*)

YEAS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Caccia
Catterall
Copps
de Jong
Finestone
Fontana
Funk
Gauthier
Harb
Heap
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Lee
MacWilliam
Marchi
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
Mifflin
Murphy
Nunziata
Parent
Peterson
Rideout
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Speller
Volpe
Wood
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—69

Anawak
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bellemare
Black
Blondin
Butland
Callbeck
Clancy
Crawford
Dingwall
Flis
Fulton
Gagliano
Gray (Windsor West)
Harvard
Hopkins
Kaplan
Keyes
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacDonald (Dartmouth)
Manley
Marleau
McCurdy
Milliken
Nault
Pagtakhan
Parker
Proud
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Tobin
Walker
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Attewell
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Boyer
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Casey
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Collins
Corbeil
Couture
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Gustafson
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hudon
James
Joncas
Koury
Lapierre
Layton
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
McDermid
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vézina
Vincent
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Worthy—114

Andre
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blenkarn
Browes
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Yellowhead)
Cole
Cooper
Côté
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Guilbault
Halliday
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
Jacques
Johnson
Jourdenais
Langlois
Larrivée
Lewis
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Moore
Oberle
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Shields
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van De Walle
Venne
Vien
Weiner
Winegard

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion negatived.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dingwall:** Mr. Speaker, again pursuant to the special order of the House, I think you would find that there is a disposition among the respective whips of the parties that Motions 39 and 42 respectively would be adopted.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The next question is on Motion No. 42. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 39.

**Mr. Hawkes:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** A point of order. The member for Calgary West.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, I concur with my colleague across the way that the decision of the Whips was to adopt these two motions, No. 42 which would apply to No. 39, without a recorded division. We could then move to the concurrence motion.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Motions Nos. 42 and 39?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

Motions Nos. 39 and 42 agreed to on division.

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications)** moved that Bill C–40, as amended, be concurred in with further amendments.

**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 on division.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** When shall the bill be read the third time?

**Some hon. members:** Now.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to order made on Monday, December 3, 1990, the bill will be read the third time now.

*Government Orders*

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications)** moves:

—That Bill C–40, An Act respecting broadcasting and to amend certain Acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunication, be now read a third time and do pass.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for many Canadians in saying that I am both reassured and very pleased to see Bill C–40, a new Broadcasting Act for Canada, receive Third Reading in this House. I know, because many Canadians have written to me from all across the country, urging Government to proceed rapidly with third reading and passage of this bill.

• (1600)

One such letter expressed, in my view both clearly and cogently, the most important reasons why this legislation should become law. The letter read in part and I quote: "Canadians want made–in–Canada programs; we want our special cultural differences and similarities promoted on radio and TV, not submerged; we want more Canadian programs, not fewer, for better choice; we want our Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and our CRTC to be strong and independent, with the public's interests given precedence."

I can think of no better summary of Bill C–49's objectives.

The Canadian broadcasting system is in a period of accelerated change. New technologies, such as high definition television, digital radio, direct broadcast satellites and fiber optics, offer the possibility of an ever–widening range of high quality programming services. Yet, the majority of these services are of foreign origin and the escalating costs of program production make producers think in terms of global rather than local or even national audiences.

Time and time again, and despite the wealth of foreign programming already available to us, Canadians have responded positively to those Canadian programs which are competitive with the best the world has to offer. And such programs are increasing in number and variety.

Canadian broadcasters are realizing that to compete with foreign services, they have to be different. To recapture their Canadian audiences, they have to offer programming of high quality. To quote Michael McCabe, President of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters: "In the one–hundred channel universe, you've got to be good or they'll switch channels".

Broadcasters increasingly are producing distinctively Canadian programs which will hold their audience and which are finding international as well as Canadian markets.

This Bill will encourage public and private broadcasters to continue to produce not only more but better Canadian programs. We believe that this is the most appropriate way to respond to the challenges facing Canadian broadcasting.

But there are other reasons why we need this legislation.

Bill C–40 will replace the outdated legal definitions in the current Broadcasting Act of 1968 with definitions appropriate to current, and hopefully future, realities in the broadcasting system so that the CRTC may regulate all types of broadcasting activities in the public interest without fear of its authority being challenged in the courts.

Technology always has been a driving force in broadcasting, but the only thing that really matters is program content; all the rest is housekeeping. Bill C–40 is the first legislation to fully recognize this truism of broadcasting policy.

The current Broadcasting Act ties the definition of broadcasting to over–the–air transmission, yet today most Canadians receive programming services by cable and satellite. Some of these services are not even directly available over the air and some are available only in return for payment.

Bill C–40 recasts the legal definitions in the Act to focus on the transmission of programs to the public, regardless of the technology used. In this way, the bill establishes an appropriate balance among all the components of the Canadian broadcasting system.

I want to stress, Mr. Speaker, that the new definitions in Bill C–40 are intended to ensure that all Canadian programming services—present or future—will operate under comparable regulations and conditions regardless of the nature of the service or the technology used to transmit their programs to the public.

At the same time, however, the Broadcasting Act must recognize that the same technologies used to transmit broadcast programs are also used to deliver other kinds of services. Broadcasting legislation should not become an intrument for inhibiting the evolution of services which do not properly fall within its scope.

Bill C–40 is about television and radio programming. These activities have traditionally been regulated because they are cultural in nature and they provide a public service essential to the maintenance and enhancement of Canadian identity and cultural sovereignty.

Information–based services such as shopping and real estate services, data base services, home security services and the like are of a different nature. Most are not now regulated. Furthermore, unlike broadcasting, the vast majority of these new services are not of such a high cultural impact.

By dealing with the transmission of programs to the public, rather than on a particular technology, this bill gives the CRTC clear guidance about which activities are to be regulated, such as broadcasting. It also gives the commission the latitude it needs to determine how best to regulate those undertakings which eventually become involved in different types of activity.

The technologies used for broadcasting and telecommunications are converging rapidly. Bill C–40 recognizes this reality and gives the CRTC the powers it needs to regulate broadcasting well into the twenty–first century.

The bill also recognizes that newer technologies allow programming services to encode their signals for distribution to paying suscribers only. For this reason, it provides a right of civil action against theft of encoded signals, a provision which has found support from the cablevision and satellite direct–to–home television industries.

The CRTC has served Canadians well. Under its supervision, the broadcasting system has witnessed extraordinary growth. The commission has tried to ensure that the range and variety of Canadian programming kept pace with this growth. More recently, the commission has taken initiatives to streamline its activities and lighten the regulatory burden.

The CRTC has largely deregulated AM radio, recognizing the particular problems of that important medium; it has introduced new approaches to the regulation of Canadian content on television, and it has launched major reviews of the regulations governing FM radio as well as cable rates. These activities are commendable. Bill C–40 will enable the CRTC to serve Canadians even better. It will encourage the commission to take initiatives and give it more flexibility to find innovative and

creative ways of pursuing the objectives of the Broadcasting Act with a lighter regulatory touch.

Bill C–40 also will change the commission in several ways.

The bill gives to the Governor in Council authority to issue broad policy directions to the CRTC and will establish clearly the Government's role in setting general guidelines for the broadcasting system on broad policy matters.

Additionally, the bill will allow restructuring of the commission, bringing more openness and accessibility to its public hearing process and greater sensitivity to regional needs.

CRTC decision–making will be decentralized so that panels of commissioners appointed to public hearings across Canada will no longer only hear the matters before them, but also reach decisions. Broadcasters and the public attending these hearings will know that the commissioners they address will be those who decide the issues before them. This is in keeping with the basic principles of justice. The Government recognizes, however, that the commission's mandate requires its decisions to reflect country–wide policies and objectives. For this reason, the bill requires that panels of commissioners *shall* consult with the commission to ensure consistent interpretation of broadcasting policy and regulations.

We believe that decentralized decision–making with mandatory consultation, provides for an appropriate balance between, on the one hand, a more open, accessible and efficient regulatory process and, on the other hand, consistent interpretation of policies by panels of commissioners operating across Canada.

• (1610)

In the same spirit, the establishement of regional offices of the CRTC provided for in this legislation will foster a greater sense that all Canadians have access to the commission and that it is aware of regional issues and concerns.

Through its decisions, the CRTC affects individual Canadians directly. Its regulations and decisions determine the range and even the selection of programming services Canadians can receive and the cost of receiving those services. Accordingly, we believe that the CRTC should have a regional presence in Canada.

Recently, the former chairman of the commission, Keith Spicer, supported passage of the Bill, saying that, on balance, the result will be very positive. "In practical terms", he said, "C–40 will give the CRTC much stronger and more credible enforcement powers."

Mr. Speaker, I now turn to the centrepiece of Canadian Broadcasting Policy, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. As the national public broadcaster, the CBC, under this bill, will remain a strong and independent voice and the foremost producer of Canadian radio and television programming.

The bill reformulates the CBC's mandate to place greater emphasis on the distinctively Canadian character of CBC programming.

[*English*]

For the first time, this mandate includes specific references to the important role that the CBC has in reflecting Canada, in providing English and French programming services, in meeting the needs of official language minorities, in reflecting Canadian society in all its aspects, in actively contributing to the flow and exchange of cultural expression, and, in all these ways, contributing to a shared Canadian consciousness and identity.

Certain critics have lamented the removal of the phrase "national unity" from the CBC's mandate. Yet, there can be no doubt that the objectives which I have just stated will indeed contribute to Canadian unity. For how can there be unity without the flow and exchange of cultural expression, in English and French, among all the component parts of Canada, as is foreseen by this bill? How can there be unity without a shared awareness of Canadian identity?

[*Translation*]

Bill C–40 reinterprets the objective of Canadian unity now in the CBC's mandate in terms which are more appropriate to a truly independent public broadcaster.

In considering this issue, Mr. Speaker, an all–party committee of this House unanimoulsy concluded that: "there must be no suggestion in the act that the CBC has any obligation to serve as a propagandist, even for a cause as legitimate as national unity."

I believe that this was and remains the right conclusion. If there is any doubt that an objective to promote "national unity" could be interpreted in a political way, then such wording has no place in the legal mandate of and independent public broadcaster like the CBC.

Most comments, including those of the new president and of the chairman designate of the CBC, concur that the new wording is a significant improvement. As to the CBC's operations and administration, Bill C–40 rationalizes the corporation's management structure, by separating the quite different functions of president and chief executive officer from those of the Chairman of the board of directors. In addition, the bill clarifies the nature of the CBC's accountability to Parliament while, for the first time, stating in law the CBC's journalistic, creative and programming independence.

Among its many other benefits, passage of this bill will allow the chairman designate to assume his long-delayed rightful title and responsibilities at the head of Canada's foremost cultural institution.

Mr. Speaker, I launched the long process that has led to third reading of Bill C–40, with the appointment of the Caplan–Sauvageau Task Force on Broadcasting Policy in May 1985. It was one of the first iniatives I undertook as Minister of Communications. Mr. Speaker, the government has had occasion to say before that Bill C–40 is fundamentally a consensus document. As we prepare to vote on its third reading, this bill has obtained the support of the CRTC, the CBC, most private broadcasters and a wide cross-section of the Canadian public. It is high time that this bill was passed into law.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to what our Minister of Communications had to say. I certainly would hope his introductory remarks would be listened to with a great deal of care and then be analysed.

I will leave that analysis to the people of Canada, to the instruments that are to put into effect this particular bill, and I believe time and history will prove that the words were right. The message was right, but the application of the message is sadly lacking. And so it is with a sense of sadness that I stand to speak at third reading of this bill.

It is a very important bill. It is a very important instrument and I would, in the time that I have, do a review and an analysis of where we are in the broadcasting industry, the broadcasting services in Canada. The purpose of Bill C–40 was to update the 1968 Broadcasting Act and is essentially identical to Bill C–136 which died on the *Order Paper* prior to the 1988 federal election.

The legislation had its genesis in the task force on broadcast policy. It had extensive review by the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture with hearings across this land. It resulted in four reports containing recommendations for new broadcasting legislation. The committee and the members of that committee listened to the people, and our report reflected the people. We on this side of the House spoke for the interested parties, while from the government benches we heard barely a word; the parliamentary secretary and now, for the first time, a speech by the minister.

While no persons on the government side spoke to or supported this bill, I have been privileged the other way. In fact, I have been more than privileged. I have been well treated by the members of my caucus.

Bill C–40 was introduced for first reading, I would remind this House, on October 11, 1989. It received second reading in December 1989, was studied in legislative committee from January to March, 1990. It was reported to this House on March 20, 1990, and it languished on the *Order Paper* until October 31 when it was finally called for report stage.

Rumours that were spread by the government about delays, dilatory amendments, filibustering by this side of the House, were unfounded. I would venture to say they were a gross exaggeration, in fact, if not untrue.

The real story of this bill was the reluctance of this government, the reluctance and lack of commitment by its cabinet, and by its members, and opposition by many of the backbench to the contents of this bill. Otherwise why did we have all those zipped lips where no one stood to speak, support, or defend the minister and his bill. I think that was eloquent silence that indicated a lack of support.

• (1620)

The reluctance on the part of the government because of the badly flawed state of this bill is one thing, I would remind the population and the involved and interested parties, many of whom called me and agreed with me when I explained the process, that I should continue the good fight. They recognize, as this House should recognize, and as the public recognizes that the government controls the action in this House, determines the calling of the bills and the procedure of the bills. We, on this side, do not have control of the legislative agenda as much as we would like to do so.

When Bill C–136 died, Liberals had hoped that the new Minister of Communications would have taken time to reshape a new bill and put his own imprint upon that bill. Again, because the government delayed, Bill C–136 came in at the last minute and it died on the *Order Paper*. We had hoped that when the minister put his own imprint on it, he might fix the major flaws. Not only has he not done that, he has shown absolutely little interest in this bill. He did not speak at second reading. He appeared briefly at legislative committee and never uttered a sound at report stage to defend his bill. He made up for part of that in a very eloquent speech to defend his point of view right now during third reading. That is the only time we have really heard from him in this House.

Liberals are pleased to see the following provisions included in Bill C–40, from Bill C–136: Women, children, cultural minorities, aboriginal peoples and the disabled are specifically mentioned in the legislation and the need to portray more accurately the multicultural and multiracial nature of our society; originators of program signals and their authorized agents, such as cable operators, will be able to take action in the courts against commercial pirates stealing their scrambled signals and thereby stealing intellectual property, creative products, which is so much a key to the well–being and the functioning of this system; provisions making educational broadcasting an integral part of the law.

Liberals are particularly pleased that the government accepted the following Liberal amendments: recognition of community broadcasting as one of the elements of the Canadian broadcasting system, along with the public and the private; mandatory requirement that the Canadian broadcasting system be owned and controlled by Canadians; that the programming of Canadian broadcasters also include children and reflection of the multiracial nature of Canada, ensuring that television and radio more accurately portray the reality of Canada in its multiracial as well as the multicultural nature.

There are flaws that remain, however. Earlier I presented on behalf of my party a range of substantive amendments which we believe necessary to make this bill the legislative instrument required to meet Canada's needs in the future.

A number of the amendments we proposed in Bill C–40's predecessor bill, C–136, were accepted, and some during legislative committee study of Bill C–40. We appreciate that. Nevertheless, the changes which have been accepted do not address some of the most fundamental concerns which we have raised throughout this debate.

Let me just remind you that the concerns we have about this bill include, in addition to those I wish to concentrate on today, many additional important policy matters. Among them are the following: we do not ensure that federal jurisdiction will not be challenged to the changes in definition section; the need to make provisions for broadcast programming in representative native languages, as well as increased access to post–captioning for the hearing impaired; the urgent requirement to avoid unfair competition and conflicts of interests by incorporating in the law provisions limiting the role of cable television systems to providing programming complementary to that offered by licensed Canadian stations and networks; the act fails to provide obligatory priority for the carriage on cable of public sector broadcasting services in both English and French, including those provided by both federal and provincial–public broadcasters; recognition of the National Film Board in the Broadcast Act, providing electronic window for Canadians to access our Crown corporation National Film Board productions, financed by our taxpayers' money; assurance of managerial freedom for the CBC.

Let me step back for a moment and look a bit more at the bigger picture, focusing on the specifics I wish to address.

In our modern communications age, the role and impact of broadcasting cannot be underscored enough. It impacts everything around us. It is the way most people get their news and information. It is how many of us get much out of our entertainment. It is a source of educational learning and provides support for our multicultural and ethnic diversity.

Of course, with its power to reach instantaneously into millions of homes from coast to coast to coast, if you want to express from Labrador to Victoria, B.C. and up through the great north, Mr. Speaker, we can reach there in a single moment.

Its potential for supporting our sense of shared values and national unity is fundamental to the role of broadcasting, especially in the trying times we find ourselves in today.

Historically, broadcasting has always been recognized as not just another industry like cars or clothing; instead, it is the central vehicle through which Canadians communicate with one another, a major instrument for Canadian creative and artistic expression in the arts and entertainment and an essential means for providing a Canadian perspective in news and information programming.

It is a powerful instrument that defines us among the nations of the world. Broadcasting has been so important because, as has been said so often, we have a very large country. We are geographically very far apart. We have different languages and different cultures. Our economic problems are difficult because our population is relatively small compared to that of our land mass.

We are strung like lights across the borders of this land and do not spread into the interior in very large numbers. We do, therefore, form a very small market and we need one another. We need to know and appreciate one another in spite of these differences and in spite of these distances.

Broadcasting is our powerful link in this respect. News and information programs are indispensable in keeping us open-minded and informed about what is going on here and around the world. Stories, fiction and drama, deal with our past, our emotions, our dreams, our passions, our weaknesses and our strengths as people and as individuals while they form our thoughts and our attitudes toward the future.

Broadcasting is a powerful means of communications, not just with adults but also with children for they spend about 24 hours a week in front of the television screen. After all, children spend more time in front of that little box than in school. I know they often refer to it as the "boob tube".

It may not be as important as all of our universities and our entire school system, but it rivals their impact on time, interest and attitudes of our children. I often wonder what will be the thinking pattern and the appreciation of my grandchildren about their Canadian heritage.

Will they be North Americanized or will they remain proud, strong Canadians, knowing and understanding their roots and moving this country forward? Stories help see behind the appearance that make us different and help us to understand our disparities and our similarities. For children they explain the past, the world around them and stir the imagination for the future.

We also need to have fun together. We need to laugh together. I am not suggesting that we legislate fun or laughter, nor am I suggesting that we can legislate good novels, plays or short stories. We do not have to.

We have much talent in every part of this land and we shine across the globe. Any country, and especially a great democracy like ours, should quite naturally encourage its print or television dramatists and other story tellers. One of the ways of providing that encouragement is to ensure that the private sector broadcasters as well as the cable system and the CBC, the national broadcasting service, have the funds and the economic wherewithal to play their part.

There is also a need these days to call for reconciliation and national unity in Canada. Quite rightly so. Yes, there is a need. I believe broadcasting can be one of the most effective means to help Canadians better appreciate their distinctiveness, their differences, and respect and love all aspects of our daily life; not by preaching and not by keeping all others out, but by telling their stories, showing their talent with sensitivity, with understanding, with its character, and with its particularity. What we need is imagination.

• (1630)

The challenge of broadcasting is it reflecting Canada to Canadians, which we tried to find in this bill, to reshape our Canadian broadcasting system for the 1990s and into the next century. The whole point was to enhance our ability to reflect Canada to Canadians. That is the whole point of a Canadian broadcasting bill. This is

not the North American broadcasting bill; this is the Canadian Broadcasting Act.

The paragraphs of the proposed Broadcasting Act restate the 68 principles which have been enduring and endured: "that the Canadian broadcasting system shall be effectively owned and controlled by Canadians so as to safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada". They newly add that the system should "encourage the development of Canadian expression, providing a wide range of programming that reflects Canadian attitudes, opinions, ideas, values and artistic creativity, displaying Canadian talent in entertainment programming, and offering information and analysis concerning Canada and other countries from a Canadian point of view".

Throughout this bill it is clear that as Canadians we will continue to require, as we have for decades, that broadcasting stations and networks both provide programming that is Canadian in its character and that will be owned and controlled by Canadians.

Where will these nice words really take us? How have the 68 promises been enacted? Unfortunately not in terms of making broadcasting the effective tool for the development of Canadian identity that could have been realized. Some have said that all we had to do was not to develop a new bill and spend millions of dollars in so doing, that all we needed to do was to apply the 1968 Broadcasting Act and tell the instruments that were to apply it that this time we really meant it. We have not done that. While we have been developing this new act, we have diluted certain very important aspects.

Let me tell the House what the 1968 act allowed, because we did not apply its thought and its meaning. The result is that in total a maximum of 4 per cent to 5 per cent of the stories presented to Canadians, jointly on both English and French public and private sector networks, is Canadian. It is only 4 per cent to 5 per cent; no more than one in twenty. Almost 95 per cent of them is American. That is what we see on our television screens; that is what our children see.

I am not suggesting that watching American programs is wrong, not at all. There are just as many—in fact there are more—wonderful, excellent programs being produced across the United States, but there are also poor products. They are often called in the industry schlock. There are poor products on many channels. There are in Canada as well. I do not think our percentage is any worse than that being produced in the United States.

What I am saying is that Canadians watch Canadian productions, but they do not watch them as much because they do not have the selection or the choices they really would like to have. I would say that when we get Canadian products Canadians watch them because they are good. In fact, many do not even realize that they are watching good, solid Canadian productions: *Street Legal*, *E.N.G.*, *Love and Hate*, *Neon Rider*, *Max Glick*, or the ever popular *Degrassi High* or *The Road to Avonlea*. In French—

[*Translation*]

—*Les Dames de Coeur*, *Lance et compte*, *Les filles de Caleb* and many more.

[*English*]

In looking at another aspect with respect to the new technologies, the question is: Who is going to control this system, the technology or the Canadian people? Ownership and programming content are not the only fundamental issues which the new broadcasting bill must address if it is to prove effective in the future.

As the former Minister of Communications pointed out, broadcasting has been changed enormously by evolving technologies since the 1968 Broadcasting Act was passed and will continue to change. Among those technologies are satellites, fibre-optics, cable, and even the VCRs which we all plug in and rent films for. With the arrival of satellite communication and other new technologies, the distinction between different media and the boundaries and frontiers between nations have become blurred. Broadcasting has become global. Europeans are now addressing this issue, both at the Council of Europe and in the new cultural commission which has been established in Brussels, the new capital of Europe. Once it was organized within countries and regulated because of the finite spectrum of wave bands.

Mr. Speaker, as a former broadcaster, I am sure you are aware of and appreciate the dilemma that this technology has presented. The new technologies destroy the rationale for the distinctions we had before with the wave bands. Above all, they make possible the distribution of signals and programming. These new technologies are being built by the few, the sky barons, as the media call them. Through mergers and takeovers they are fighting for control of what the world will see, read, and hear in the coming century. That control includes the creative artists who define and describe the images we will see. The control extends, therefore, to the

imagination of individuals. It affects how we will see ourselves.

Therefore I believe that the content of programming becomes key. As we see technology ever developing and further globalization during the next decade, we will no longer be able to regulate Canadian content on our airwaves. The window of opportunity is very small. If we want to establish a firm and solid base on which to grow in the future, the infrastructure must be in place, and now is not too soon. Canadian programming is going to have to compete, not only with American, but with Australian, British, French, Belgian, and Italian. Subtitling will become part of our normal day. As I said, we must create opportunities so that Canadian programs will be developed and will help define us on the world screen.

Part of the solution lies with the development of the public and private sector, which have important, complementary roles to play in the Canadian feature film industry and in the area of regulation before these sky barons and skypix take over. In addressing the issue of the present and the future of our system, the crucial test will not just be the extent to which the provisions of the 1968 act are retained. The key test will be the extent to which in a more complex situation we continue to retain control by Canadians over the system and to provide a reasonable balance between Canadian and foreign programming.

There are two quite different and quite separate aspects of this issue of foreign versus domestic programming balance. First, what proportion of the programming offered by individual stations or networks should be Canadian? Second, what proportion of the programming offered by distribution undertakings such as cable systems should be Canadian?

This question of how Canadian the programming offered should be was much simpler in the past. The 1968 act provided that each broadcaster should use predominantly Canadian creative and other resources. At that time it was not considered necessary to deal with cable television. Until the early eighties, not so long ago, this provision was interpreted to mean that over half of the programming provided by each station or network should be Canadian. In light of the lack of clarity in the law and the financial difficulty for some services of providing predominantly Canadian programming, the CRTC allowed a number of such services to operate with more limited levels of Canadian programming.

• (1640 )

In response to this situation the standing committee proposed two changes. The first would clarify the meaning of predominantly Canadian so that it would be obvious that it meant 60 per cent or more of the programming provided should be Canadian; not just the channel, but the content of the channel, the programming.

The second proposed change would permit the CRTC to exempt from this requirement specialized, limited audience services for which such a requirement was just not practical. When Bill C–136 was introduced, this recommendation was rejected, and again in Bill C–40. Subsequently, in response to extensive criticism from many quarters including the CRTC, the government amended the clause to reintroduce the concept of predominantly Canadian.

However, the redrafting has been done so badly that it remains unclear whether the intent is that the programming provided by Canadian broadcasters should, unless subject to exemption provisions, be predominantly Canadian programming.

Given the importance of this provision, the bill should not be passed, in my view, without further amendment. If it is not amended to require that programming be predominantly Canadian, there will be no legislative basis for the CRTC to maintain such requirements. This is a very straightforward drafting issue.

If the government indeed agrees that such a requirement is justified, it should have amended the bill to make this clear. Or, tell me: Do you think it is possible that it was fear of American reprisals under section 2005 of the free trade agreement? Was that the reason for fuzzing the issue? I wonder whether I need answer my own question.

**Mr. Nunziata:** Oh, please do.

**Mrs. Finestone:** No, I am going to leave that to all of you. I believe it speaks for itself.

There is little point, however, in maintaining a requirement that most of the programming provided by individual Canadian stations and networks should be Canadian, if at the same time the programming content offered by the cable systems is to be overwhelmingly and increasingly foreign.

Turn on your set, go station by station, count the number of Canadian systems, and then count the number of American outside the three plus one, the national networks of the United States, CBS, NBC, ABC, and PBS. Just count them and see for yourself how the system has been diluted with access to an abundance of independent stations from the U.S.A.

Then look at the content of our Canadian CTV, Global, CBC, as well as some of the independents to see how many of those programs are duplicated on the Canadian channels. Their presence on the Canadian channels are quite welcome. They are important so that we have points of view from other parts of the world. We share in their fun, laughter, et cetera, but there is a reason that they are there. It is important that those channels be heard and seen. They also add to the Canadian programming content funds available for the promotion of Canadian programming. It is an important role. Duplicating that at different hours through other channels and other means is just not a constructive way to ensure Canadian programming.

Today, therefore, it has become evident that the role of cable is equally important as that of the programmers and the broadcasters to the maintenance of a Canadian broadcasting system. Choices on their system make the difference. Their contribution must go beyond human resources, hardware, and the obligation to provide for community channels. Quite properly the expanded choice offered by cable television has been viewed as positive to the extent that it actually made available to Canadians a wider range of programming that they had previously been able to receive only from off-air sources, and often not clearly or not able to receive at all.

Genuine increase in programming variety is clearly a good thing. At the same time, however, to the extent that cable systems were simply bringing in programming already available from Canadian sources, as I said before, and undermining Canadian broadcasters, the way cable has functioned was and is of concern. There are a number of measures, particularly simultaneous program substitution, that have been enacted to partially offset these negative effects. There has been virtually unanimous agreement that a new act must at last provide the CRTC with a proper legislative basis for regulating cable television.

Indeed, the communications minister has emphasized again and again that a major inadequacy of the 1968 bill was its failure to deal adequately with technology, particularly with cable. Yet the government has, against the unanimous advice of both the 1986 report of the Task Force on Broadcasting Policy and the Standing Committee of Communications and Culture, failed to provide any effective legislative basis for the operation of cable systems in the future.

The simple amendments that we as a party brought forward could have easily remedied this issue, but the government and particularly this minister were too stubborn to admit that they were wrong. That deficiency in the legislation has the potential to completely undermine all other provisions in this important legislation. It is in fact the Achilles heel of the Conservative proposals for this new law. This issue is so fundamental that I want to review the background to it.

After 18 months of extensive research and consultations with the public and the broadcasting industry, the government's $3 million Task Force on Broadcasting Policy reached the following conclusions: that radio and television, public and private, to the extent that foreign broadcasting signals are carried, should complement programming from Canadian sources, any kind of new programs. We recognize that an exception must be made for the at least 17 foreign television signals that are already an established part of the system. In other words, we have grandfathered what exists today. We are not changing that which is available. However, the presence of a particular foreign signal in the system should never be allowed to preclude the development of new Canadian services. Priority must always be given to the development of our own broadcasting services.

In the public hearings which our standing committee held, the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, the CBC and the Canadian producers expressed strong support for the approach the task force had proposed. You, yourself Mr. Speaker, were a member of that committee. The test in the future of whether to permit the importation of any additional foreign service should

be that it actually adds something significant to the mix of programming available to Canadians.

Specifically, the test proposed was that the service should offer programming complementary to that already available from licensed Canadian broadcasters. In response to this recommendation the CRTC has stated that "it agrees generally with this recommendation", while the Canadian Cable Association said that it agreed in principle. To the extent that they expressed concerns, these were related only to the carriage of stations already available off air. In the case of the CRTC, concern was also expressed about including in the new act provisions related to carriage of the foreign television signals in the Canadian broadcasting system.

In our judgment, this issue is at least as important as any other that has been addressed in Bill C–40, and as legislators it is an issue that now must be addressed. I want to emphasize here that the government is not assuming the CRTC will implement this reasonable and necessary policy of protecting our own Canadian broadcasting system. Instead, astonishing as it may seem, the Government of Canada has categorically rejected these policy recommendations, although they were widely perceived to be both moderate and essential to the maintenance of a strong and separate Canadian broadcasting system. Instead, the position the government has taken is that any restriction whatsoever on the entry into Canada of American stations and networks is in principle unacceptable. I call this Americanization of the Canadian broadcasting system.

This position, which is inconsistent with over 50 years of broadcasting policy, is clearly stated in the government's June 1988 response to the fifth, sixth and fifteenth reports of the standing committee. In responding to this recommendation the government has stated that, "The prohibition of foreign radio and television services other than those whose programming is complementary to that available from Canadian sources has not been included in the legislation, since it would unduly restrict Canadians' access to a new range of international broadcasting services". That is to be found at page 90 of the government response in June 1988.

• (1650)

Elsewhere the response states: "The government's policy is not to restrict access to foreign services". That is on page 28.

The government has explicitly rejected proposed amendments which would have implemented the unanimous recommendations of the standing committee.

We on this side of the House are not saying, Mr. Speaker, restrict access. What we are saying is that in our view new channels should add something new as a choice. What will this position mean in the future? It will lay the basis in Canadian law for allowing all American broadcasters to extend their reach into Canada. The result will be to make it far more difficult for Canadian broadcasters to acquire the right to show the best U.S. programming in Canada, even though it costs a heck of a lot less to buy it than it would for us to produce it.

Even when they are able to purchase these programs, it will reduce their ability to earn revenue where they could be found on other channels at other times. There is no exclusivity. There is no protection of their investment and that is grossly unfair.

Revenues from showing foreign programs are now crucial to the successful operation of Canada's private broadcasters. Just speak to CTV, Global, CBC and see what they have to say about this aspect of the lack of exclusivity of their purchases. The resulting loss of revenue will in turn undermine Canadian broadcasters' ability to finance Canadian programming.

The implications of creating a single Canada–U.S. market are obvious already in the film and theatrical business. In that sector there has been a continental market for decades. The Americans have seen us as their back yard. The result is that most of the revenues earned in the Canadian market flow south to finance more American films, while Canada's own film companies lack sufficient resources and, in fact, often lack sufficient window time and space to substantially contribute to financing Canadian films and the ability to distribute and market them effectively.

The same thing will happen in the future if the government carries out its plan to give the U.S. broadcasters almost unrestricted access to the Canadian market.

Why this radical and far-reaching departure from a tradition of building a separate Canadian broadcasting system, a tradition begun in the 1930s by a Conservative government? Why the refusal to provide a sure legislative basis for maintaining and strengthening Canada's own off air broadcasting services, and developing a strong and separate system of Canadian pay and specialty services?

The only answer that can explain this decision by the government is surely that it knows that any new provisions which restrict the entry of American broadcasters into Canada would contravene the Canada-U.S. free trade agreement. I think that is an answer to my colleague from York South—Weston.

That is the key. I did not want to give it away too soon. I wanted people to think about it—if it was not already self-evident.

We have of course already seen evidence in the areas of cultural policy of the way the government is acting since the signing of that free trade agreement. We saw the gutting of the Minister of Communications' original film importations bill, and we have Simon Reisman's public assurance that the revised and eviscerated bill has at least been made consistent with the free trade agreement. That, of course, is why the film legislation will do nothing effective to protect Canadian interests.

We know that the government suppressed an independent consultant's study of the sound recording industry which, in its leaked form, warned of serious consequences for Canadian song writers and performers and the Canadian record industry under the trade agreement. The consequences of a weakened Canadian record industry for Canadian content quotas in radio is obvious, but it is also obvious how wonderful it is for those outside of Canada, for foreign influence.

We have seen the government reject as well the central proposals of its own 1985 task force on film policy related to the use of the Investment Canada Act to strengthen Canadian ownership and control over film distribution.

Indeed, in the book industry, which after all is one of the basic and fundamental sources of material to produce film for VCRs, as well as stage productions for that matter, and where the government had already established a very strong policy in 1985 to strengthen Canadian participation in this vitally important book industry, we saw in the 1988 new American library decision, the abandoning of that essential Baie Comeau policy.

At the present time the government seems to be avoiding making decisions on a number of Investment Canada cases which will again test the 1985 Baie Comeau policy.

Will those decisions now wait until after the election in order to avoid the embarrassment of having a further withdrawal from protecting Canada's cultural sovereignty and identity? There is, of course, further evidence for this interpretation of the government's actions since other new legislative initiatives which might have contravened the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement have also been rejected.

For example, the government refused to include in Bill C-40 any requirement that foreign pay television or specialty services carrying on business through affiliates in Canada should do so through a Canadian entity licensed by the CRTC. I remind members of this House that this unanimous, all-party recommendation of the standing committee was endorsed by the Canadian Cable Television Association as well.

Failure to act on this recommendation will result in two classes of broadcasting networks carrying on business here: one, those which require a licence and must contribute to achieving Canadian programming objectives and those which can extract money from the Canadian market without a licence and with no obligation to contribute to Canadian programming. For them, Canada is strictly a cash cow.

The result will be a growing sense of unfairness and a resulting undermining of the legitimacy of the regulations applied to Canadian services. The result will also be a reduced ability to meet Canadian programming objectives.

It has been our view that anything that has access to our home television set should have been considered by the CRTC and exempted where deemed acceptable, but not necessary to contribute to Canadian broadcasting.

That includes this new alphanumeric channels that we have got that no longer fall under the Broadcast Act.

There is a threat to federal jurisdiction and the national capacity of broadcasting in Canada. The combination of increasing pressure from American broadcasters for access to Canada, and an absolute refusal by the government to include in Bill C–40 any legislative basis whatsoever for limiting their access to Canada is a sure recipe for the rapid erosion of Canada's own broadcasting system.

The government has further weakened Canada's broadcasting system by putting federal jurisdiction over broadcasting at risk and by diluting the national structure of the CRTC. Let us look at this.

Since the 1930s, broadcasting has fallen under federal jurisdiction, reflecting the recognition that this is a prerequisite to maintaining an effective, integrated national broadcasting system. However, Bill C–40 redefines "broadcasting" to include hard wire or closed circuit services hitherto deemed to be under provincial control.

The bill also dictates that broadcasters and cablecasters should now have their services separated into programming and non–programming functions, a rejection of existing legal practice which argued that these changes could only lead to a questioning self–inflicted vulnerability.

Furthermore, Bill C–40 provides the foundation for an argument that a cable company may be subject to two regulatory regimes: one in accordance with which its broadcasting business is regulated, and another, possibly a provincial one in accordance with obligations to maintain different sets of books for different regulators, perhaps using different accounting practices, depreciation methods and cost separation techniques. This is all very costly, and add to that the GST, retransmission payments, and many other aspects and see what is happening in this field.

Second, with the passage of Bill C–40, all full–time CRTC commissioners, now known as the executive committee, will no longer be required for the taking of its decisions. This approach was known as collegial decision making and has been replaced with a concept that is called "who hears decides" whereby panels of three will be empowered to make decisions binding on the entire commission. The introduction of those who hear decide—Mr. Speaker, did you want me to finish this?

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but the order adopted yesterday by the House provides that at five o'clock, the House shall proceed to consideration of Private Members' Business. At 6 p.m. we shall resume debate without interruptions.

[*English*]

It being five o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's *Order Paper*.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—MOTIONS

[*English*]

### ENVIRONMENT AUDITOR GENERAL

PROPOSAL FOR ESTABLISHMENT

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of establishing the position of Environmental Auditor General, whose purpose would be to conduct an audit of all government operations on a rotational basis to ensure that any activity, program or initiative of the government is conducted in a manner that is compatible with a policy of protection and enhancement of the environment.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move this motion today on an idea whose time has truly come.

The concept of introducing environmental audit as an integral part of government operations and decision making has been promoted and supported by, among others, the minister in introducing the discussion paper on the Green Plan, the consultation on the discussion paper, the Standing Committee on Environment unanimously, the C. D. Howe Institute, the Rawson Academy of Aquatic Science, the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy, and the Auditor General.

Like value for money or operational audit, environmental audit is an indispensable tool for management control of spending, for the effectiveness of the use of public resources, and for decision making. In addition,

accountability to Parliament and to the public on environmental matters simply cannot be carried out or ensured without environmental audit.

In times of tight budgets and rising public debt, environmental audit presents opportunities for substantial savings on government operating costs. As a new field of knowledge, environmental audit methodology has the potential to be a major international market opportunity for Canadian expertise and knowledge. As well, this initiative by government will ensure that businesses seeking to be more environmentally responsible and more competitive and productive in a global economy will have the tools they need to reach these objectives.

This year for the first time the Auditor General chose to address the question of environmental audit in the first chapter of his 1990 annual report to Parliament. The chapter is entitled: "Matters of Special Importance and Interest". In that chapter, on page 23, the Auditor General talks about "the protection of the natural environment, a prime example of the need for accountability". He talks about the responsibilities for protection of our natural environment as being major and shared, and that accountability for them should be exacted.

Section 1.46 states:

> One can look at the environment as a fund: a fund of paramount importance to all. It is shrinking while the number of people who must share it is growing. The share of each person, especially those coming after us, is being reduced—for practical purposes it is governments that have been given the operating responsibility (for the environment)—
>
> The federal government deals with national concerns for the environment—Parliament should expect governments to devise acceptable means of being held accountable for the conduct of its environmental responsibilities—
>
> Here then is a case where government's accountability for—the total government effort on the environment—is more important than focusing on the individual performance of departments—

On the question of the environment, the Auditor General finishes up by asking, in terms of responsibility for Canada's environmental well-being: "Who is minding the store?" That is the purpose of this motion today.

I want to make a few other references and indicate to the House why I say that this is an idea whose time has come.

It was in late 1970, that the Securities and Exchange Commission in the United States first asked for disclosure to investors of present and future costs of complying with environmental regulations. That was when companies had to begin doing environmental audits.

In 1986, New Zealand introduced the position of parliamentary commissioner for the environment, one of whose main functions is the audit and surveillance of government operations for their impact on the environment and holding government accountable for those operations.

In 1988, the enforcement and compliance policy accompanying the Canadian Environmental Protection Act recognized the effectiveness of environmental audit as a management tool for companies and government agencies.

In the spring, the discussion paper on the Green Plan stated with regard to about environmental audit that the objective "to make Canada by the year 2000, the industrial world's most environmentally friendly country" can be achieved if we lead by example. "As the largest single business in Canada, the government has important responsibilities related to the environmental impact of its own decisions. Good environmental management will increasingly make good business sense." It went on to state that "a number of businesses have already developed environmental audit procedures and put the question, should businesses and governments be required to perform environmental audits?"

The answer from the consultations on the green plan discussion paper was a resounding yes. The August report recommends that all government departments be required to undertake annual environmental audits and make the results public, which is exactly what this motion is proposing.

Those businesses, environmental organizations, and ordinary citizens with whom the government consulted again suggested that "all government departments should be required to conduct annual environmental audits and that the government should develop a code of environmental stewardship to govern the operations of all federal departments". The trend continues from there.

The C. D. Howe Institute, in its July publication, talked about the need for good information and cost benefit analysis for decision making to integrate economic and environmental considerations.

We had the *Eco Source* magazine in August, 1990, calling "the environmental audit the road map to a greener corporation". For the largest corporations in the country, environmental audit is fast becoming a senior management issue and that "companies are realizing they have to factor the environment into business operations. You'd have to be dumb to be in business in North America today and not be taking on these issues."

The certified general accountants' magazine similarly described the importance of environmental audit as an idea whose time has come. It stated that the "International Chamber of Commerce and various industry associations in Canada are exploring how they can best assist their members in the use of environmental audits."

Finally, in October, 1990, the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy, with the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Finance both present and not dissenting, recommended to government that an environmental auditor should be named. I emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, both the Minister of Finance and the Minister of the Environment were present at that meeting when that recommendation was adopted.

• (1710)

The Rawson Academy on Aquatic Sciences, when it was before the environment committee on Bill C-78 on November 8 of this year, talked in very serious terms about the need for environmental audit, pointing out that such an office would be responsible for monitoring the performance of government agencies and departments according to designated standards of environmental protection or resource conservation.

Most of the sources I have quoted have been within the last year. There is an obvious ground swell of support for the recognition that, to truly integrate environmental decision making and economic decision making, environmental audit is an essential tool.

I will refer to only one last source and that is the interim report of the Standing Committee on Environment. The report is entitled: *No time to Lose—The Challenge of Global Warming*. Recommendation 16 states that "the committee recommends that the Auditor General, working in conjunction with the Departments of Environment and Finance, establish an environmental audit function to ensure that all federal departments and agencies have implemented environmental assessment processes and to monitor the effectiveness of environmental programs".

Recommendation 17 states that "the committee recommends that all federal departments and agencies, as part of their budget submissions, report on the direct and indirect impacts of their operations on global warming and set annual targets for reductions".

These things cannot happen without the tools to let them happen. As the single-largest employer in the country, government must set the example. The green task force on the Hill, the Greening of the Hill, has been a symbol and a beacon to Canadians that we, as parliamentarians, are serious about our concerns for the environment and are determined to examine our own environment and to make it as friendly towards the survival of life on this planet as we possibly can. Canadians expect the same thing throughout government.

We cannot sit here and decide that we will impose regulations, laws, green taxes, and horrendous reporting requirements on everybody else in the country, and then exempt ourselves from what we require others to do at some cost to them.

However, I do want to point out that a number of sources have told us that what we are looking at here in environmental audit is not an expense, but a significant opportunity for cost-savings. I will give just one indicator. The DPA report estimated that in energy conservation alone, this country could save $150 billion.

Again, I quote from *Eco Source* magazine. "The new audit is a matter of performance. It examines the environmental details not normally of concern to engineers and lawyers, such as the lighting system, the heating system, recycling practices, purchasing habits, packaging systems, supplier and investment policies. The auditors check washrooms and cafeterias, interview groundskeepers and cleaning staff, and discuss packaging alternatives, employee car poolings, staff training programs, and codes of conduct."

In this government, we do not even know how much we spend on vehicles every year, how much we spend on gasoline, how much we spend on electricity, how much we spend on heating our buildings, how much we spend to have garbage carted away, and how much unnecessary money we spend on paper. We have no system of accounting for those things.

The Green Plan consultations talked about the importance of investing in technology. What better way than for the government, as the largest corporation in the country, to start looking at its own operations, getting its own house in order, looking at what technologies it needs to do that, and then being in the forefront of developing those technologies? Just as a customer for new products, the government has the opportunity to influence the marketplace in a positive way rather than imposing requirements and to ensure that the kinds of products and services that are developed will not only make government but the private sector more environmentally friendly.

Many companies want to be environmentally friendly, but especially the small ones need the tools to do it. Environmental audit in government can help those tools be developed.

I want to talk about environmental audit as a major international opportunity for Canada. As I said, in 1986 the government of New Zealand was the first, and is still the only country in the world, to establish environmental audit in its parliament. I want to quote again from *Eco Source* where it says:

> No government standards exist anywhere in the world for environmental audit.

It also says there are real commercial advantages in turning out a better than average environmental performance. Finally, it says that "the implications of a full-blown greening commitment on the part of a major multinational or government agency would be impressive, primarily for its ripple effect".

We have in Canada some of the best raw talent to develop the methodologies and techniques of environmental audit anywhere in the world. When New Zealand set up its audit function, it did so with the help of Canadian officials. We need to put that talent to work, develop skills and knowledge that will give us a major product to market internationally, to help other countries and private sector operations become as environmentally friendly as they can.

That is why I say to get into environmental audit is a major business opportunity for Canada.

I want to conclude by saying that we have been trying to tell households, individuals and companies how to be more environmentally friendly, how to cut down their use of energy, how to cut down their production of garbage. Now we are looking at regulations, legislation and green taxes. Why not lead by example?

In the 1970s we were forced into energy conservation, and now again in the 1990s the Minister of Energy is telling Canadians to cut back on the use of energy. What have we done in government to demonstrate how that can be done? The major need now is to do it in business, in industrial operations, not in households.

Certainly the idea of an environmental auditor as such needs more exploration. There are many options as to how environmental audit can be started and carried on. The establishment of a specific position may or may not be the best way to do it. But until we take the first step along the road to ensuring that every government department has the skills, the tools, the knowledge and the necessity to monitor its environmental impacts, we will not get anywhere. We will never decide how best to do it. We will never develop those tools of knowledge that our companies, our private sector, and the public sector at all levels of government need.

Next week the green plan will be tabled. I hope it will not ignore the advice it got from over $6 million worth of consultation. I will only point out that for less than half that amount, the office of an environmental auditor general could have been established.

I hope the government will include environmental audit in its Green Plan to be tabled next week. I would hope that if it intends to do so, it will make a point of allowing this motion to go to committee. All that needs to happen for this motion to receive further discussion and for us to start along that long road to being environmentally responsible as a government, as a Parliament, as a nation, is for government members not to continue talking until six o'clock.

• (1720 )

If this debate ends before six o'clock, this motion can then be examined and acted on by a committee. We will have taken one important step down the road.

I ask members opposite who are going to speak on this bill to give serious consideration to speaking very briefly, allowing the debate to terminate before six o'clock and allowing this motion to go before a committee for study.

**Mr. J.W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury):** Mr. Speaker, although I am not a member opposite in a geographic sense, I would have to say that I probably will be deemed to be a member opposite when I am finished speaking to this motion.

First of all, I congratulate the hon. member for putting her motion. I have the privilege to serve with her on the environment committee of the House of Commons where she makes a major contribution. Generally speaking, we and other members of that committee are in consensus not only about the importance of the environment to Canada and to the world, but also about the measures that we must take to enhance and protect our environment in this country.

I would have to say that, in reading the hon. member's motion to appoint an environmental auditor general, I believe as well intentioned as her resolution may be, in my view it goes in the wrong direction to the ultimate resolution of sustainable development in the sense that sustainable development means the reconciliation of both economic and environmental factors.

To isolate an auditor general strictly in an environmental sense is to miss the point that we cannot ignore the environmental without considering the economic and vice versa. In fact, I would refer the hon. member to a resolution in which she shared in our interim report on global warming, which was published just before the Geneva convention when, in recommendation 16, the environment committee said that we recommended the auditor general—

**Mrs. Catterall:** I said that.

**Mr. Bird:** Did you? I missed that.

Perhaps it is worth reading again, because frankly it underlines the weakness in the concept of an environmental auditor general.

It does recommend an auditor general who works in conjunction with both the departments of environment and finance to establish an environmental audit function. I do not think there can be any dispute about the need and the concept for an audit of environmental considerations, as is the case for an audit of economic considerations.

Again, I say that in the concept of sustainable development, the two very much go together.

I would also like to say that one of the areas that has been of concern to the environment committee and to another committee on which I sit, the forestry and fisheries committee, is the organization of environment departments themselves whether they are operating departments, regulatory departments or policy departments.

I think a general consensus has developed and is recommended in this report by the environment committee and also by the forestry subcommittee, that environment departments generally be policy and regulatory departments whose disciplines and policies permeate the operating decisions and criteria of all government departments wherever they may fall, be they provincial environment departments and other provincial departments, or federal government departments and the federal environment department.

The concept of environmental administration should be approached in very much the same manner that economic and financial considerations are approached in a policy and regulatory sense, and not in an operating sense.

I would like to refer to the forestry report in brief, if I may, because this report which addresses the federal role in the forests of Canada is very much an environmental document. It touches on the commercial importance of forestry, but it also underlines the fact that the forests are the essence of the environment of this country. It expresses concerns, as I have said, that environmental policies and disciplines should permeate every operating entity and every operating decision, just as do financial and economic considerations. But it also underlines the fact that operating agencies should conduct the operations.

There is an area of concern that I would like to mention in respect of the initiatives we are taking to enhance our environmental disciplines in Canada, specifically with respect to Bill C–78, which is itself a move in a direction of more intensive environmental audit. I have expressed a concern publicly in the environment committee, and I would like to express the concern again here today that the Department of the Environment, in its environmental assessment review process, does not become a master operator, a font of wisdom in all directions and in all disciplines.

I think it is extremely important that while the environment assessment review process addresses the environment broadly, those disciplines which are affected, such as forestry, fisheries, mining, energy or agriculture very clearly have a statutory obligation and a statutory right to be involved in the environmental assessment process, whatever direction it may take at any given time.

This government addressed the need originally for environmental assessment review guidelines with Bill C–78, to enhance those disciplines, to make not only the initiating minister responsible for environmental assessment of departmental actions, in whatever department they may occur, but also giving the environment minister the authority to oversee and overrule the environmental planning of specific initiatives.

The government has placed a great cloak of security around the environmental process in this country and I applaud it and support it while expressing the caveat that it contain very clear and mandatory provisions for the operating entities, professions and disciplines to be involved in their specific areas of activity.

Another area where this government has made significant progress and, as the hon. member has mentioned will make an announcement next Tuesday, is in the area of Canada's Green Plan. It was on March 29, 1990, that the Government of Canada released the framework for discussion on the environment which began the process of the Green Plan, called "Our National Challenge". Its long–term objective was stated to be to make Canada the industrial world's most environmentally friendly country by the year 2000. There is a lot of evidence that we are making progress in that direction. It was to do that by ensuring that the activities of business, individuals, communities and governments are consistent with the concept of sustainable development. I believe that it has done that.

Canadians responded to the government's invitation to that discussion and, during the first phase, more than 6,000 people attended 41 information sessions held across the country. They asked questions, expressed concerns and they identified needs for action. In phase two, more than 3,500 people participated in two–day consultation workshops, in 17 capital cities and major centres in the provinces and the territories. I participated in one of those in Fredericton and I want to tell you that it was a good consultation. It was the kind of dialogue that gave you confidence that this government really is in touch with the people.

I believe that when we see the green plan unveiled next week, it will reveal that that, in fact, is what has happened, that there has been close, intensive dialogue, there has been effective consultation, and we shall have a national environmental plan, a green plan that will truly address the needs, the aspirations, the goals and objectives of all Canadians. Mr. Speaker, that is consistent with the undertakings and the obligations of this government.

**Mr. Caccia:** Time is up.

**Mr. Bird:** As much as my hon. friend may really hate to hear this, this government in its throne speech in early 1989 said, and it was a major pillar of the throne speech, that we were going to address the environmental imperative.

• (1730 )

With Bill C–78, with the Green Plan, with the environment committee report, in which my hon. colleagues have participated, on global warming and on climate change, and in this excellent document which I would particularly recommend to your attention, Mr. Speaker, with the Commons subcommittee on forestry addressing the federal role in the forests of Canada, one that even my hon. friend from Toronto would endorse, I am sure the government has truly endorsed, addressed, sustained, and is moving on an environmental imperative for Canada.

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand to speak to the private member's motion put forward today by the member for Ottawa West. Her proposal to have this House and this government consider the advisability of establishing the position of environmental auditor general is a very welcome proposition to those of us in the New Democratic Party for many reasons. I think it is welcomed by all Canadians. There is no question that we have to hold the government and Canadians accountable for their actions relating to the environment.

We do have, as the hon. member for Ottawa West said in her initial remarks, a government financial auditor to protect or at least alert the taxpayers to possible abuses by the government of taxpayers' dollars. We also need a government auditor, more importantly an independent auditor on the environment, to protect our air, land, water, and indeed our future from the activities of the human race that in the quest for greater development of this planet is in fact jeopardizing our future.

In June 1989, the New Democratic Party task force on the environment presented a report to the House entitled *Towards a Sustainable Future*. In that report there is a couple of very important quotes which I would like to put on record. One is dealing with why the environment is a difficult matter. It reads: "The existing relationship between the federal government and most development is fundamentally flawed. Despite the government's endorsement of the Brundtland report and the increasingly frequent addition of the words sustainable development to projects across Canada, government and industry have failed to act decisively on that report's recommendations. To date, the federal government has not implemented the policies, measures or targets needed to facilitate the transition to a genuinely sustainable society".

Later in the report *Towards a Sustainable Future* the New Democratic Party talks about the transition to a sustainable society as undeniably and enormous one. "Fundamental changes are required in the way we weigh costs and benefits to make decisions. The federal government must be prepared to demonstrate leadership in adopting these changes, not just in matters of national policy but in its own day-to-day operations. Implementing the Brundtland report entails more than just mouthing the words sustainable development and attaching environmentally friendly stickers to everything in sight".

The report envisaged a whole new approach to economic development, not just tinkering at the edges. The federal government must begin an immediate re-evaluation of all its policies and programs, asking if each is in environmentally sound. The federal government must also show leadership by ensuring that the federal government departments, agencies, and Crown corporations practise the principles of sustainability in purchasing, waste management, and other aspects of their operation. Their compliance would be monitored by a federal environmental auditor.

Our recommendation is that the House of Commons immediately adopt legislation which would establish an environmental auditor to review the sustainability and environmental soundness of all federal projects and undertakings. That report, as I said, was tabled in the House in June 1989.

In May 1990 a regional conference at the ministerial level was held in Bergen, Norway on the follow-up to the report on the World Commission on Environment and Development in the ECE region. The following report was issued: "Action for a Common Future".

In that report they talked about the accountability of this process and the needs of the environment. I would like to quote from the report "Action for a Common Future" presented in Bergen, Norway. They talked about awareness of the public and public participation in the process of environmental assessment. One of their recommendations was: "To undertaking the prior assessment and public reporting of the environmental impact of projects which are likely to have a significant effect on human health and the environment and, so far as practicable, the policies, programs and plans which underlie each project".

They go on to say: "To reaffirm and build on the CSCE conclusions regarding the rights of individuals, groups and organizations concerned with environmental issues and, in addition, to safeguard the rights of individuals and concerned groups to have access to all relevant information and to be consulted and participate in the planning and decision making concerning activities which may affect health and environment, with reasonable access to appropriate legal and administrative remedies."

More important, they go to say: "To develop rules for free and open access to information on the environment. Such rules can increase public participation in the procedures to control pollution and prevent damage to the environment".

These matters, all very important to what we are talking about when we are dealing with the environment, will require the attention of an independent auditor. Only the Canadian government, through legislation here, can ensure that an independent auditor is in place.

Also at that conference in Bergen, Norway had a report entitled "Bridging the Gap: An Agenda for Action", drafted by the delegates of the Non-Governmental Conference on the Environment and Development held in March 1990. They had a number of recommendations, again stressing the need for awareness raising and public participation. Most clearly they said that the public is very important in all of this process and that "the full recognition and legal protection of the environmental rights of individuals, groups and organizations, including unrestrained access to environmental information, is an essential requirement for the achievement of sustainable development". In other words, there has to be someone who can have access to that information and can make it available to the public who is not tainted by industry or government interests.

"By 1992", this group suggested, "national sustainable development audits and progress reports should be prepared, publicly financed and published annually by an independent body". That means in every single jurisdiction, including Canada. These audits should focus on the quality of a nation's environmental health, its natural resources and endangered ecosystems and species. Resource centres and data banks should be established. All this could be done in Canada under the auspices of an environmental auditor.

As the hon. member for Ottawa West indicated in her remarks, the Auditor General, the financial auditor of Canada, has indicated a great need for environmental auditing in this country. In his report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1990, he has a scathing report on the Department of the Environment which should be examined carefully by an independent body whose interests lie with the Canadian environment.

• (1740 )

All sorts of industry representations are made to government, but the environment needs a voice at the cabinet table and needs a voice to the public. The Auditor General said that the department's program evaluation coverage was inadequate and that it had evaluated less than 10 per cent of its programs. For example, it had not evaluated any of the Canadian parks service programs, even though it had half the department's person-years and a $387 million budget.

The Auditor General also talked about the Minister of the Environment being required to report annually to Parliament on the administration and the enforcement of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. No report has been presented from the time the act was proclaimed in June 1988 until June 30, 1990, when the Auditor General wrote this report.

I see you signalling my time is up, Mr. Speaker. I respect that. Thank you for much for the opportunity to address this important initiative. I wish the member for Ottawa West the best of luck in gaining support for this motion from the government side.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, I will be brief, but first of all, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Ottawa West.

[*English*]

She has put forward a very interesting proposition upon which she has already very clearly elaborated. In essence, she is telling us that the government, any government for that matter, would be well served by the services provided by an environmental auditor general who would, by virtue of the work carried out under such auspices, offer the government of the day a very important tool in the decision-making process. Nothing would be more desirable at this point when governments, ministers, and decision makers are embracing the concept of sustainable development than to proceed by adopting this specific proposal.

The hon. member for Ottawa West has elaborated on how the environmental auditor would operate. It is interesting to note that the Auditor General noted in his report: "Parliament should expect government to devise acceptable means of being held accountable for the conduct of its environmental responsibilities." This is in a letter that the member for Ottawa West has written, alerting us to her motion.

The Auditor General is very precise, accurate and timely in that particular remark. The private member's motion of the member for Ottawa West reflects that timing. We congratulate her and hope that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment will give us the good news that the government has no objection to having this method proceed to committee for an appropriate and thorough examination.

**Mr. Geoff Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to participate in debate on this private member's motion initiated by my friend, the hon. member for Ottawa West.

At first blush it is an interesting proposal. The member's motion requests that in the opinion of the House the government should consider the appointment of an environmental auditor general who would conduct an audit of all government operations on a rotational basis to ensure any activity, program or initiative of the government is conducted in a manner that is compatible with a policy of protection and enhancement of the environment.

It is not a bad idea, but let me make it clear that protection and enhancement of the environment are already high priorities of this government. Our record clearly shows our commitment from the passage of the Canadian Environment Protection Act in 1988, to the clean-up of orphaned waste sites, one part of which the Minister of the Environment announced in British Columbia just last week, and the soon to be completed negotiations on an acid rain accord with the United States. While our past actions are bearing fruit, we are now clearly looking to the future with the publication next week of the government's environmental Green Plan for a healthy environment.

Before we rush to create yet another new bureaucracy, we should review what we have in place now to ensure that environmental consideration are fully reflected in the decisions of government. The Government Organization Act of 1979 gives the Minister of the Environment the power to implement the policy of the Government of Canada with respect to the environment.

This act requires the minister to initiate, recommend, undertake and co-ordinate programs and policies to promote the establishment or adoption of objectives and standards relating to the environmental quality, or to control pollution; and to ensure that new federal projects are reviewed and assessed for their environmental impacts. That is a pretty wide-ranging mandate.

The Minister of the Environment is also required to provide the heads of departments, boards and agencies with advice on environmental issues and may, with the approval of cabinet, establish guidelines for federal departments, agencies and Crown corporations with respect to activities that have a potential impact on the environment.

In addition to the legislated base, the Prime Minister has clearly committed this government to consider the environment as a priority in all of its policy and program decision-making. The Prime Minister has played a key role in making Canada a world leader in promoting environmental concerns by, for example, ensuring a prominent place for the environment on the agenda of the annual meeting of the G-7 countries.

This government's commitment to the environment is also enshrined in legislation. Bill C-78, an act to establish a federal environment assessment process, affirms in its preamble a commitment to, and I ask the hon. member to listen carefully, "achieve an appropriate balance between economic development and the preservation and enhancement of environmental quality".

Bill C-78, the Canadian environment assessment bill will ensure that all federal departments and agencies conduct environmental assessments of all project proposals, for which they have a decision-making authority and gives the Minister of the Environment substantial powers to ensure that this process is fair, efficient, transparent and allows for a high level of public input into decisions of projects which have a potentially significant impact on the natural environment.

As a government we realize that the activities of government touch Canadians in many ways which are not directly linked to projects. That is why it is government policy to require that an environmental statement accompany any proposal considered by cabinet dealing with policies or programs which may have a significant effect on the Canadian environment.

Together, Bill C-78 and the policies of the Government of Canada will ensure that virtually every significant action considered by government will be reviewed for its environmental implications and that Canadians will have the right to either participate directly in the process or to have access to the results.

In addition to Bill C-78 and the policies of the government, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment has the responsibility to administer the Canadian Environment Protection Act. This act gives the minister substantial power to establish regulations protecting Canada's air, water and land. More than this, the act creates for the minister the obligation to report to Canadians at regular intervals on the state of the Canadian environment. The next state of the environment report will be published early next year.

Environmental information is an area to which this government attaches a great deal of importance. During the process of consulting with Canadians as part of the development of the government's Green Plan, individual Canadians stressed repeatedly that a major priority of the government must be the regular provision and wide dissemination of readily understandable information on the state of the environment and how it is changing.

• (1750 )

Canadians told us that they wanted a sound basis to make their own decisions about the environment. They wanted a basis to understand whether the actions they were taking as individuals would help to reduce environmental degradation. They want to be able to judge whether the private sector is doing its part to contribute to a healthy and sustainable environmental legacy for our children. Of course Canadians want to have a basis to make judgments about the environmental performance of their governments.

The routine provision of high quality environmental information will be a major commitment included in the Green Plan when it is made public next week. There is much work to be done in this complex area, but the government is committed to providing Canadians with the information they need to make informed decisions about their own activities and about the environmental performance of others, including governments.

In the view of the government, the measures we have already put in place and are contemplating as part of the Green Plan are, we believe, the best way to ensure that environmental impacts are always considered as part of the government decision–making.

In my view, an environmental auditor general would needlessly duplicate many of the functions which already rest with the Minister of the Environment. Such an institution is simply not an effective substitute for an environmentally aware electorate making fully informed decisions about government performance. This is true accountability and we are committed to the public as auditors general of our environmental performance.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yvon Côté (Richmond—Wolfe):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take part in a debate that not only gives hon. members a chance to propose a number of concepts that are praiseworthy, attractive and generous, but also gives other members a chance to respond to the concepts that one of our members, in this case the hon. member for Ottawa West, has presented in the House today. Mr. Speaker, I must admit that the contents of motion M–456 are very interesting and attractive, and I would like to read the motion, and I quote:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of establishing the position of Environmental Auditor General —

I am going to skip some of this, since the focus of our comments is now clear, and the motion goes on to read:

> — to ensure that any activity, program or initiative of the government is conducted in a manner that is compatible with a policy of protection and enhancement of the environment.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this is a very interesting and attractive approach for anyone who is environmentally aware. The motives underlying this proposal are indeed generous and praiseworthy, and I believe we share those motives as a matter of principle. However, I am not sure it would be appropriate to proceed immediately to discuss establishing a position as novel as that of environmental auditor. I want to demonstrate that it is perhaps premature to develop and establish this kind of responsibility.

I was saying that the purpose of the motion of the hon. member for Ottawa West was to establish the position of Environmental Auditor General, whose main role would consist in monitoring the government's progress in protecting the environment. This is very attractive, I agree, but this concept would merely weaken the government's responsibility in a very important area, because the government already has well defined responsibilities in this respect. Authority is already well established at various levels and reflected in various position.

Establishing this position might involve bureaucrats identifying new and increasingly complex criteria and procedures, which only bureaucrats would be able to understand. We would be on the outside looking in, we who were officially appointed by the people to manage our public affairs which includes a responsibility for the environment where we have a major contribution to make. I do not think we should appoint an auditor now or even in the near future. I think that appointing an auditor general immediately would be putting the cart before the horse. It would be like hiring a truck driver without knowing whether he is supposed to drive a heavy truck or a light truck, whether he will carry bulk or people or whatever. Mr. Speaker, I think it is premature to commit the government to establishing this kind of position right away, because as you know, the environment is a very complex and very broad field. When we consider the scope of the operations the incumbent would have to administer, when we consider the scope of activities under federal jurisdiction, which means the government we represent, it boggles the mind.

I would like to take this opportunity to explain the problems this might create. As you know, the federal government's activities which are very wide ranging and complex employ as many as 585,000 Canadians. This means 30,000 buildings to manage, and these people with the federal government represent a market that is worth $10 billion in terms of consumer goods and industrial products, divided into over 17,000 categories. This is an enormous area the auditor would have to monitor, and he would not be an elected official. As a public servant, the auditor would not be elected, and he would be asked to manage all that and to set standards and have his own staff. I think it is clear that because of the scope and variety of the activities in question, the government's actions have a considerable impact on the environment. Canadians have every right to expect their government, and only their government, to act responsibly in protecting the environment.

Mr. Speaker, the government is no ordinary business. In fact, that is exactly why the impact of this government's activities on the environment is a factor that is beyond the normal scope of those activities. As a result, the government must set rules and regulations that control the manner in which a large number of private sector businesses operate. And these rules and regulations which are all contained in the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, determine those conditions. In addition, however, there are other acts, regulations and programs that, although they focus on a wider range of socio-economic objectives, nevertheless support the government's legitimate policies.

Considering the scope and the impact of government activities, what tools do we actually have to protect the environment? Mr. Speaker, I think the answer is quite simple. Protecting the environment must become a priority throughout the government. Through legislation, sustainable development should become the expressed goal of every minister in managing his department. The Minister of the Environment must have the necessary resources to be effective in his role.

You know, it is like safety and security, As long as we felt that safety and security was a matter for the police, there was a lot of insecurity. Today, we realize that ordinary citizens also have to be involved. We all have to participate and share the responsibility.

• (1800)

Mr. Speaker, the question is, how would an auditor, with complex legislation and public servants, be able to monitor Canada's environment and all government operations? I think the answer is pretty obvious.

Like my hon. colleague, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that this government has demonstrated its ability to manage the environment for a number of years, and especially during the past year, with the Green Plan and Bill C-78.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The time for 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*.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to order made on Monday, December 3, 1990, the House will now resume debate on the motion of Mr. Masse for third reading of Bill C-40.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

## BROADCASTING ACT

### MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Masse that Bill C–40, an act respecting broadcasting and to amend certain acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunication, be read the third time and passed.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, it was extremely interesting to debate on the environment that interrupted my speech. Certainly, it is a key player in every aspect of anything we undertake to do. The media and communicating those concerns are vital and key to an understanding by the population and by business people of the role that the environment plays in all our lives, whether one is young or old, in business or just at leisure.

I would like to welcome the parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for Edmonton Southwest, and congratulate him upon his daughter's recent marriage.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mrs. Finestone:** He has today, I believe, returned from Australia and we welcome him. He will be probably the only voice heard from the other side of the floor, and a welcomed and knowledgeable one at that. Certainly his voice has been the one we have heard most consistently. We do congratulate him and welcome him back.

Previously, I was talking about the CRTC's executive committee and the collegial decision–making process on those issues of very serious importance to an even broadcasting environment across the land. This has now been replaced with the principle of "who hears decides", whereby panels of three will be empowered to make binding decisions on the entire commission. The introduction of the "who hears decides" concept, together with the ability of the cabinet to direct the CRTC to establish regional offices, will profoundly change the way the commission goes about its hearings and decision making.

The new regionalization concept, coupled with binding panel decisions, will erode the consistency, uniformity and quality of the decision–making process and could lead to the Balkanization of the CRTC.

Keith Spicer, the temporary chairman of the CRTC, who I believe will return this mandate later, appearing before the legislative committee, recommended against this approach. I know he changed his song. However, I think the circumstances on which he changed that song might well be examined. I will not go into that any further at this moment.

He said in essence at committee that "In broadcasting you have to look at the whole matrix of issues, many of them very subtle, cultural issues, and I mean regional cultural issues. It is not only a matter of law, it is a matter of common sense, sensitivity, as well as law. That is why in the broadcasting area we think it is much better to have one national consensus so that we can compare what we are doing in Newfoundland" to that which is being done in Saskatchewan or up in Iqaluit or anywhere across this land and to "make sure that all Canadians feel they are being treated in the same way. And at a time when there are some regional inter–ethnic tensions in Canada we ought to be looking for some of these mechanisms to have a strong national view, but with much greater sensitivity to regional concerns."

I think that that is happening, Mr. Speaker, and we do not have to change the mechanism to have that sensitivity to regional concerns. He went on to say: "We all know that this whole process is like squaring a circle, but that is what we are trying to do, and in our honest opinion we think it could be done better that way." The way it was done before, in other words.

**Mr. Edwards:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to abuse the charity and goodwill which the hon. member for Mount Royal acknowledged when she welcomed me into the House. However, I did want to have some clarification as to whether the Official Opposition has signalled a departure from House practice in the use of a podium for a debate. I believe that the Official Opposition has denied the Prime Minister the opportunity to use a podium in this House and that indeed the House practice is that the only occasion on which such use is made of a podium is when the Minister of Finance is delivering the Budget.

What really piqued my interest was that I usually have an unobstructed view of this very distinguished member and I was deprived of this on tonight's occasion, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Unless the hon. member for Mount Royal wants to make a comment, the Chair would be ready to give the hon. parliamentary secretary the clarification he requested.

**Mrs. Finestone:** I do have a comment to make, Mr. Speaker. I was offered to try this podium and, when I raised the question, I was told that the Minister of Justice used it the other day and even at an earlier occasion, I believe. I thought I was entitled to do the same, but if you think it is contrary to the rules, I will do without. I wanted you to know that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but the Chair is now in a position to make a ruling. The House practice and tradition is indeed that none shall use such a podium but the Minister of Finance for delivering the Budget speech. Another member may have used it. Personally, I was inclined to be tolerant. However, another member having raised the question, I have no choice but to enforce the rules. I would therefore ask you to remove this podium and revert to the usual method.

**Mrs. Finestone:** Since this government was never big on tolerance, I will respect your decision. I hope this will allow my hon. friend opposite to see me and hear me, but foremost, to listen to me because the problem with the government of the day is that it does not listen.

[*English*]

**Mr. MacWilliam:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did not intend to interrupt the member's presentation certainly any further, but I am more or less seeking clarification in terms of the definition of your ruling. As you well know, many members have used, for example, stacked books, just to place their reference notes on. I am not sure, in light of your ruling, whether in fact using those stacked notations are in fact a violation of the House. I may provide for you, Mr. Speaker, the fact that many of the provincial legislatures, including the legislature in British Columbia of which I am a former member, makes common everyday use of the podium simply as an instrument to allow a little more flexibility in the presentation of written notes.

• (1810)

It is simply a matter of being able to have the notes a little more accessible to the glance of the eye as one is making those presentations.

So, I am somewhat confused in terms of your current ruling and whether in fact it rules out the use of any elevation whatsoever.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** You have to understand that, in such cases, parliamentary procedure and tradition are of the utmost importance, and usually hon. members are allowed extensive material. However, the House has been pretty strict on the use of lecterns, and once again, I am bound by the rules of this House. If the House wants to amend the rules, it can do so, but for now, according to parliamentary practise, only the Minister of Finance can use a lectern to make his speech.

Having said that, the House can make appropriate changes, if it so wishes, but for now, I must stick to tradition, according to which no one can use a lectern to make a speech at the House of Commons, although books and other reading material are allowed.

The hon. member for Mount Royal has the floor.

**Mrs. Finestone:** I will use no material, and no books, just my hands.

[*English*]

If I ever get around to discussing the problems of the CRTC with "he who hears decides" between the podium and the interruptions and the arrival—not unexpected, I would like to say—of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Communications. It was not the surprise, it was just the pleasure of the arrival of the parliamentary secretary who fundamentally believes in this bill but who has certainly missed my opening comments when I indicated—

**Mr. Edwards:** No.

**Mrs. Finestone:** Oh, no? You were here to hear them? Then the hon. member knows the government has had since March to bring this bill in. The fact that his House leader did not was one of the problems in the pushing through of this bill and the zipped-lips across the way, with the exception of his.

To return to this whole question of the regionalization through the "she/he who hears decides," the CRTC is not alone in its concerns about this matter. As a matter of fact, I would quote Bernard Ostry of TV Ontario who told the committee that "the regionalization of the commission and the initiation of the 'she/he who hears decides' rule will lead to fragmentation of national policy and general confusion as to the guiding principles of regulation in all parts of the country".

CFCF from Montreal argued that with this particular rule "we are running the risk of contradicting one of the fundamental objectives of the system, to maintain a single system".

Let us look further at what is happening with the CRTC. This bill seriously jeopardizes its ability to carry out its role as an expert and an independent quasi-judicial body because it will grant new power to the cabinet while retaining an existing one. It would permit the cabinet to issue policy directions to the CRTC, but it would also retain the ability to set aside a decision of the commission on the basis that the decision derogates from the attainment of the objectives of the broadcasting policy or the objectives of a direction issued to the commission.

The Liberal Party argues that the dual powers of cabinet review over CRTC decisions and the power of general policy direction to the CRTC are excessive. These tandem powers allow for government interference particularly through the cabinet and that is most unhealthy. Whatever side of the House a minister comes from, they should be wary of this particular move.

Therefore, Liberals believe that the power of cabinet review should be removed to uninvite—if I may put it that way—political interference that would jeopardize the independence of the commission.

The commission and its predecessors were created precisely because it was recognized that there was a need for a body characterized by continuity of expertise and independence from everyday political pressures. As far back as 1928, the Aird Report noted that this independence also protected the government of the day from the political pressures inevitably exerted upon it as it ensures that the competing arguments put forward to the decision-makers are weighed as dispassionately as possible and in the interests of the communication system as a whole, and are not dictated or influenced by parochial political pressures.

If there is a member of this House who understands that, it is the parliamentary secretary of the day who at the time of the all news channel hearings felt very compelled to push for an understanding of the proposal of one of his riding people, Allard in this instance, and so resigned as the chairman of the standing committee in order to promote his own constituent's interest. I understand that he felt both a sense of commitment and obligation to promote that particular presentation before the CRTC, but he had the good sense to resign from the standing committee. I do not know that this would allow ministers to resign from the cabinet as they are pressured in the interests of their own particular self interests.

Let us turn to the heart of the broadcast bill, which this government is cutting to the quick bit by bit. I do not know if four bypasses would even save or be able to reinstate the CBC to the power, influence and importance that it does hold within the hearts and minds of Canada as it links and communicates across this land.

Bill C-40 undermines the central role of the CBC as Canada's national broadcaster. On the television side, the CBC's traditional mandate to reflect all regions of Canada and to meet special interest or minority group programming responsibilities is assigned to the non-existent alternative programmer. However, while the bill permits the creation of this new national broadcaster, it does not mandate or require its creation, which appears very unlikely.

In fact, while the government said in June 1988 that the alternate programmer should be operational within two years, as of December 1990, which is here, not one single step has been taken toward its creation. Instead, the CBC, now stripped as well of its mandate to serve Canadian unity, continues to have its budget slashed out of all proportion to overall government budget reductions, thus cutting its voice and the potential for the extension of its voice across this land.

Cuts to the CBC with this Conservative government began in 1985-86 with $85 million; 1986-87, $5.6 million; 1987-88, $21.1 million; 1988-89, $5.6 million; 1989-90, $5.8 million; and for the year 1990-91, $25.9 million.

Last week, when I asked the minister to assure no further cuts to the CBC, he refused to say no. His only words were: "It is with great pleasure that I note the member's suggestion".

We know that when you start to cut, the retirement packages are expensive and difficult to manage. It becomes a rolling stone that cannot stop, which has a wide impact on us all, radio and television, French and English across this land. It is a very serious matter.

For six years the government has been using major budget cuts to force the CBC to focus strictly on programming for mass audiences, to expand its dependence on advertising and to radically cut its regional services. As well, there is the potential jeopardy to the maintenance of the parliamentary channel, to the northern service and to Radio Canada International.

The role of these non-mandated services is important in the spectrum of what we see on the sets that we turn on. This past week we have heard the challenge to their survival. CBC has been so badly wounded, so cut, that in trying to meet its own personal mandate it is going to have to cut services dramatically across this land.

One such service is that of the parliamentary channel, and I would invite the public to let their voices be heard if they want to continue to watch this House discuss and debate the issues of the day. Call for a parliamentary appropriation to ensure the survival of the parliamentary channel. Let the people's voice be heard. This government is mean-spirited. If it thinks that its popularity at 14 per cent can go any lower because their voice is being heard on the channel, that is a pretty sad reason for cutting the parliamentary channel. There are some reasoned debates that go on in this House. I must say from the mute forces across the floor these days, one would presume that they have already decided that the television service of the parliamentary channel is cut out, so they do not have to bother with any form of democracy or multiparty programming responses to the issues of the day.

• (1820)

That is a pretty sad commentary on democracy. When you let it slip, it can slip away. If it does, it is the fault of this government across the floor for its mean-spirited and unparliamentary approach to reasoned and sensible debate. It has not even opened its mind to the arguments that have come to them that are logical and well reasoned. Certainly some of them are.

With the passage of this bill, the CBC will no longer be required to contribute to the development of national unity. It has been dropped from their mandate. The parliamentary secretary loves to say that I voted against including the national unity in this bill. He, like many others on his side, forget to look at society and determine if they have done things inaccurately, incorrectly and be prepared to stand up and say: "I was wrong and we were wrong in that standing committee."

The illusion to this being a propaganda state like South Africa, which was used by the parliamentary secretary, is far from acceptable in this House or as a description of parliamentary democracy or democracy as expressed over the last many years through CBC. I could go on and explain that this was propaganda. There were some things that took place that perhaps should have been cut out of the CBC, the Sault Ste. Marie being an example. But they were not.

Journalistic freedom has grown and is respected in this House and across this land. I think that illusion to propaganda is totally unacceptable, whether it comes from Patrick Watson, Jim Edwards or anyone else. It is an incorrect reading of the right to report and reporters to report. It certainly does not speak highly for respect for leadership across this land.

When Canadians are being pulled in so many directions over trade, the GST, the Constitution, just at a time when the government should be doing everything in its power to give each and every Canadian a sense of belonging and of participation, this is the wrong time to cut out national unity. What better role is there for the CBC as the country's national broadcaster than to help unify Canadians through understanding, through an accessible voice all through this land at this critical point in our history.

The Liberal Party's goal for Canada is developing the national personality, giving access to its expression, building a sense of national identity by giving access and consciousness to that sense. If building access and a sense of national identity and expressing one's personality does not develop a sense of national unity, then what does it do? We believe we need national institutions like the CBC, which is one of the few that are left after they have absolutely sabred most of them across this way, to weave all the regions and all the diverse participants in Canadian society into a unified voice.

National unity also means money behind infrastructure and money behind rebroadcasters. You, Mr. Speaker, come from an area and a lot of your colleagues are from areas where you need to have that kind of reinforcement of the voice across those wires so that they can reach the farthest reaches of this land. We heard from the English-speaking people of Sherbrooke where they cannot get a proper CBC voice because we need improvement of that service.

We heard in parliamentary committee of areas in this country—they are few—where they feel the loss of the Canadian voice as heard through the national broadcaster. How did that voice get there? We had a responsibility when we put CBC into place to put the kind of infrastructure that would lead to national unity so that we could build this sense of consciousness and national identity. There is something very nefarious when this government removes the national unity clause.

Recently, the Prime Minister highlighted the importance of national unity by saying: "Everything that we have accomplished as a country can be traced back to our sense of national purpose, to our national unity." If the Prime Minister believes this and says this with all this emotion and feeling, why has that not been carried through? Why has he allowed, at the table of the cabinet, the removal of national unity along with other very important aspects of this bill?

I think the lack of any ministers to sit in this House while the bill was being debated, the lack of any single, solitary person to sit behind the minister as he spoke and the lack of any voice from across this floor to support the government's bill in steering the debate of the findings after second reading in the legislative committee is indicative that either they were so busy with their GST and so busy with the Constitution that they paid absolutely no attention to the contents of this bill when it came to the cabinet for ratification, or they just do not care.

With respect to the two separate CBC standing committees, the government plan to create these two committees, one for English-language programs and the second for French-language programs, will only isolate Canadians from Canadians and create an atmosphere of two Canadas at the CBC.

The Liberal Party believes that dividing the CBC based upon language runs counter not only to the goal of national unity, national interest, national understanding or exchange but to the interest of all Canadians in both official languages which the CBC has always served.

I will not go into the detail of budgeting and the division of the budget, but certainly the sectors on both sides have gained rather than lost in that expression of voice.

The two separate standing committees for the CBC is not a new concept. It has its roots in a recommendation of the 1965 parliamentary committee on broadcasting. However, the Liberal government in 1967 rejected that recommendation.

I would like to remind this House that the Conservative government accepted that as that bill passed unanimously through the House. The Hon. Judy LaMarsh on November 1, 1967 explained why to the House of Commons this was not an acceptable procedure.

She said: "A statutory requirement that the board should split itself up into two would, in the opinion of the government, be undesirable. If the CBC is to be an instrument for the continuing expression of Canadian identity, it must have a clear identity of its own that is neither English nor French but is Canadian."

That is what we have lost, that whole mentality that it is Canadian, the role and function of the heart and soul of this bill, the CBC.

I would like to finish my remarks with the following observations. I really am quite sad. My heart is heavy because I believe that we have missed a wonderful opportunity. A most important cultural instrument in law has been lost. It will impact on our own artists, singers, dancers, writers, actors and our actresses.

It will be a negative, long term impact on this country, and that is what is so sad. There is no vision of this country by the government at this time.

Let me reassure the minister that when I said my heart was sad, it is in due measure to what he has done with this bill: Meechified it, balkanized it and ignored the importance of Canadian programming. I find that in contradiction to many of the things which he does in other areas.

I believe that many of the amendments that we have made were worth-while to make this bill fitting for the kind of Canada that we see and, when we look back on our history and down the road to where we were headed, the road to this day has been a very long one.

I would take up too much time thanking all who have helped make this process work for me, my party and, I think to be fair, in the interests of getting a better broadcast bill for all Canadians.

Indeed, I could not even attempt to count the witnesses I have seen, all the meetings I have attended, all the briefs I have read, all the submissions I have heard, all the lawyers who have offered their advice, all the representatives of industry who have done their lobbying, all the experts who have graciously come forward to make their contribution to the creation of a better broadcasting bill.

We also cannot forget the members of this House and the staff of the committees in this Parliament and the last Parliament on the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture and the legislative committees that joined us in this exercise. I would also like particularly to thank the parliamentary secretary, the member for Edmonton Southwest, whose knowledge of this bill, as government spokesman and previously as chairman of the standing committee, and explanations have been clear and unequivocal. He has the right to his opinion as we have the right to ours. He has been helpful on many occasions while maintaining full commitment to his government's points of view.

• (1830)

I want to thank Nancy Jean Waugh, who is my legislative assistant, for her hard work and dedication. She was diligent and gave great commitment, exemplary and of immeasurable help.

I should, as well, acknowledge all the Canadians who have been moved to join in this debate, writing to me and to members on all sides of this House about this chapter in the history of Canadian broadcasting that the government seems intent on closing today. They obviously cared enough about their country to sit down and write a letter about it.

The bill, as it stands, is seriously flawed. I want to bring to your attention what was said by Mr. Serge Gouin , President and Chief Executive Officer of Télé-Métropole. He says:

> I therefore add my voice to those of all the other representatives of the industry who have come to you to express their concerns and to ask you to postpone passing the bill in order to ensure that the final version is in line with the conditions prevailing in this sector and represents a positive change rather than a giant step backwards.

In summary, the bill fails to address important policy matters. It could do more to ensure that our system better reflects Canada to Canadians in terms of greater Canadian content. It could do better to prevent global technologies from wrestling control of our broadcasting system away from Canadians. It should do more to avoid the North Americanization of all that we see on our screens. It should not allow the Balkanization of our system into regional ones. It should better entrench the CBC as our unifying, national broadcaster.

I and my party plan to continue our fight, a fight in which we said in the very beginning that if a new broadcasting bill was proposed by this government then it would have to be true to its its roots as we know it could be, and true to a vision of Canada that goes right back to the time when a Conservative government created the CBC.

This government has listened at times and, at other times, found it easy to say no. I believe it has made some obvious mistakes. This bill, to be very simple, is flawed. It is not true enough to ensure a Canadian system for tomorrow. But pass it, it will, for the last time I checked the government held the majority in this place.

I just want the record to show that I and my fellow Liberals did everything we could; studied the bill, listened to witnesses and proposed amendments, while trying to improve it, better support our shared set of values, and better enhance our shared sense of national unity and national purpose. If we have achieved that in some small measure then the effort has not been in vain.

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to this particular bill in somewhat of a pinch-hitting capacity because even though I am the newly appointed critic for communications, arts and culture, much of the detailed work in this piece of legislation, many of the reasoned amendments that have been put before the House that we have debated and discussed through the months, were essentially brought forward by my colleague, the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam.

I want to say that a great deal of credit for the attempts to improve and strengthen this piece of legislation have to go to the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam. He has a great deal of work and I hope I can do him justice in presenting the summary debate at third reading stage of Bill C–40.

All of us in the New Democratic Party were delighted when the government brought forward a broadcast bill, a communications policy, because we recognized for some time that there was a real need to upgrade, update, or modernize what was essentially an outmoded and outdated policy with regard to broadcasting in Canada.

We were excited about the prospects of the bill and even more excited about the opportunity to address many of the outstanding concerns regarding the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the CRTC, and native broadcasting. There are many aspects to this legislation. It is a large bill, a large piece of legislation. As we saw, there was some 42 different amendments, many of them proposed by the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam on behalf of the New Democrats and many proposed by the Liberals.

At the outset I want to say that it is somewhat perplexing because we wanted so much to be able to support this legislation, to give it the strong mandate that we feel it requires. It was very disappointing—and I think I speak for all members of the opposition—to find that virtually every amendment, every reason to change that we tried to bring in through committee and through report stage debates, was essentially turned down. The government turned a deaf ear toward these amendments; not all 42 of them because some were actually the government's amendments, but certainly all of them put forward by the opposition parties.

It was very disappointing to find that a piece of legislation which could have been a hallmark of this legislative Chamber, a piece of legislation which could have set the future of broadcasting in Canada, had been left severely compromised because last night the government reacted with stony silence on the amendments and essentially voted every one of them down.

It is with some discomfort that we in the opposition, even though we so much want to support the legislation, find that we simply cannot do that without the amendments to strengthen it. I want to present the reasons for that.

Essentially the bill attempts to chart the future of broadcasting in Canada. It represents some very fine work by the officials in the Department of Communications, some very fine work by the standing committee, and some fine work by all those people— government members as well as opposition members—who have participated in its formulation at all stages. Yet, despite that and the prime opportunity that we have to make this a top notch piece of legislation, it remains essentially flawed. It is deficient in five crucial areas of broadcasting.

First, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is brought essentially under siege by this legislation. As has been mentioned numerous times in this assembly, the CBC through Bill C–40 is being leeched and it is being meeched. It is being cut back in its expenditures in terms of fulfilling a national mandate of communications in Canada and of binding this country from coast to coast to coast, and as a national voice, a national symbol of Canadian identity. It is being meeched. It is being divided into two realities: the reality of French broadcasting and the reality of English broadcasting, an essential duality in communications in Canada. We think that is wrong.

Second, with respect to the cable television industry, which is a virtual monopoly in Canada, under this bill the industry remains unregulated in terms of profits and the ability to import foreign programming, essentially the only monopoly in Canada that has absolutely no price structure regulation brought to it. We will speak more about that later.

• (1840)

Third, private broadcasters are still not doing enough in the creation of Canadian programming, and this bill does precious little to rectify that weakness in our communications policy.

Fourth, in terms of the weakness of this particular bill, through this legislation the government is threatening the independence of the Canadian Radio–Television and Telecommunications Commission, the CRTC. The CRTC requires specific legislative remedies to give it the kind of direction and the kind of mandate it needs to set firm policies for the future. Instead, it is being weakened and emasculated by direct ministerial control.

Let me turn specifically to the CBC, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I want to say that the CBC is ideally suited to contribute to our goals of national unity. It is suited to developing a shared national consensus and a national identity. It plays an extremely important role in that regard. It is perhaps more difficult to see in central Canada but, speaking as a member who comes from the west, I can say that there are many areas in my province of British Columbia where the CBC is the voice of Canada. It speaks to the people in the hinterlands, in the communities that because of geographic location and what-not simply cannot receive other signals unless they are signals from Tijuana, Mexico or Los Angeles, California. It is the CBC that presents a distinct image of Canadianism from Victoria to St. John's. It is an extremely important function that this organization must fulfil.

This bill does not support that idea. The over-all strategy of this government toward the CBC has been characterized by funding cuts, by neglect of specific initiatives, and by the bifurcation of the management structure of the corporation, by splitting it into two entities, essentially. This legislation puts it clearly on that road.

The government has demonstrated an antipathy for publicly owned enterprises. We have seen this with the privatization of Air Canada, with the privatization of Petro-Canada, and with the move which is well on the way to privatizing our postal service. The government is quick to point out the weaknesses and just as quick to sell those enterprises off to the private sector.

As I speak this evening and talk about the future of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in Canada, as we talk about the effects of the funding cuts facing the corporation and the impact that this legislation will have on the future of the CBC, I have been notified that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has just announced a major lay-off. That spells serious problems for the future of this industry and serious problems for the future of developing that unique Canadian identity. Exactly what the impact of those lay-offs will be, I do not have the details, but that announcement has just come through.

The government is prepared to cut, to privatize, to emasculate, but is it prepared to point to a successful, publicly owned enterprise and perpetuate that enterprise? This legislation, I submit, suggests that it is not.

The main threat to the independence and the integrity of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is not a commitment to national unity, shared national consciousness and identity, not according to this legislation. The main threat to the CBC is inadequate funding, insufficient commitment to public broadcasting, and essentially an unwillingness to fund innovation through a publicly owned enterprise.

It comes down to the simple ideology of the government that everything in this country must be market driven, that there is no role for the government in terms of a vehicle for national unity if it does not fit with the bottom line structure of the market system. We have seen the result of a market-driven economy in our neighbour to the south. That is what makes Canada a uniquely different country from the United States. Thank God for that.

The CBC will, can and, I would submit, is doing what private enterprise either cannot do or simply will not do and that is its uniqueness. I think the quality of this publicly-owned enterprise is in terms of defining a sense of national unity, a sense of national identity.

I wonder whether this government will cease hindering the corporation as it seems wont to do and actually give it a hand. This legislation drags its feet in a commitment to public broadcasting. The CBC is a national and, I would submit, a nation-building institution. Through first-rate television, radio services and the all news channel, the CBC reflects a Canada that is more than simply the sum of the regions. The sum is greater than the simple addition of all the parts.

The CBC is a buffer against the kind of continentalism that has driven this government's ideological rigidity. In this continentalist view by this government, Canada's destiny lies in a continental bloc led by the United States. To that end our policy on trade, our policy on foreign affairs, our policy on defence have been harmonized with those of the United States in order to fit into this continentalist bloc ideology.

We have seen the process take place already with the advent of the free trade agreement, the artificially elevated high interest rates, the dollar inflating policies of this administration, the abandonment of a search for an independent foreign policy, and the lock-step with the United States on security issues.

The CBC is not easily harmonized with American institutions and that is what is causing some problems for this government. Its history, its development, its function, its mandate, its role do not fit with the concept of harmonizing with our neighbour to the south. The CBC is quintessentially Canadian. It is a Canadian achievement and we should be proud of it. It evokes a Canadian style in broadcasting. It is not, I submit, a private enterprise achievement but it is a public one.

The CBC is not easily harmonized but it can be, and it will be. It is being underfunded. It is being organizationally neutered. It is being economically emasculated as a first step in its demise. The division of the CBC board into English and into French weakens the CBC as a national institution. If the government sees no value in a publicly-owned and autonomously operated public broadcasting service, then it will do what it can to lessen the distinctiveness of that service. That, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what is happening.

Under this strategy the national broadcasting service comes more and more to resemble the private networks, until essentially the rationale for having the service in the first place is lost and then, "what the heck, guys? We may as well privatize it". It becomes a distant memory.

The legislation advances a strategy that sees little value in public broadcasting and sees no point in perpetuating something that is vigorously and quintessentially Canadian.

I would like to turn to native broadcasting because I think that this legislation seriously erodes the initiatives in that regard. The objective should have been to strengthen aboriginal broadcasting provisions through this legislation. Many of the amendments we had proposed in fact pointed in that very specific direction. Those amendments were voted down.

This bill reads that "programming that reflects the aboriginal cultures of Canada should be provided within the Canadian broadcasting system as resources become available". Fine. But then this bill gives little priority to communications difficulties and realities of Canada's aboriginal communities, particularly our northern communities.

The Broadcasting League noted that the government's proposal makes no provision at all for broadcasting services for aboriginal people. Examining the government record does not inspire confidence. The northern native broadcast access program funds 13 communications societies. Since it was established in 1983, it has had its funding cut, and cut, and cut again. The Northern Native Broadcast Access Program was created to ensure that northern native people would have fair access to distribution systems. This was given in order to maintain a native culture, a native identity, and to maintain the native languages. The aim was also to help create programming that is relevant to native communities and to reflect their concerns.

• (1850)

How has it fared? In 1983, the program was given a budget of over $40 million for four years. In 1985 and 1986, the government reduced the funding to $33 million. In 1987-88 and 1988-89 and, again in 1989-90, funding was frozen at $13.2 million, down from $40 million to $13 million. In this year's budget, the Conservative government cut back the program to $11.3 million. It has completely knee-capped this program. It has completely emasculated its ability to serve our native communities.

The proposed legislation reflects a basic lack of support for aboriginal communications. This government is attacking aboriginal cultural expression and is attacking aboriginal peoples at the worst possible time. The legislation simply does not go far enough in ensuring access and control of communications by our aboriginal peoples.

My time is limited but I want to make a few comments with regard to the cable television industry. Cable TV in Canada is a territorial monopoly but it is not regulated by other communications industries. The bill simply does not undertake to regulate the profits made by these companies in an industry that earns, on an average, 30 per cent of its net fixed assets annually. It is completely unregulated in that regard.

Does this bill provide cable television rates for Canadians that are just and fair? We submit that the answer is no. Many amendments were made to try to strengthen that part of the proposed legislation and all of those amendments were defeated.

I have much more to say in that regard but my time has almost expired. Let me just summarize. This bill charts the future of broadcasting in Canada but it is basically flawed. The course that this government has set is insupportable. National unity, cultural development and regulatory independence are not well served by this legislation. This country, I submit, is not well served by this legislation. The government has failed to provide a Broadcasting Act that Canada needs and needs desperately to survive.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague, the hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap a question but, first of all, I would like to compliment him on the very nice job he has done in carrying through this very complex bill in the absence of the critic. I know that the critic was not pleased about not being in this House, but I am sure he will be very delighted to know that the hon. member has done a very fine piece of work and so I congratulate the hon. member. I know it was not easy.

I would like to know if the hon. member feels comfortable enough to answer a question with respect to cable, which was one of the very strong points raised by the hon. member's colleague, the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam.

Not many of the members of the New Democratic Party took the opportunity to speak to the bill. I know that my friend from Windsor and a few others did but certainly they were not overly numerous in their exercise of concern in this House. Could the hon. member tell us what is the view of the NDP in respect of cable? The hon. member was talking about the rates of return which they enjoy. I thought it was much closer to about 24 per cent but the hon. member says it is closer to 30 per cent and that is not net profits, either. What does the hon. member think would be the answer and what would be the best route to enable them to contribute more effectively to the Canadian broadcasting system?

**Mr. MacWilliam:** Mr. Speaker, the member raises a very legitimate point. Because of the time limitations I did not have the opportunity to go fully into that matter.

I want to reiterate that the cable industry in Canada is basically an unregulated monopoly. Although we may have a slight dispute concerning the net profits received by the industry, I think my hon. colleague would agree with me that it does pretty well for itself. As a matter of fact, in the past 18 months alone, the increase in the price structure has been some 29 per cent. That is a very substantial increase in pricing.

We are saying that essentially we have a monopoly situation. Why do I say that it is a monopoly situation? Very simply, one cannot go into my riding or any place in British Columbia or Canada and start up a competitive cable company. You cannot do it. The cable companies that are serving that market virtually have a hammerlock on the market. Therefore, they become a monopoly.

That is not necessarily a bad thing. I think it makes everyone slightly uncomfortable when we hear talk of monopolies. Do not forget that our telephone systems province-wide are essentially monopolies. These are monopolies that are structured in terms of the pricing increases they are allowed to implement. We do not have this situation in the cable industry. Perhaps if we had some mechanism to tie it to a reasonable and justifiable profit margin, then we would not see the kind of price gouging that I submit we have seen recently with the industry. They are making a very tidy profit indeed.

In terms of consumers across Canada whose income levels make it very difficult for them to go out to see a movie or to spend their disposable income in entertainment because they have virtually no disposable income, cable television is one of the few tools that they have to relax and enjoy some culture with. It is very difficult for these lower-income people to afford those kinds of price increases.

In summarizing my comments, I suggest that because it is an unregulated monopoly, and because it has demonstrated its unwillingness to moderate its price increases, there should be a mechanism developed to establish some pricing guidelines as we have in other monopolies in Canada.

**Mr. Jim Edwards (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap for his very balanced presentation and to take this opportunity to welcome him to the role of official critic for communications and culture for his party.

He has already demonstrated a great interest in the issues and is seriously addressing them. He follows in the steps of two distinguished predecessors, the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam and Lynn MacDonald, who was a member of this previous House and who made a real contribution towards the bill that we have before us.

I would like to ask the hon. member, with reference to the cable industry, an industry which, incidentally, I hold no brief for, because I was a conventional broadcaster. Back in those days, we considered them to be newcomers, and that was the kindest thing we could say about them. He is quite correct that they do enjoy a territorial monopoly and that they do not have the kind of rate regulation that public utilities have which, I understand, is the position his party is advocating.

• (1900 )

I just wanted to reflect and pose a question to the hon. member. Is he aware that there are a great many very small cable companies in the country, as well as some giants? Is he aware of the efforts that cable companies have made in recent years with community channels and the preparations that they are having to make in allocating capital budget for upgrading of systems and preparations for HDTV?

I am familiar myself with a situation of a system in Hinton, Alberta where the regulator, in good faith, ordered the independent operator of a cable system there to wire four subdivisions with underground cable in anticipation of the growth of that community. The growth never came and that load had to be carried. Eventually, the operator had to sell to a larger cable company, a good operator, albeit, but it had to get out of the business.

I think it is, perhaps, unfair to generalize and the CRTC recognizes the situation that there are variations within cable companies. That is why it is so healthy to have an independent regulator so that it can distinguish between the situation of a very profitable, large operator and that of a small operator.

I am sure that the hon. member, coming from where he does, is aware of the contribution that small cable operators make to the broadcasting system as a whole.

**Mr. MacWilliam:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for his very kind comments.

Understandably, he has recognized that, as a newcomer in this very complex area of legislation, it is difficult to be completely up to speed in all aspects of the industry. If I appear to stumble about somewhat from time to time, it is simply a matter of coming to terms with the many intricate details that the member has already pointed out.

To answer the member's question, first, yes, I am aware, of course, of the smaller cable companies whose profit margins may not be anywhere near the larger monopolies that we have such as Rogers Cable and what-not.

The bottom line criteria has to be fairness to the public. I am particularly concerned, as I mentioned, about the lower income Canadians who do not have the option of going out to see a movie or to a theatrical production simply because they cannot afford it.

What we have seen demonstrated by the industry, on average—and I am not pointing any fingers to any particular company or entity—are some very hefty price hikes. Perhaps some of those price increases have been justified. I do not question that, and there has to be flexibility allowed for justified price increases in terms of expansion of service and the upgrading of the technologies, et cetera.

I think the member would agree with me that, if the industry fails to demonstrate a sensitivity to the economic aspects of our Canadian life-style and to the fact that our lower income Canadians may not be able to afford those price increases, then it comes time for the government, through some mechanism—I am not sure exactly what mechanism would be provided—to be able to influence that price structuring to some small degree.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jim Edwards (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to participate in tonight's debate—

[*English*]

It is a wonderful opportunity. To me, it is closing the circle. When I first had the privilege of speaking in the House in November, 1984 I drew to the House's attention the need for a new broadcasting bill, one which would contain, among other elements, the power of direction of the government of the day to the CRTC, with appropriate safeguards.

I take some pride—and I am sure members opposite can share in that—in the realization that tonight we have before us the final stages of debate in third reading of a broadcasting bill. The previous administration sought perhaps to bite off more than could realistically be chewed at the time when it had an omnibus communications bill which did not pass when the Thirty-Second Parliament was dissolved.

Then, of course, in the Thirty-Third Parliament there was Bill C-136. Bill C-136 was the fruit of the labours of the Caplan-Sauvageau Task Force and the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture in which the hon. member from Mount Royal laboured so diligently and made such a signal contribution, as did Lynn McDonald, the former New Democratic Party critic.

I appreciate the graciousness which members have extended to me in their comments about my involvement in this work. If anyone is going to "vix merbs" tonight I think it may be me because I left Sydney, Australia at ten o'clock this morning, Australia time, when I learned that there was a possibility of participating in this debate.

There have been reports in the press that the government had sought to delay this bill and I just wanted to allay those beliefs. That is speculation and I am happy to say that the speculation is totally unfounded. It is true that the bill was reported back to this House in March of this year. You yourself, Mr. Speaker, participated well in the legislative committee that dealt with the bill. We had a very distinguished chairman of the committee.

Then, of course, we entered into a phase of national debate, having to do with the very future of our country, focused on the Meech Lake Accord. I respect that the hon. member for Mount Royal and I hold totally different views on many aspects of that now defunct accord. It was not my decision, but in my judgement it would have been wholly inappropriate to have subjected the country to the kind of filibuster that was suggested would be upon us if that bill were put through the House in the months of May and June of this year, having to do with aspects of the bill which the hon. member for Mount Royal and others disagreed with profoundly.

So, we have the bill back before us now. We had two half days in late October in which we managed to get 12 per cent of the amendments dealt with at report stage and I must confess that before I departed on my family errand to Australia, I despaired of getting the bill through during the life of this Parliament, because of the sincere expression by members opposite that they wanted to "destroy a bad bill", to quote directly from one of them. I am grateful to the minister who was here last week and yesterday to shepherd this bill through report stage. I am sorry that I was not here to assist him in that regard, but he managed rather well I am given to understand.

When we were beginning report stage in late October, there was a rather strong barrage of support for the bill and I want to refer to one distinguished Canadian who said that there are both symbolic and practical reasons for passing C-40 now. Symbolically, it will send a much needed signal of hope to Canadians that parliament believes in some civilized future for the Canadian family and in a rich more realistic dialogue among Canadians who, at this time in our history, want to find again a sense of reconnection and mutual self-respect.

He went on to say: "In practical terms, C-40 will give the CRTC much stronger and more credible enforcement powers such as court orders and fines. Even though we maintain our position as to the tandem powers of direction and review, on balance I think the result is very positive. The regulatory watch-dog may have a slightly shorter leash in theory, but it will have much longer teeth." That is a quotation from Keith Spicer who, at that time, was serving as chairman of the CRTC. He made the remarks in Vancouver on October 26 of this year.

• (1910)

There was a good deal said by the hon. member for Mount Royal, in her very thorough contribution to today's debate, about a number of aspects of the bill. In particular, one aspect that piqued my interest was her despairing of what she saw as a lack of commitment to Canada in the bill.

I recall the labours of the standing committee where I think all of us were unanimously committed to seeing broadcasting policy and broadcasting legislation that would truly enhance the Canadianness of all of the components of the Canadian broadcasting system, public and private.

I think tangentially that this bill recognizes that a very significant portion of the Canadian broadcasting industry, the private broadcasting industry, including its cable component, has come of age and is pulling its weight with reference to a commitment to Canada. Time after time, with the cudgel behind the back, the regulator has been able to encourage through various creative suggestions private broadcasters to make a contribution to Canada.

I should add that many of these private broadcasters have spontaneously—and I think the hon. member for Winnipeg St. James can acknowledge this—made contributions to the Canadian broadcasting system, including some significant contributions made by broadcasters based in his own home city.

I feel that the letter, for example, which the hon. member for Mount Royal had published in *The Toronto Star* on May 17 on the opinions page, may have—

**Mrs. Finestone:** You've read it.

**Mr. Edwards:** Yes, I did and I responded to it, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, but I got a bizarre response from the editor of *The Toronto Star* who said, "Although your article has merit, it is not appropriate for our Op-Ed page at this time. We receive a great volume of unsolicited manuscripts and must perforce reject many." That was my response to my rebuttal of the hon. member for Mount Royal's contribution in *The Toronto Star*.

Seriously, she makes quite a number of charges in that particular article and she touched on some of them tonight in debate. I suggest that some of the comments that my hon. friend makes are based on an honest difference of opinion on what the bill provides. I would say perhaps even a misunderstanding of what the bill provides. In fact, the article in *The Toronto Star* suggested that there might be some sort of a conspiracy on the part of the government, perhaps connected with the free trade agreement, to gut the Canadian broadcasting system.

This new act is designed to increase Canadian choices, not to restrict them. Technological advances, including direct broadcasting from high powered satellites to which my hon. friend referred, have made available new services over which the government and the CRTC technically have no control. Canadians are embracing that progress and, indeed, it has such power and momentum that in some situations no government or people can stop it, even if they wished to. Therefore, the role of government is then to provide Canadian choices, Canadian voices, in the words of the distinguished predecessor to the present Minister of Communications, the Hon. Flora MacDonald.

The hon. member for Mount Royal criticizes this bill for not restricting foreign access to the Canadian market. In doing so, I submit that she ignores the fact that the act gives the CRTC the power to supervise and regulate the entire Canadian broadcasting system, including those carrying foreign or other programming services. Under this legislation the only foreign signals which can be legally retransmitted in Canada are those authorized by the CRTC, which is also empowered to set the terms under which such signals are retransmitted. The CRTC will continue to control entry of foreign specialty services that compete with Canadian services.

In the past my hon. friend has suggested that foreign services be licensed by the CRTC. I should point out that no Canadian laws requiring licensing can apply outside Canada. If she were to achieve this objective, Canadian cable operators would be forced to drop all their U.S. signals or to ask foreign broadcasters to set up shell Canadian companies for the purpose of holding a licence. I do not believe that Canadians would find such a proposal acceptable.

There are many charges to the Canadian broadcasting system in this bill to reflect Canada and its regions to national and regional audiences by serving the special needs of the region. Our national broadcaster, the CBC, is mandated to serve the needs of our official language minorities and to reflect the multicultural nature of Canada. That, I submit, enhances our Canadianism. As a matter of fact, we on the government side accepted an amendment from the opposition which even broadened that definition to include the multiracial aspect of our society, which is an important consideration when one considers the fact that we are dealing in large measure with television.

I would also like to mention a couple of points that are included in this bill to which the hon. member has not referred, and neither of the opposition critics have referred to this so far.

First, the private right of action for theft of signal is a very important aspect of this bill and something for which the industry has been craving and, indeed, those outside the industry have as well. I have in my hand an ad from the Hinton Parklander of July 30, 1990. The ad reads: "Farmers, ranchers and acreage owners; Live out of town? No cable TV? The home cable network invites you to a preview of rural satellite television. One hundred and fifty channels for $79.99 a month for equipment only. An open house will be held at the Hinton Legion conference room. Eight music video channels, 30 sports channels, 21 movie channels".

Many of these services that are being openly advertised are not available in Canada legally because the owners of those signals did not intend that they would be distributed in Canada except under proper business arrangements. This bill will provide a private right-of-action for the owners of those signals as it would for any Canadian owner of any signals for the unauthorized distribution, not the unlicensed, but the unauthorized distribution of those signals.

I also want to point out and to give reassurance to those members who have condominiums in their ridings that this bill does give the CRTC the option of declining to license a condominium operator of a system provided that that operator, in the CRTC's judgment, is playing within the rules of the Canadian broadcasting system.

The hon. Minister of State for Housing and other members, including the hon. member for Beaches—Woodbine, have drawn to my attention the concerns of condominium operators in the metro Toronto area, those who live at 75 Graydon Hall in Don Valley East and those who live elsewhere in that area. I want to give them my assurance that, to the best of my knowledge, most of these operators are now playing within the spirit of the Canadian system and there will be no need for the heavy hand of the law to come down upon them.

If, on the other hand, they are starting to do the kind of thing that is being promoted in Hinton by satellite operators, obviously, they then become those who are playing outside the rules of the Canadian system and the powers will be there within this bill to act upon it.

**Mrs. Finestone:** Isn't that the matter we have heard before?

**Mr. Edwards:** Yes, it is, Mr. Speaker, the individual who appeared before us.

I would like to go quickly to some of the points made by my hon. friend from Mount Royal on the issue of they who hear decide. I understand her concern, but from discussions I have had with those inside and outside the CRTC, I am satisfied that not only the chairman of the commission but others within the commission now feel that the system can be made to work well as it is drafted now. The hon. member for Mount Royal was concerned about the cumulative effect of they who hear decide and the setting up of the regional commissioners. I believe her concern would be Balkanization.

• (1920)

On the surface there may be some cause for concern, but I believe that those within the CRTC and certainly those in government who would, after all, have the power to give some direction under this bill to the CRTC are determined to see that there will be consistency of decision-making but on the other hand that there will be the undoubted benefits of regional application and considerations when decisions are made.

We are committed to the unity of this country, but we also I think arrive at that unity through a sense of being treated fairly across the country. Fairness I believe has one of its roots in the opportunity to assess fairly, to judge sensitively local conditions and to apply consistent national policies in a regionally sensitive way.

The hon. member for Mount Royal was concerned about what she called the dual powers and advocated the removal of the cabinet review power while maintaining the power of direction. I do not think it is necessarily appropriate to rub in the fact that the hon. member did support the dual power when she served on the standing committee. But as she has said, circumstances change and re-evaluations occur. I take it that she has re-evaluated her position in this regard.

I would go back to what I quoted Mr. Spicer as saying, that there will be a slightly shorter leash, but the commission will have much longer teeth. I think that just about says it all.

The hon. member for Mount Royal suggested that the CBC's central position is removed from the broadcasting system. I am sorry that I fail to understand just what she is driving at. The CBC remains the public instrument of broadcasting in the country and whatever one may say about budget allocations and so on, I would point out that the most severe budget cuts ever in the history of the CBC occurred in the year 1982. In fact in real dollar terms since 1984, the CBC budget has been maintained on a slightly increasing basis each year.

Whatever one may say about that, I believe that the CBC's central position in the system is maintained and, in fact, the CBC has recently been showing some rather creative solutions to the problems that beset their system. I believe that once the position of Mr. Patrick Watson is legitimized through the passage of this bill that we will see a flourishing of the CBC. I have great faith in that individual as the chairman designate of the corporation and, indeed, in the president of the company, Mr. Veilleux, as well as in the board itself.

Mr. Speaker, referring to the question of the CBC committees of the board, I know that the hon. member for Mount Royal finds that as problematic as any aspect, including the national unity issue. But I would say to her once more, and I have said it many times, look at it as a creative exercise. Look at it as an opportunity to bridge the two solitudes which I know she and I agree desperately need to be bridged.

Finally, on the question of national unity, we cannot have unity in this country until we have a shared sense of national consciousness and identity. When I made my remark about South Africa—and by the way I have written to the South African ambassador saying that the use of the word totalitarian in describing South Africa is inappropriate because it is a multi-party state—the point that I was making is that a broadcasting system should never be a propaganda instrument of the state or have the least opportunity to be used or have used as such whether it has been or has not been.

I find that there are distinguished broadcasters in this country, including Mr. Spicer, who can give you arguments that this clause ought to be changed and that national unity does not belong in the CBC's mandate. This is based on his experience with Radio-Canada in the 1970s and we must go to basics and have national consciousness and the promotion of that identity as the fundamental basis of the CBC's mandate. Mr. Speaker, I, as an Albertan and as a proud Canadian, am comfortable with that.

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James):** Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say how much I appreciated the remarks of the hon. parliamentary secretary. I can say, with deep sincerity, that he is a gentleman to the core and that our dealings with him were always most pleasant. However, we are here to transact some very hard political business.

I have a couple of questions for the hon. parliamentary secretary but, first, I want to deliver to him, if he does not already know, some news. This is news to this House and news to the viewers from coast to coast. The news is this: the CBC is about to be savaged by another round of horrible cuts. As I speak, press reports are circulating that the CBC may undergo, and it will be announced tomorrow, cuts to the tune of $100 million. I am told by sources that the president of the CBC was on the phone all day, speaking to regional directors across the country. The president will be making a formal announcement tomorrow at a news conference. I am told that perhaps up to 10 CBC regional stations will have to be closed as a result of these savage cuts. According to the CBC's all news channel, some of the other regional stations will be turned into mere store-front operations. That is the magnitude of these cuts that are to be announced tomorrow.

**Mr. Nunziata:** It is $200 million, John.

**Mr. Harvard:** Now I am told by one of my colleagues that it could be $200 million. One hundred million dollars is horrible, $200 million is, in my mind, absolutely unthinkable.

According to what I have been told, maybe all of Radio Canada International will be chucked or at least a portion of it will be. I am also told that the CBC is almost bound to get out of the parliamentary service. The parliamentary service may be continued on by the hon. Mr. Speaker, but what I am told is that the CBC will be getting out of the parliamentary service.

I am told that if I live in a province with two CBC outlets, and I think of provinces like Ontario and Quebec, the hon. parliamentary secretary's own province of Alberta, and the province of Saskatchewan, four Canadian provinces which each have two CBC outlets, I am not going to be very comfortable because, from what I understand, there is going to be some kind of rejigging of the operations, a so-called rationalization that will devastate at least one of the operations in each of those four provinces.

As I lead up to my question to the parliamentary secretary, let me say this: I find it to be a cruel irony that, on the very day that the hon. Minister of Communications stands in his place and talks about strengthening the CBC, in a week when this House of Commons is on the verge of passing a broadcasting bill that is there ostensibly to strengthen broadcasting in the country, we are told that the CBC is going to suffer another round of savage cuts. That is an affront to every CBC-loving person in this country and there are millions; it is an affront to this magnificent institution that has made this country so great.

Ever since this government assumed power in 1984, it has made it a national pastime, a habit, that every time it touches one of our treasured national institutions, to demean those institutions, to diminish those institutions.

• (1930)

Do those people opposite find nothing sacred about this country any more? Is there nothing sacred about our institutions? Shame on all of them. Now that I have said that, I want to know: Are all these reports true?

The parliamentary secretary is in the upper echelons of government. I think it behoves him to answer these questions now.

**Mr. Edwards:** For a moment there, Mr. Speaker, I thought it must be 2.15 in the afternoon and that the hon. member had a rare opportunity to pose a question in Question Period, which is the proper spot for this question to be posed.

However, he raises some serious questions, and I will endeavour to answer them. I think it was significant that he said that the president of the CBC was to make some announcement tomorrow. If the president of the CBC is making the announcement, obviously he is talking about a CBC decision. I think the CBC, being an arm's length institution which we all want to preserve, should be best positioned—

**An hon. member:** He is with Treasury Board.

**Mr. Edwards:** No, he is no longer with the Treasury Board. He is president of the CBC.

I do not feel it is appropriate to comment on some speculative reports that may be on the air, in some newspaper, or wherever the hon. member has heard them.

There was an announcement before the standing committee the other day by the president of the CBC with reference to the parliamentary channel. I believe that what Mr. Veilleux said at that time was in line with recommendations by the Caplan-Sauvageau task force, the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, as well as the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture, and the McGrath committee. They all recommended at one time or another over a period of about five years that a more comprehensive parliamentary service should be provided and that the cost of providing such a service, including distribution, should be borne by the House of Commons. Except for minor changes in the CBC's packaging of the House of Commons service, no action has been taken on those recommendations over the five years.

Apparently, from the announcement that the president of the CBC made, the corporation is willing to continue providing distribution of the House of Commons service, but to do so would require Parliament to pay all costs, the same way it pays for *Hansard*. In today's day and age, it is probably appropriate that it be done that way.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for the parliamentary secretary, in light of the fact that he was out of the country, to know that that question was asked in the House yesterday morning. The minister, in response to my question as to whether or not the House of Commons would handle the parliamentary channel through its parliamentary appropriations, made an unequivocal answer. The answer was no.

As he continues to speak, I want him at least to be up to date with the information that has been given to this House in that regard.

**Mr. Edwards:** I am grateful for that piece of information, Mr. Speaker, but I think my answer would remain the same, my response on the issue of the parliamentary channel.

If the CBC has made this decision with reference to the parliamentary channel—and I understand it has—then it is up to the House of Commons and the Speaker to decide what to do about it. It would be inappropriate for me to suggest to you, Sir, sitting in that chair, what the appropriate course of action would be. It is up to us on both sides as members of the House, with the assistance of the Speaker and through his wise judgment, to arrive at these decisions.

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to pursue this question on the parliamentary channel just a bit further.

As we speak, Canadians have the opportunity from one coast to the other and in the north as well, as I understand it, to watch the proceedings of Parliament live.

We on this side of the House consider it essential that Canadians continue to have the opportunity to watch democracy in action live, not that it makes for great television, but it permits constituents to view first-hand what is going on in the House of Commons.

His minister has unequivocally stated that the government would not subsidize or pay for this particular parliamentary channel. I would like to ask the hon. member, as parliamentary secretary to the minister, whether he considers it essential that this service continue to be provided. If so, is he prepared to speak to his minister and to the government to urge them to provide the necessary resources? He seems to be passing the buck, Mr. Speaker, to you and to the House, as if the Speaker has some oil well in the back of Parliament or some vault full of money. Ultimately, the taxpayers will have to pay for it.

Can the member indicate whether he is prepared to urge his minister and the rest of the ministers to provide the necessary resources to the CBC, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, to continue this very essential service?

**Mr. Edwards:** Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the CBC does not want to continue to provide this service. It is clear that the position of the CBC has been for some time that the service ought to be in the hands of the House of Commons where it properly resides. Therefore I stand by my earlier statement that it is an appropriate decision for the House of Commons to make as to whether it wants to come up with the funds to provide the service.

The hon. member asked what my view was. My view is yes, this is a very worth-while service and it ought to continue. However, to ask the Department of Communications to cough up $4.5 million at this time to provide the service is perhaps inappropriate. It is really a decision of the House of Commons. For the Department of Communications to finance it, I think, would be an inappropriate exercise by the government of control over the affairs of the House of Commons.

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to take part in third reading debate in the House of Commons tonight. It gives me an opportunity to place some of my thoughts on the record. I must say that I have expressed some of these thoughts in earlier debates, but I hope they are worth repeating.

Bill C-40 has undergone a long examination. There have been many debates. However, despite the fact that we have just heard from the hon. parliamentary secretary and despite the fact that we heard from the Minister of Communications earlier this day, there has been very little Conservative participation in debates on this bill.

To give some idea of how scarce and how sparse Tory participation has been in the debate, I want to remind you that yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we had six hours of debate. On many occasions we had some worth-while questions. Not one Conservative, including the Minister of Communications, stood in his or her place and responded either to questions or gave some of their thoughts or gave any support to the bill. I find that kind of non-performance—and that is what it is, a non-performance—rather disgusting.

If the Tories are proud of this bill—and when they do speak they claim that it is a good bill, that it is good legislation—I find it rather strange that they do not come forward and speak in defence of it.

Normally it is for us on this side of the House to say a few things positive about the bill, particularly at third reading stage. However, when the Tories refused to rise in their places and say anything about this bill, apart from a few exceptions, it made it even more difficult for us to come out and say something good about the bill.

• (1940)

There are some good things about the bill. It has been already stated that women, children, cultural minorities, aboriginal peoples, and the disabled have all been cited in this legislation. That is good. That is positive. I hope something very good comes of it.

My esteemed colleague for Mount Royal in Montreal has examined this bill in minute detail. She has done an outstanding job. She has absolutely no peer. There is no one who knows this bill like the member for Mount Royal.

I do not want to cover much of the ground that she has covered. However, I do want to spend some time on this matter of national unity as it relates to broadcasting in general and to this bill in particular. I want to do so because broadcasting is and can be a very powerful force for national unity. I really feel that this government does not understand that. It just does not understand the kind of instrument for national unity broadcasting can be.

If the government really understood about broadcasting and national unity, would it take away the national unity mandate from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation? I think not. If the government had understood the linkage between broadcasting and national unity, would the government have gone ahead and divided the CBC board of directors into two standing committees: one for English and one for French? I think not. If the government really understood the kind of force broadcasting can be for national unity, would the government in this legislation, in this bill, attempt to balkanize and regionalize the CRTC? I think not.

I want to talk about broadcasting in general and television in particular, especially the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, because it really forms the very foundation and the fulcrum of broadcasting in this country.

The power of television goes well beyond providing information. I am talking about the kind of information that we pick up on newscasts. Television does a very good job of imparting information. I am a great fan, for example, of *The National* on the CBC.

However, television goes well beyond that. It does a very good job, if it is given the opportunity, of really getting inside the psyche of this country, the psyche of Canadians and of reaching into what I would call the deepest recesses of our emotions, thoughts and imaginations. Television is good at reflecting Canadian culture in all its forms, in all its multiculturalism. It is very good at reflecting our values. It does a super job of showing our sorrows and joys, our loves and hates, our strengths and weaknesses, our disputes and agreements, our divisions and ties. I could go on. Television really does a good job of telling the story of the Canadian family, and I am talking about a family of over 26 million people.

If given the opportunity and the proper supports of government, television can do a much better job. What happens if we support television, especially the CBC, and we go out of our way, in particular, to support Canadian productions, drama, music, dance programs, and the like? I think if we do that it naturally follows that national unity will be strengthened. We are going through another what one might call constitutional spasm, a constitutional trauma, which we seem to go through about every 10 or 15 years in this country. I think it is partly because we do not know enough of each other and this is where broadcasting and, television in particular can help.

Let me raise some questions: Do we really know what eats away at those people in the province of Quebec who embrace what we call nationalism, who some would would call separatists? Do we really know the aches and pains of prairie farmers, particularly the current aches and pains? Do we know what goes on in the minds and the hearts of fishermen on the east coast or the west coast? What do we know about miners in Alberta and British Columbia, woodworkers in Northern Ontario, single mothers in Toronto? I could go on and on.

Television should be given the opportunity, particularly television drama because I recognize there are severe limitations to information programming. I think government support is paramount in this area. If television is given the opportunity, we will get those inside glimpses of the Canadian family.

How can television do the job? It can do the job if we give it the proper supports. it cannot do it if we continually cut supports to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

I spoke earlier about the news reports that are circulating tonight. I was told about an hour ago that the cuts would be in the neighbourhood of $100 million and now I am told they are around $200 million. I only hope that those news accounts are wrong, because the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation will be absolutely devastated if $200 million is cut. It seems that the government just does not understand that the CBC is really an investment in Canadian unity. Yet, the government takes away the national unity mandate.

I respect the hon. parliamentary secretary because I take him as very sincere, but when he expresses this concern about the national unity mandate of the CBC somehow turning it into a propaganda machine, I find that just absurd. I find it difficult that the hon. parliamentary secretary, whom I respect, can even say that kind of thing.

If you ask the CBC to be this national unity instrument, you are not telling news editors and news directors to somehow warp the news, you are not asking these people who write the news to manufacture good, happy stories about the CBC. You are not doing that at all.

It seems to me that assigning a national unity mandate to the CBC is, first, recognizing that a public broadcasting system like the CBC can be a force for national unity and, that being the case, we must make resources available to it. In turn, this gives the CBC more clout. With such a national unity mandate the president or chairman of CBC could tell the government politicians that they cannot have it both ways. They cannot ask us to be a force for national unity and, at the same time, cut the legs from under us. You cannot do it. It is not consistent. If we are right in saying that broadcasting can be this instrument for national unity, how could the government, in am arm's length relationship, starve the corporation to the tune of say $200 million? I do not think it is possible.

• (1950)

**Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth):** They want to kill it, John.

**Mr. Harvard:** Yes. One of my colleagues says that this government wants to kill the CBC and I, unfortunately, have to come to that conclusion. It certainly would be consistent with this government's behaviour because the CBC would not be the only institution that this government has harmed.

Taking away the national unity mandate is a serious mistake and it certainly sends out wrong signals to certain groups and individuals in this country who would be more than happy to see the country broken up.

When we talk about national unity and the government's role in that, we are not only talking about removing the national unity mandate from the CBC, we are also talking about the splitting of the CBC Board of Directors into two committees, one for the French language and one for the English language. The hon. parliamentary secretary spoke earlier about it.

Surely we must have one public broadcasting system that serves what is called the two solitudes in this country. Surely we must have a public broadcasting system that straddles the two solitudes but, somewhere at the top comes together under a board of directors, under a chairman or under a president who make the decisions for both French and English. Yet, you can be almost sure as God made little green apples that if the government goes ahead with these two committees, as it will, it will drive a wedge through the CBC. The two language groups will be driven farther and farther apart. I just cannot understand why the government cannot understand that. I believe it is the beginning of the end of the CBC as we know it and it is the beginning of two separate networks.

We have Radio–Canada right now and we have the English service, but they are really one because they come together at the top. I think the two committee system is the precedent that will result eventually in the two arms going separate ways, that these two arms of the CBC will eventually become separate broadcast arms and never the twain shall meet.

As I talk about this national unity matter as it relates to broadcasting, I also have to be concerned about the balkanization or the regionalization of the CRTC.

I listened to the hon. Minister for Communications this afternoon and, again, I take him sincerely. He talks about setting up panels. He who hears decides. He talks about increasing the regional sensitivity. I can understand that from one perspective; that if you have, for example, a panel that serves only Ontario or British Columbia, there is no doubt that in their own narrow parochial way, not in a denigrating way, they will know

their region and they will become very sensitive to that. That is fine in itself, but what about the bigger picture? Who is going to be concerned about all of the country? Who is going to be concerned about what I call the pan-Canadian view of the country?

I know it was already pointed out and the hon. Minister for Communications mentioned this afternoon that under the legislation the panels will be charged with the responsibility of consulting the full body of the CRTC. Somehow or other, through consultation, each panel will have this national view. So there will not be an inconsistency between a panel that is rendering decisions on matters relating to Quebec and a panel rendering decisions for British Columbia. I asked the question, Mr. Speaker. The legislation is not clear as to how they will consult, or how someone is forced to consult. What is consultation? Does consultation mean picking up the phone and saying "Hey, Joe, we have this matter down in Toronto. This is how it is going to go. What do you think of that? Good, wonderful, thank you". End of speech, end of conversation, end of consultation. I am perhaps a little sardonic in my description but I think my point is made. The legislation does not really define consultation.

Let me just finish by saying—and again I want to paraphrase the Minister for Communications— that the essence of broadcasting is programming and that the rest is really housekeeping. He is right. Mr. Speaker, you are a former broadcaster. The hon. parliamentary secretary is a former broadcaster. We know if you take programming out of broadcasting, you have nothing left.

It seems to me that what this bill fails to do is to address the very essence of broadcasting, which is programming. I think it does address the matter of housekeeping. I hope I am wrong. I would really like to see a proliferation of Canadian programming. We know that we are in a sea of American programming. We know that in many cases Canadian broadcasters, at least those on the private side, would find it financially impossible to continue without American programming. If we are going to have the kind of broadcast system of which we can be proud, one that will truly serve this country, and when you serve the country you serve national unity—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I regret to inform the hon. member that his time has expired. But just like a true professional broadcaster, you brought it right up to the second.

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see you in the chair tonight. I know you will listen attentively to the debate because you have a very deep concern about the issue at hand.

I want to add a few remarks to the comments made by my hon. colleague from Winnipeg. My hon. colleague and I have discussed this many times and we are of a like mind. I think his views tonight represent the views of someone that not only has been in the broadcast industry with CBC but a view from a Canadian who understands the role of the CBC and national unity.

One of the things I am really concerned about is the loss of the mandate by the CBC under Bill C-40 to promote national unity in this country. I have heard some members opposite, and I think the hon. parliamentary secretary inferred that this was a dangerous clause because it could lead to propaganda. I do not think that anything a Crown corporation or a public corporation can do to foster greater understanding between Canadians, no matter where they live in this country, should ever be considered propaganda. It is necessary education so that the tolerance we used to have as Canadians can return and grow and foster.

My hon. colleague from Winnipeg, in all of his speeches has certainly underlined that. He showed the bankruptcy of ideas of the government opposite and particularly the minister opposite, who I challenged the other night to stand up after I spoke and give a rousing speech about national unity, about Canada, because I could not find any other reason why a minister of the Crown would tamper with a clause that was benign, that was doing no harm and actually was doing a lot of good in the country.

• (2000 )

Everyone knows that, when I get up to speak, I say I am from Atlantic Canada. I do that because I am proud of the fact that I am from Atlantic Canada.

There is something wrong here. The news that we have heard—and the rumours are rushing through the halls of Parliament here tonight—is that there are going to be major cuts in regional services to the CBC. I heard out in the lobby, and it is probably good conjecture, that there could be four stations closed down in Atlantic Canada.

I refer back to my colleague's comments about national unity. At the very time that there is a debate going on as to whether or not the country has the wherewithal to stay together, what in the name of goodness is the government trying to perpetrate, when it takes one of the few remaining vestiges of national unity and guts it? What does this mean? It has now used the lever of fiscal control before they brought in Bill C-40? It took the mandate away from the CBC for national unity. Now it is taking the resources away from CBC to perform that very necessary service of trying to represent all of the country.

My hon. colleague also talked about the panels that are being set up because they will be more regionally sensitive. I can tell my hon. colleagues in the Chamber that what I do not need to see on CBC in Atlantic Canada are more shows about Atlantic Canada. Atlantic Canadians needs to see CBC shows produced in northern Canada that are run on our national network, the CBC, so that we gain a greater understanding of the problems of the north.

People in western Canada do not necessarily have to become more sensitized to the fact of life of being a western Canadian. What they do need is to produce shows locally in their own stations in some small community where there is a CBC station right now, so that people in Ontario can learn to be tolerant and have a greater understanding of the wonderful diversity that is Canada.

I know that members opposite must be getting calls on this because members on this side are getting calls. I am just absolutely stunned, after the debate that has taken place, that the parliamentary secretary could possibly stand there and say he believes—and I am sure that he does believe—what the Conservatives are doing is in the best interest of the CBC. What they have effectively done is neutered the CBC as a vehicle for national unity.

When I wake up tomorrow I hope that I do not find out that the comments to which my hon. friend alluded earlier, and the rumours that are bouncing off the walls here, that the CBC, because of the budget cuts which have been forced upon it, is going to be shutting down stations from coast to coast in the country.

I hope that those members opposite, who are in a position to change things because they are the majority in this place, have a good solid reflection of what the government through this policy is doing to the country and to the CBC.

**Mr. Edwards:** Mr. Speaker, it is marvellous what broadcasters and former broadcasters can do with rumour and, I should add, unfounded rumour.

**Ms. Clancy:** He's not a broadcaster.

**Mr. Edwards:** He ought to be one. He is not a humble Liberal.

Very quickly on the question of Conservative participation in debates on this bill, a question raised by my friend from Winnipeg St. James, I should point out that we spent just under 11 hours on clause-by-clause study of the bill. The member was there throughout most of it, if not all of it.

I answered every question that was put to me on behalf of the government. I then found that many of those amendments which I had responded to in full were withdrawn and then reintroduced at report stage. Therefore, I think there has been a very, very full government participation in debate on this bill.

With regard to the question of the national unity issue, I am compelled to quote very briefly from an editorial in *The Toronto Star*—a newspaper which is not generally favourable to this government—which appeared exactly four weeks after the member for Mount Royal's letter was published on the opinion page. I quote: "A decade ago, CBC president Al Johnson ordered CBC journalists to cover the Quebec referendum debate on sovereignty association as a news story and avoid the role of government propagandist. Johnson's fairness order respected a sound journalistic principle and was heeded. But it plainly disregarded the public broadcasters legal mandate to 'contribute to the development of national unity'."

It goes on: "Opposition Liberal critic, Sheila Finestone, has argued forcefully that it is wrong to drop the clause when Canada's future is in doubt, but she's mistaken. Canada doesn't need a cheerleader CBC. What it does need is a CBC with enough independence to tell the truth and a government with a thick enough hide to let it be told."

On the issue of the CBC's standing committees of the board, I wish members opposite would stop using the expression, "splitting the board". What is proposed is a unifying mechanism with standing committees of the board, on which the president and the chairman would serve. That is the bridging. Those are standing committees only.

On the issue of "he who hears decides", I feel compelled to point out to my hon. friend that the bill specifically requires that members of panels consult with the commission for the purpose of ensuring consistent interpretations of broadcasting policy and regulations. This will enable panels to avoid inconsistent decision making.

The chairman selects panel members and could decide that issues of national significance, such as network licences, would be decided by a very large panel, representing the commission as a whole. Decisions affecting regulations and over-all policy matters would continue to be made by the whole commission. That should allay the concerns about Balkanization.

**Mr. Geoff Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth):** Mr. Speaker, at long last, I am pleased to participate in this third and final reading of Bill C-40, a major and welcome overhaul of the 1968 Broadcasting Act.

As a broadcast journalist with more than 20 years experience before I jumped from the third floor parliamentary press gallery to the floor of the House of Commons in 1978, I have listened with great care to the thoughtful contributions of my friends opposite during report stage of this debate. Indeed, sometimes I thought their interminable interventions got a might repetitive, but hon. members of both opposition parties hammered home their points with passion and eloquence.

I particularly want to pay tribute to the hon. member for Mount Royal—

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth):** —and her cohort, the hon. member for Winnipeg St. James, and to the hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam, for their commitment to the preservation and strengthening of a distinctive Canadian broadcasting system.

Indeed, more and better Canadian programming designed to enrich Canadian life and, above all, to safeguard our precious Canadian identity is a goal we all share, regardless of party affiliation in the House.

No one, Sir, epitomizes the true spirit of the Canadian identity from both founding cultures' point of view than the minister in whose name this bill will soon become law, my friend, the distinguished hon. member for Frontenac. I am sure, as others have done, he would allow me to pay particular attention to the yeoman efforts of his parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for Edmonton Southwest, who laboured for months in committee and in the House to help fine-tune Bill C-40 to the flexible state it is in now and to pilot this piece of legislation to its worth-while conclusion.

Like others who have spoken in this debate, I could wax enthusiastic about all of the positive aspects of Bill C-40 which I consider to be tremendous improvements over the 1968 Broadcasting Act. We have here measures designed to bring both public and private players in the broadcasting system into line with the challenging new technological realities of the 1990s. There are measures here to portray more accurately the multicultural nature of our society and to enshrine in the legislation for the first time programming priorities for aboriginal peoples, the disabled, women, children, and cultural minorities.

Above all, I applaud the thrust of this bill to move the CBC toward more distinctively Canadian programming and especially measures to strengthen the CBC's management structure and financial accountability to Parliament. For obvious reasons, Sir, I am delighted that this bill guarantees the journalistic freedoms and artistic independence of the CBC.

• (2010)

There is so much good stuff in this new Broadcasting Act that time will not permit me to dwell at length on the merits which the Minister of Communications and others have so eloquently set forth in this debate.

Rather, as one of the final speakers on this third and final reading, I would like to take an overview of one fundamental and recurring theme throughout these many days of discussion about the Canadian broadcasting industry, namely the very real need to preserve a distinct Canadian program identity. When I say overview, I mean that literally.

I heard expressed many times, both in committee and privately, the hope that this 1990 version of the Broadcasting Act will serve Canadians for the next 20 years as well as the 1968 act did.

Well, in one key respect, I am deeply concerned that this act could last until about 1993. The overview I was referring to will be whoever owns and operates the satellite over the skies of North America. From the television standpoint, in a worst-case scenario, direct satellite-to-home broadcasting over 108 channels, such as that proposed by Rupert Murdoch and his consortium, could render the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission obsolete.

The 60 per cent Canadian content regulations, 50 per cent in prime time between 6 p.m. and midnight, could be meaningless. There is no way in the world any number of CRTC commissioners can regulate a Canadian broadcasting system in that environment, with every kind of high-definition programming in the world, covering every time zone you can imagine, available in high-definition television on a direct satellite-to-home basis, simply by buying a dish—a dish the size of your handkerchief—sticking it in your kitchen window. One can see the monumental challenge that this represents to this Parliament and, indeed, to the very soul of the Canadian broadcasting industry.

The 1993 doomsday scenario is the worst one, although I fear, not unrealistic. Let me back up for a moment and suggest that one of the most valuable features of this bill is the far greater flexibility that it endows to the regulatory authority in giving the CRTC more tools and more mobility to cope with this technology from the sky.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, as a former broadcaster and, more immediately, the spouse of a Canadian recording artist, I am keenly aware of the need for keeping the regulatory authority to protect and strengthen our Canadian broadcasting system.

Let me add parenthetically that, while any discussion about broadcasting invariably focuses on television because of its immediacy and its importance, let us not forget that radio is an integral part of our lives. Canadian radio, both public and private, is unquestionably the best in the world and radio serves Canadians well thanks to the vigilance of the CRTC. May the commission continue to ensure that the widest possible number of choices for Canadian listeners is maintained and the distinctive Canadian identity in radio, along with a viable Canadian recording industry, be central to the CRTC's mandate. Our AM and FM programming is too precious to be swallowed up in the profusion of American and other international signals.

Canadian television, however, is a different and potentially more devastating story. It is a serious issue, this survival of a distinctive Canadian television broadcasting system. In my view it is the greatest challenge of Bill C-40 and, ultimately, of this Parliament. Trying to ignore the phenomenal pace of technology, trying to believe that the Canadian television broadcasting system can remain hermetically sealed off from what is happening out there, and it is happening fast, is about as realistic as going back to rabbit ears and watching CBC English and French channels, CTV, and Global, and letting the rest of the world go by.

As I see it, there are two realistic options open to this and future Parliaments if a truly distinctive broadcasting system is to survive the tremendous competition, and this Bill C-40 touches on both of them. The first imperative is that Parliament will have the power to give policy direction to the CRTC for the first time. This is so important, particularly since cable television is now formally recognized in this legislation.

The bill will permit Canadian cable television operators to create programming services but now the CRTC can require the priority of carriage of local Canadian television services. This is a key step toward combating all that U.S. programming up in the sky. Once the entire country is cabled, then Parliament will have the power to see that our homegrown, Canadian programming is protected to the maximum extent possible. I realize that cabling this whole, far-flung nation, from sea to sea to sea, especially in the outer regions, is a long-term proposition. But it is not beyond the range of possibility to see the vast majority of Canadians reached by cable and that capability is already going ahead by leaps and bounds, even in beautiful downtown Hinton, Alberta.

In the meantime, we still have a chance to compete in this new world of sky channels on a level playing field. As Canada cannot ignore participating in an interdependent trading world, and we go it alone at our peril, so Canadian broadcasters cannot avoid the inevitability of having our product viewed around the world and, indeed, that is a highly desirable goal. Here again, Bill C–40, formally foresees this prospect in one of the most significant provisions. The bill gives the CRTC power to set up an incentive system to encourage broadcasters to produce more high–quality Canadian programming.

Every private broadcaster I know has his or her heart in the right place when it comes to wanting to preserve and promote a distinctive Canadian broadcasting system, but a Canadian programming strategy has to be rooted in sound economics as well as profound conviction. Any Canadian broadcaster I know would surely prefer our Canadian programming to be watched by 300 million viewers in preference to three million. Well, it can be done.

I have not got the time, in the few minutes remaining to me, to go into detail but I can see the very real prospect of a flexibly–minded CRTC allowing Canadian broadcasters to invest, say 20 per cent or 33 per cent, in European television; there would, of course, have to be some ceiling; and they may be able to invest in our system too. It could be a very positive way for the regulatory authority to use its loosely–worded incentive system to tremendous advantage, to allow a good deal of Canadian broadcasting to be profitably seen in Europe and elsewhere around the world. Because, in the short run, the only way to safeguard our distinctive Canadian programming identity is to make it good enough so that Canadians will want to watch it and others, around the world, will want to buy it, Canadian broadcasters want to produce more, first–class and relevant Canadian programming. With proper funding, they can do it better and better and better; we know that. Given the proper financial environment, we Canadians can turn out a product which can compete with anything the world can fling at us. This is our challenge and Bill C–40 is, in many ways, an important step toward reaching it.

The industry wants this bill. It knows and we know and heaven knows the hon. members opposite know that it is not perfect but it is a start. Officially, as of the vote tomorrow, Bill C–40 will be in place as a piece of legislation from which the industry can base its activities. The Broadcasting Act sets objectives, guidelines, and the rules of the system. It is up to the players themselves, the broadcasters, distribution services, producers, consumers, and it is up to the CRTC and, above all, it is up to Parliament itself to make sure that this Broadcasting Act works in the name of a truly viable, Canadian broadcasting system. It may be that we only have two years to do it.

• (2020)

**Ms. Ethel Blondin (Western Arctic):** Mr. Speaker, I am really pleased to rise to pre–empt my question with a number of concerns I have about this broadcasting legislation, Bill C–40.

On February 22, 1990, the Inuit Broadcasting Corporation stated, after a $600,000 cut was announced, that the $600,000 cut will have an immediate and devastating impact on Canada's leading aboriginal television network. It went on to say that some of the best aboriginal producers and journalists in Canada will be victims of this budget.

There is no where else for them to go. I think, with the rumoured $200 million cut for CBC—even if it is $100 million—the impact will be equally devastating. There is a lot of competition with regard to the opportunities that exist in the CBC.

For people who have numerous years of experience, the aboriginal producers and journalists are relatively new to this game. They are few in numbers. As we all know, many of the aboriginal people who are employed in the public services and in central agencies or corporations are small in number. They are very small and are grossly under–represented.

Having said that, I want to know how it is that if the hon. member across the way believes in the level playing field, he can support a bill that essentially gives no legislative reference for CBC northern services and that gives no legislative reference or base for use of aboriginal languages.

Is it that the government would be encouraging CBC to review and look at the viability of broadcasting in aboriginal languages, even in areas where there are many unilingual individuals who depend on that service in their own language? How is it that an individual who has as much pride in Canada as I do—his identity as a Canadian is very important—the member opposite, can support not having an amendment in there for CBC's contribution to the development of national unity?

I just feel that this is morally indefensible. It does not speak well for a government that should be supporting a mandate for CBC northern service. Every single job in the north is important. We are in an area with one of the highest unemployment rates. People who train in journalism in the north are very employable. They do an excellent job in the areas that they are employed in.

The majority of those people who get training in the north are aboriginal people. How is it that they can call this a level playing field? How is it that they can justify and morally defend a broadcasting act that basically negates a legislative base for CBC northern service, the use of aboriginal languages and also the development of national unity?

**Mr. Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Western Arctic for her very sincerely put question.

I just point out that the last time I looked at this new broadcasting bill, Bill C–40, I saw for the very first time that aboriginal language rights and programming is recognized for the very first time in a broadcasting act.

One of the significant guidelines to the CRTC through Bill C–40 is by way of policy directive through the commission to give absolute priority to aboriginal programming rights, particularly in northern Canada. I think that this itself is testimony to the far greater importance that this Parliament and all future Parliaments must place on aboriginal peoples and programming rights.

I sense a whole new thrust here, through Bill C–40, toward preservation of Canadian programming and nothing could be more Canadian than the aboriginal rights and languages of which the hon. member speaks so eloquently.

I think the parliamentary secretary covered this point very effectively, on the national unity aspect of Bill C–40. Many motions were defeated in the committee to include and incorporate the words "national unity". The phrase was deliberately removed from the CBC's mandate in this bill based on recommendations from the Caplan–Sauvageau Task Force and the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture. Both concurred that the phrase national unity implied a political bias which was inappropriate to a public broadcaster.

Again, let me just assure the hon. member for Western Arctic that the whole purpose of Bill C–40 is to do the very best we can. It is not perfect. Nobody is suggesting that this bill covers all bases and that it cannot be subject to amendment down the road, as a government or the CRTC itself sees fit, but let me just reassure her that the whole thrust of this bill is to preserve and protect a distinctive Canadian cultural identity and that, first and foremost, includes the aboriginal languages and peoples of which the hon. member speaks so proudly and represents so significantly in this House.

**Mr. Jim Edwards (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications):** I put this question to the hon. member for Hamilton—Wentworth whose speech I admired and whose contribution to this whole process I have admired since the days when he was a journalist and, beyond that, to opposition critic and later parliamentary secretary for Communications. I know he still has his ear to the ground and it is a very well tuned ear. Is he aware that not only are there no CBC budget cuts contemplated by the Government of Canada, but that the Government of Canada will be putting some funds into the CBC and that that will be part of the announcement to be made by the President of the CBC tomorrow.

**Mr. Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth):** I thank the hon. parliamentary secretary for his question. I have been locked into the House of Commons all this afternoon and this evening and, like the parliamentary secretary, any rumoured cuts to the CBC, I believe, should be more appropriately dealt with by the President of the CBC when they hold their formal announcements tomorrow.

I am a fan of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and I regret, as we all do, cuts when they have to come to this magnificent symbol of national importance and national unity in Canada, but cuts may have to come. They have come and gone over the years, the CBC has still survived and I have no doubt that the Canadian

Broadcasting Corporation will survive as one of the finest corporations in the world. I applaud whatever the CBC can do and I know it will survive, cuts or no cuts.

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax):** I compliment the hon. member for Hamilton—Wentworth on his sentiment. I just wish that I could believe that it will be followed through. I, too, am a long-time fan of the CBC, but I have great fear for its future. I also say to both the parliamentary secretary and the hon. member for Hamilton—Wentworth, if the hon. member for Hamilton—Wentworth has his ear to the ground, his shoulder to the wheel and his nose to the grindstone, he may soon need the services of the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier who, as you know, is a chiropractor. I want to talk about my sorrow at this bill and the fact that this debate is winding to its close on an issue of such incredible importance to all Canadians.

• (2030)

I have spoken several times on this bill, at the amendment stage, at second reading, and so on. I keep coming back to the question of the national unity mandate in the Broadcasting Act and national unity as a mandate for the CBC.

The first example that comes to mind is the question of two standing committees of the board of directors of the CBC: one in French and one in English. Why? With all of the difficulties we are experiencing in this country in understanding each other, why should our government legislate to make that understanding even more difficult? Why are we institutionalizing a particularly Canadian kind of apartheid within the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and doing it at the behest of government? It is insanity. It is unacceptable, and Canadians do not want to see it.

The kind of cutbacks that we are looking at can result in the cancellation of the parliamentary channel. The cutbacks that are being reported by Newsworld, the cutbacks that are being reported by *The World at Six*—

**Mr. Edwards:** That is false.

**Ms. Clancy:** False, you tell me they are false? Perhaps the hon. parliamentary secretary can stand in this House and tell me that Radio Canada International is safe. Perhaps he can tell me that the parliamentary channel is safe and, most particularly, perhaps he can tell me that regional stations such as Charlottetown, Sydney, Yellowknife, western stations and Inuvik are safe. I do not mean just safe until tomorrow. I do not mean just safe until Christmas Eve or until old Christmas Day in January. This is not some twelfth night safety we are looking at. We want to know that they are safe in some form of perpetuity. Safe is not safe for two weeks. We want to know they are safe. The parliamentary secretary will get his chance. We want to know that they are safe, and I will talk more about the dangers to regional programming.

**Ms. Blondin:** Blame the CBC.

**Ms. Clancy:** Yes, blame the CBC. Here we go with the old arm's length again.

According to clause 31(*m*) of this bill, programming provided by the CBC is supposed to reflect Canada and its regions. We will no doubt hear from the parliamentary secretary during questions and comments. I look forward to that with great alacrity. However, tonight Canadians heard via the CBC, via Newsworld on television and *The Word at Six* on radio, that there was a very strong rumour that 10 regional stations were going to be cut.

Those of us in the Atlantic have a paranoia about this government. I use the word paranoia perhaps advisedly, because it is a well-known saying in Atlantic Canada that just because you are paranoid does not mean they are not out to get you. We have discovered that, to our sorrow.

**Mr. Edwards:** Try western Canada.

**Ms. Clancy:** Western Canada. If the gentleman opposite would care to come and spend some time in Atlantic Canada, he would know what true hardship is. I love western Canada and I greatly admire members from western Canada but, believe me, we can show the problems that government neglect or, God forbid, direct government action against you can do to your economy and to your faith in what government is supposed to do.

I want to talk about what could happen in Atlantic Canada. I will give one example. What if Sydney is cut? Sydney on Cape Breton Island, the home of my ancestors, the place where I first learned to listen to CBC radio as a small child. One of the things that comes out of CBI in Sydney is Celtic programming, part of the regional reflection provided by the CBC. A certain number of hours per week has contributed quite significantly to the Celtic revival on Cape Breton Island. Indeed, more people on Cape Breton speak the Gaelic than speak it in Scotland where it originated. It was carried on by oral tradition down through the generations and then with the help of the CBC and St. Francis Xavier University and the University College of Cape Breton, the language has been revived and brought back.

This is a wonderful reflection of respect for one of the many diverse cultures in this country.

The fact that it happens to be part of my culture is something that makes me feel very good. If CBC in Sydney is cut, what happens to that programming? Somehow I have the feeling that there are not a whole lot of Gaelic speakers floating around Jarvis Street in Toronto who would be prepared to take up the slack.

You may think I am being facetious here, but I am not. Aside from a number of members on this side of the House and even a few members on that side of the House, one of the ways that the Celtic culture has enriched Canadian public life is by producing one of the greatest political leaders in this country, who is currently showing his great political leadership and his tremendous support for the views of the Canadian people. I refer, of course, to the hon. opposition leader in the other place, Senator Allan J. MacEachen.

I am waiting for the parliamentary secretary when he gets his turn to tell me not to worry, that this is not going to happen, that Sydney is safe, that Gander is safe, that all sorts of regional stations are safe. I want to hear this and I will heave a great sigh of relief. Without these regional stations, how will the west understand the Atlantic?

The parliamentary secretary made it clear that he did not quite understand until I explained it to him. How will central Canada understand the regions? Who will speak for Canada in its diversity?

Diversity is not a dirty word. Diversity is a word that reflects our strength. It is not disunity. Two languages and many cultures are not disunity. They are not and do not have to be forces that break us up. They can be forces that bring us together and give us a magnificent cultural resources upon which to draw and with which to educate our children. I resent this deeply, that diversity should be looked upon as something that should then be compartmentalized instead of used to pull us together.

My life has been enriched by the CBC. It was enriched in childhood with programs like *Uncle Chichimus*—

**An hon. member:** *Chez Helene.*

**Ms. Clancy:** I am going to get to her, but not for a bit yet.

**Mr. Edwards:** *Just Mary Stories.*

**Ms. Clancy:** *Just Mary Stories*, absolutely. *Maggie Muggins and Farmer McGarrity*. Did you watch it too? *Hidden Pages*, with Beth Philanders, that introduced Canadian children to the great classics in English literature. I understand there were comparable programs in Radio-Canada to introduce children to classics in French literature.

On radio, even before the advent of television—I hate to admit that I can remember this, but I can—there was a program *Cuckoo Clock House* where children again were read to by wonderful actors who made the stories and the richness of our cultural past come alive to us. We hear about Susanna Moodie and we heard about Katherine Partrayal, women who helped build Canada. We heard about the great Entendent in Quebec. We heard about Jeanne Mance on these programs. We heard about Canadian history and that was a force for Canadian unity. I remembered when I was lucky enough to make my first visit to Quebec City in university. I remembered the stories that I had heard on CBC radio about the early days of Quebec being told to me as an anglophone child in one of the other regions of the country, and that made me know that Quebec was a very special part of my country too.

CBC enriched my life because as a small child home from school through snowstorms or through illnesses, I developed my lifelong devotion to news programs, listening in the early 1950s to a great big console radio and hearing the horrific reports from the wars in Korea and Indochina. This gave me and a lot of other people of my generation a life-long commitment to the cause of peace. That came from the CBC as well.

• (2040)

As a teenager I was becoming aware of my country and its differences, watching the various programs that came from different parts of the country, whether it was *Land and Sea* from the Atlantic, whether it was broadcasts relating to farms and agriculture from the west, whether it was programs relating to different cultural events in the north—not as many as we should have had but enough—whether it was *Front Page Challenge* or *Hockey Night in Canada*, it gave you a sense of being Canadian.

The CBC enriched my life when I was a graduate student in the United Kingdom. We would stay up—there were about 10 of us at the London School of Economics in the mid-1970s—to listen to Radio Canada International, because it was our connection to our country, to find out what was going on, to hear the day-to-day news of the country, and to listen to the hockey games. Also, because our friends from other countries came to listen, it gave a certain portrait of our country to others who got a better understanding in the international sense of what it was to be a Canadian.

Earlier the parliamentary secretary mentioned in his comments that Al Johnson in 1980, under the national unity mandate, kept integrity in CBC's journalism and covered the issue of Quebec and the referendum fairly.

This does not surprise me. You do not need to take national unity out of the Broadcasting Act, out of CBC's mandate, to ensure that CBC will cover things fairly. I know the member for Hamilton—Wentworth agrees with that, but the mistake is that you are putting the cart before the horse. You are saying that national unity somehow hampers journalistic integrity. In all the years of the CBC's existence it has not done that. Why should it start doing it now?

Mr. Speaker, you know, I know, and every member of this House knows that no one wants the CBC to slant news. We do not want the CBC to interpret the national unity mandate in its news coverage. The argument that it would do so is specious. It is not fair or worthy of the kind of news coverage CBC radio and television have given us as Canadians over the years. It is not worthy of any member of this House, and I do not think any member of this House truly believes it.

What we are talking about in a national unity mandate has always been handled well within the context of news coverage. What really happens within the context of news coverage on national unity is that the CBC reports events and thoughts of one region of the country to another and back and forth to the centre.

National unity also equals cultural programming in music, drama, and public affairs. It is in effect saying: "Winnipeg, this is what Halifax thinks", "Yellowknife, this is what Shawinigan cares about", "Vancouver, listen to what is irritating St. John's, Newfoundland," and today it is quite a bit.

I resent this evisceration of yet another cornerstone of our nation's infrastructure. I resent the pious mouthings of the government that by breaking down we improve. We have an expression in Nova Scotia that I think the rest of you in this country have heard: "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Well, CBC ain't broke yet, try as some people have.

**Ms. Blondin:** It will be.

**Ms. Clancy:** And Canadians do not want the government to fix it.

The member for Hamilton—Wentworth talked about competition and whether we can compete. I am astounded at this member who is a journalist and has been a journalist whom I have admired and respected and still do for many years. He is certainly much more senior to me. We can compete. We do compete. We compete now, and we compete internationally in every possible facet of the CBC's production. *Degrassi High* competes. *Street Legal* competes. CBC news and *The Journal* compete. Sports coverage competes. The world acknowledges that no one, for example, films and presents ballet better than the CBC.

**Ms. Blondin:** Or hockey.

**Ms. Clancy:** Hockey, of course. That goes without saying.

As the member for Hamilton—Wentworth said, CBC radio is the finest in the world. I agree, absolutely. I received what little journalistic experience I have had in training on CBC radio, and it remains one of the fondest memories of my previous existence.

What is this ridiculous contention that we are not competitive, that we need that ghastly phrase which I hope will soon be wiped from the Canadian lexicon, a level playing field. We do not need a level playing field. If we are at the bottom of the hill and they are at the top, we can still get over the top faster than they can. We compete. We do better.

I hate to sound like a Torontonian, but the CBC is truly world-class. Are we to give up our kind of programming for some sort of Bart Armstrong of Arnprior or Roseanne of Rosedale? Is this what you want? Is this what competition means? Good heavens, Mr. Speaker, this cannot be true.

I said before I was going to mention *Chez Helene*. I have to admit that by the time *Chez Helene* came on television, I was a little too old for that kind of programming, but I frequently watched it with the children I baby sat, and I watched it later with my godchildren and other younger members of my family.

I think the cancellation of *Chez Helene* shows a particular tragedy in our Canadian communication and culture experience. *Chez Helene* was an example of how the CBC could be used for us to speak to each other. What better vehicle to promote national unity than to have small children right across this country start learning communication skills so that they can use those communication skills to talk to each other—the two major language groups in this country.

That is what we need to do, to settle this distemper of our times that we are living in. We need to talk to each other. We need to listen to each other. We need to understand each other's terms of reference. We need to understand each other's hopes and aspirations.

We particularly need to know that they are not very different, that what brings us together is so much stronger than what pulls us apart. What we need to know is that there are institutions that can help us do that. We know, because it has been proven, that the CBC is one of the institutions that has always helped us do that.

This is one of the most important bills that we will see in this House in this session. It goes to the very root and heart of what Canadianism is and it goes to the very root and heart of whether Canadianism is going to grow, thrive and blossom, or whether it is going to wither on the vine.

I do not want to see it wither on the vine. I know you do not, Mr. Speaker. The member for Hamilton—Wentworth does not; the parliamentary secretary does not; my colleagues on both sides of the House do not. We are all here in this Chamber because we want to see our country and its citizens enrich themselves and thrive.

It does that by knowing why we are here and not being afraid to say that national unity is not only something each one of us subscribes to; not only something that each one of us prays for every night; but it is something that we are prepared to look at our national institutions and say, "Yes, you have a mandate to assist and foster national unity for all Canadians from coast to coast to coast".

I hope, Mr. Speaker, in this year of grace 1990, words like that are not said too late. I hope that words like that will not fall on deaf ears.

**Mr. Jim Edwards (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I am always pleased to hear from our lady of sorrows, the hon. member for Halifax who was lamenting about the damage that could be done to national unity by Bill C-40.

[*Translation*]

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this narrow-minded opinion is the manifestation of a Christian inspired cult.

[*English*]

That having been said, I think that it is up to the committees of the boards of the CBC. I stress that no one is proposing splitting the boards. I know the hon. member has studied the bill well enough to know that any such committees would be governed according to the bylaws of the corporation, and that they would be participated in by the president and the chairman of the corporation.

• (2050)

I would submit to the hon. member for Halifax that it is in those committees of the boards that we can best put our hopes for a restoration of programs like *Chez Helene*, or perhaps something more appropriate for today's time.

I was intrigued to listen to the hon. member, who brought back a number of memories of some of my favourite shows. Many of the examples,—with two exceptions—*Front Page Challenge* and *Hockey Night in Canada* are programs which have been on the air since 1968.

I picked that year very deliberately, not to get personal about ages here or viewing habits connected with ages, because we all age at roughly the same rate I think, Mr. Speaker.

**Ms. Clancy:** Some of us started earlier.

**Mr. Edwards:** Some start earlier.

The point is that the programs that my hon. friend referred to have not been on the air since 1968. It was in 1968 that the phrase "national unity" was put in as part of the CBC's mandate. We have not had a flourishing of the kinds of programs that show one of us to another during the run of the Broadcasting Act of 1968.

Obviously it has not been taken seriously by those who would want to unite the country. I put my question to my hon. friend: Is the problem not a lack of access to network time rather than anything else?

That was the finding the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture arrived at when it travelled the country in 1986 and 1987 holding hearings into broadcasting policy and legislation in this country. Would it not be sensible to have another look at the structure of the corporation and how it delivers its programs to see if there is not a better way of serving regional needs, perhaps through satellite to cable networks, showing the regions of the country one to another?

I would like to know whether the hon. member has, for example, examined the West German system where you can indeed, Mr. Speaker, see a regional service in one region and in another region. The common system is an alliance of all the regions. I wonder if the hon. member has examined that and whether she has another model to propose that would better overcome the regionality difficulty that we have.

The issue is not unity, because unity will flow from an understanding of each other. I think we are on the same wave length there. Unity will definitely flow if we understand and appreciate each other. When the Hon. Flora MacDonald, with her Gaelic roots, brought in Bill C–136 she put forward the idea that we should stimulate national consciousness and identity rather than compelling a commitment to national unity.

It was her authorship and not the current minister's authorship that brought about that change. Would she not agree that it is putting the cart before the horse to demand that national unity occur as a precondition when, in fact, you cannot even conceive of unity unless you have an appreciation one of the other.

**Ms. Clancy:** Mr. Speaker, actually there are so many questions in the hon. parliamentary secretary's intervention that I am wondering if we can get unanimous consent to give me another 20 minutes. Just kidding.

I certainly will get to his comments and his question, but I also am a little disappointed because I did not hear a denial of the cuts to the regions. I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, all my colleagues in the House that I did say I was prepared to take his denial. We did not get it, and I guess here I am again being a typical Nova Scotian remembering that just because we are paranoid, it does not mean they are not out to get us.

I have actually seen the west German system. My German is not good enough to really make a comment. I have done some reading on the particular system. I think it is interesting, but I would not be prepared at this point to suggest whether that system could replace the system that has evolved.

I am not quite sure what the hon. parliamentary secretary was on about when he talked about *Front Page Challenge* and *Hockey Night in Canada vis–à–vis* 1968. The fact that the national unity mandate came into existence in 1968 does not mean that it was not being followed in spirit before. The problem with removing it is that when we take something away, particularly in these troubled times in this country, we are making a statement. Whether the government admits it, whether the parliamentary secretary admits it, we are making a statement that speaks volumes.

The former member for Kingston and the Islands is not here now. It is not the same time that it was when she brought in her bill. I am not discussing that bill. I am discussing this one. I think every one of us knows that the removal of the term "national unity" from the CBC's mandate has and will continue to have a pejorative for Canadians. It will continue to make Canadians say, "If the government does not believe that CBC has to have a mandate for national unity, what does that say for the government's view of this country?"

Are we a community of communities or are we a nation? I believe we are a nation. I believe we are a nation that is going through a very difficult time. I do not want us to be a community of communities. I want us to be a bilingual, multicultural, diverse, intense, exciting, flourishing Canada. I want us to be a country that looks after and fosters every Canadian's response to the communication and the culture of this country.

I remind the member for Hamilton—Wentworth that in spite of his comments about aboriginal issues, and the fact that he seems to think that this bill does so much, Motions Nos. 18, 19 and 20 were turned down by the government. Motion No. 18 says, "Broadcasting services reflecting aboriginal cultures and representative native languages shall be provided where numbers warrant". It was defeated. "Native cultures and representative native languages should be provided" was defeated. Motion No. 20, proposed by the New Democratic Party also relating to the protection and preservation of an aboriginal presence was defeated.

We can say many things but in our hearts every one of us knows the question is: is there a commitment to national unity, is there a willingness to stand up and be counted, is there a willingness to say, "This is what we want as Canadians"? I am afraid not, not in this bill, and that is very sad.

**Mr. Guy H. Arseneault (Restigouche—Chaleur):** Mr. Speaker, it has been a long day for us all and I wish to thank you for providing me with this opportunity to participate in the third reading debate of Bill C–40. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to us as a result of the Caplan–Sauvageau commission's report, as well as four reports tabled by the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture.

The purpose of the bill is to replace the 1968 Broadcasting Act, a law which no longer reflects the rapidly evolving nature of the communications industry. However, the bill is seriously flawed. As we have seen in the report stage debate, it is in bad need of amendments. Indeed, Bill C–40, if passed will seriously undermine Canada's national fabric and it will help divide and balkanize Canadians at a crucial moment in our history. Moreover, our broadcasting system will become one more casualty in the long list of Tory blunders. In fact, the new definition of broadcasting, contained in clause 2 of the bill, is defined broadly to include the transmission and reception of programs, other than by means of radiocommunication. In other words, the hard–wire or closed–circuit transmissions previously considered to be under provincial jurisdiction will now be covered by the new broadcasting law.

• (2100)

As well, undertakings by cable companies or broadcasters will be divided into programming and non–programming functions. This is a rejection of conventional legal practice which has regarded such undertakings as indivisible. You will surely agree, Mr. Speaker, that this change promises to be a source of major headaches in the future.

The 1968 Broadcasting Act required that the CBC, and I quote, "contribute to the development of national unity". We have heard a lot about that clause today and over the past days in debate. Unfortunately, all reference to this has been eliminated from Bill C–40. As Liberals, we believe that the developing of a national personality, identity, and consciousness are best brought about with the help of broadcasting agency, mandated to contribute to the development of national unity.

Given its geographic, demographic and cultural characteristics, Canada needs strong national institutions such as the CBC to weave all the regions and all the diverse participants in our society into a unified network. It is obvious that Canada could never have become a distinct, sovereign, and prosperous nation from coast to coast had we not had government involvement and institutions to help offset the permanent attraction of the United States.

As I said during the report stage debate, this country is the fruit of the efforts of our forefathers to build a nation, from east to west. To overcome the daunting task of uniting the country, successive governments gave us a national railway, a post office, a national radio and television network, a national airline, as well as a variety of measures which contributed to the development of the Canada that we know and the Canada that we love. A rapid overview of the institutions which I have just mentioned reveals nothing but the scorched earth which the Tories have left behind them.

Another serious flaw of Bill C–40—one which I might add also undermines national unity—is the creation of separate standing committees on English and French–language broadcasting at the CBC. The result of this change will only serve to isolate Canadians from each other. Furthermore, it is contrary to clause 3(1)(i) which confirms that the CBC programming should, and I quote, "contribute to shared national consciousness and identity".

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian government, back in 1967, rejected the concept of two separate standing committees at the CBC. At that time the then minister, the hon. Judy LaMarsh, explained why this was a policy of the Liberal government. She said, and I quote:

> A statutory requirement that the Board should split up into two, would, in the opinion of the Government, be undesirable. If the CBC is to be an instrument for the development of national unity and the continuing expression of Canadian identity, it must have a clear identity of its own that is neither French nor English but Canadian.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree that the Conservative government could indeed learn a number of important lessons from this great Canadian. As a matter of fact, even new CBC Board Chairman Patrick Watson said to the standing committee last March that such separation would be harmful because it would be telling one and all that English and French programming would meet different needs and policies.

He went on to say, and I quote: "Such is not the case, and we want to be able to say that we do have co-operation, a series of policies". As we have explained before, one of the most serious flaws of this bill it that it refuses to acknowledge the various CBC services. That is the approach taken by the government and, this needs to be emphasized, it is contrary to the recommendations made in the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture released in 1987.

Not only does the government refuse to acknowledge these services, but it has completely forgotten all about my own province, New Brunswick. This province is the only one in Canada which does not have its own televison station wholly owned and operated by the CBC English network.

This is why New Brunswickers have to be satisfied with listening to the CBC English programs over Saint John's station CHSJ.

Given the francophone and anglophone make-up of the population of New Brunswick and the mandate of the CBC, it does not seem very fair that the province not be allowed to have a network station. In fact the situation is clearly intolerable.

Even though the CBC appropriations have been slashed, the fact remains that New Brunswick still needs a CBC station. The federal government still has to show the political will to respond to that need.

Mr. Speaker, another harmful aspect of this bill is the Balkanization, so to speak, and regionalization of the CRTC. This legislation provides that the executive of the CRTC, that is to say all the permanent members, will no longer be involved in the decision-making process. Instead, his power will be put in the hands of groups of three people. Such decentralized and regionalized decision structure will result in a loss of national consciousness, political fragmentation between regions and the creation of an environment that will not be favourable to the development of a national broadcasting system.

Another serious shortcoming of this legislation is that it would foster the Americanization of our broadcasting system. As you know, Mr. Speaker, our broadcasting was always organized along an East-West axis to make it truly Canadian.

Unfortunately, Bill C-40 imposes no limit to the importation of bradcasting services from the United-States. That too goes against the recommendations of the Standing Committe on Communications and Culture.

As we have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, this legislation contains several flaws. However, the amendments we proposed would have improved it considerably. The government, in its wisdom, did not see fit to accept these amendments and Canada stands to loose the most in the end.

[*English*]

In closing, I would like to just reiterate two major points. One is that we have heard a lot about national unity this evening and in previous debates. We have heard the position of the Conservative government and Conservative members talking about taking out the national unity mandate from the CBC. We have heard that it wanted it out because it was a propaganda clause and it did not think it was suitable.

We have heard the Liberal position, that we thought it was a must, seeing that the country was so divided and that it was good to see some national institutions trying to promote national unity.

The NDP. Well, we know it is just a tag-along party anyway and we would like to look at them as the great pretenders. That is what we do with them. We do not know what its positions are on national unity. It depends upon whether they are speaking in Quebec or outside Quebec. It depends upon whether they are speaking English or whether they are speaking French. It is very confusing.

I would speak a little bit about the national unity issue and whether or not it should be in the Broadcasting Act. I sat back here and asked: "What's wrong with a little bit of propaganda about national unity? What's wrong with an agency promoting national unity?"

• (2110)

We all know that the right hon. Prime Minister does not really want to come out and defend Canada in certain provinces. We know that he does not want to promote national unity in some cases. Is he now putting out that philosophy to his members and asking them to make sure that the institutions do not promote national unity either? Is this why they are taking the national unity clause out of the mandate of the CBC? I wonder about that.

The other question I want to address in closing is the government's strategy with regard to CBC. Whenever things get tough, it has a policy of saying that the CBC and the government are at arm's length and that it cannot do anything about it.

We have heard rumours tonight that there could be cuts of over $200 million to CBC. We have heard rumours that this would lead to cutbacks in the regional stations throughout Canada. In fact, the number 10 was used, four of them in Atlantic Canada.

I note with a little bit of sadness the strategy that the members from the government side seem to want to expound during difficult times and that is that it is not the government that is cutting programming at CBC. No, it is not the government. The CBC is making those decisions. Well, let us make it very clear. The government provides the funding for the CBC. The government is saying: "Your funds are being cut." The CBC then has to make a commitment with what it has have left to work with. That is what the situation is.

I will end on that note. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for being so attentive. I hope in all wisdom that all hon. members in the House will vote against this bill.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jim Edwards (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Restigouche—Chaleur on his appointment as assistant critic for his party.

[*English*]

I very briefly want to correct the record, Mr. Speaker. I know the hon. member did not intend it this way, but the record needs to be corrected. The Prime Minister does want to promote Canadianism and national unity and his very actions speak to that. It was Caplan and Sauvageau who made the recommendation that the change take place. They were supported by a former CBC president, Al Johnson, and by the standing committee, including the hon. member for Mount Royal.

On this question of these putative cuts, I think the record needs to be corrected as well, in that sense. The impression sought to be portrayed here tonight—and it is an unfortunate situation—is that the government has somehow intended, or will cut, the CBC's budget by figures of up to $200 million. That is absolute nonsense.

Whatever announcement the CBC makes tomorrow or tonight—whenever the CBC management chooses to make it—does not involve any government cuts in government funding. The only cut in government funding to CBC that is contemplated to take place is the $1.7 million in funding for the Persian Gulf activity of our armed forces. That was announced last week. I might say that CBC was less affected by that proportionately than many other government agencies and departments.

Those are my comments. I just wanted to conclude by again congratulating the hon. member on his appointment as associate critic for his party for communications.

**Mr. Arseneault:** I have a few short comments, Mr. Speaker. I must thank the parliamentary secretary for his kind words, but there are two things that I want to reiterate. I suppose we could debate all night and I would not mind actually.

I am not going to debate the point about the Prime Minister. That is very debatable and a lot of people across Canada share my view. The hon. parliamentary secretary mentioned there was a recommendation in one of the reports which said that we take out the national unity mandate. It is fine to pick and choose here and there. There were many more recommendations in those reports that were never instituted. In fact, some of those recommendations were brought forth as amendments by the Liberal Party and the hon. members voted against them.

The other thing I would like to point out is in regard to CBC cuts. I guess we should look at the record of the government. The cuts were made in the last budget and what could be happening is the announcements are working their way out right now. The cuts were made in the past and now the CBC has to contend with those cuts. They find they are having a difficult time. The government is forcing them to cut back on programs by not giving them the proper funding.

**Ms. Ethel Blondin (Western Arctic):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for giving such an eloquent speech and for his very thoughtful comments.

I would like to ask him in comparison to the comments made by the spokesperson for the Friends of Canadian Broadcasting, Mr. Ian Morrison, in an article he wrote indicates that 80 per cent of the time a Canadian child watches television is spent watching American programs. For almost as much time as that child goes to school he or she is exposed to a foreign culture, to someone else's values, to another country's views about what is right and what is wrong, to life in Los Angeles, New York, or Miami. Is that what we really want for our children? Absorbing the pictures, scenes, and viewpoints of another people is no way to build a sense of belonging in Canada.

All American television is not bad, but what about our own country, our dreams, our values? What about life in Halifax, Sudbury, or Edmonton?

He also suggests a necessary signal would be the appointment of new leadership to the corporation combining non-partisanship, public broadcasting experience, management flare, an ability to capture the public's imagination. But much more important, the new leadership must be given the resources to fill the CBC's statutory mandate.

Having said that, I think in the appointment of the president, Mr. Veilleux, we have many of those qualities, but the only thing that is completely out of kilter with this whole suggestion is this. Mr. Veilleux is not being given the resources to see out the CBC statutory mandate. He is being put into a corner where he has threatened to cut the parliamentary channel. He has pressed the right buttons because this is a president who is very astute politically, who knows where the raw nerve of politicians and governments are.

I ask the hon. member what he feels about my suggestion that we indeed have the kind of leadership we need and the expertise and the valued experience of the president, Mr. Veilleux, but we do not have the commitment of government for him to see out that mandate of CBC.

**Mr. Arseneault:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Western Arctic for her comments and her questions.

I quite agree with most of what she had to say. When we look at some of the problems we are having in Canada today in national unity, part of it is a lack of understanding of other cultures that exist in Canada. Part of that lack of understanding comes from not knowing enough information.

Part of the information that come to our children come via television. I think it is very important that we get more Canadian programming. It is fine to say that 80 per cent of our viewing time for small children is Americanized. I do not want to put down the Americans, do not get me wrong. They have some good programs, but what about our own culture? What about the cultures of other people that exist in Canada? What about the far north, the far west? I come from eastern Canada. If my children cannot experience it in person, they should at least have the opportunity of being able to experience it through the media.

• (2120)

We are world leaders in telecommunications. We always were. I am afraid to say that with this Bill C-40 we are taking a step backwards.

**Mr. Bob Wood (Nipissing):** It gives me great pleasure to stand in the House tonight and give my views on Bill C–40, the Broadcasting Act. There is absolutely no doubt that we need to introduce new legislation to modernize regulations that affect that particular industry. The technology in this industry has advanced at an incredible pace in the last 20 years without any major reforms to the laws that regulate it.

I have to be honest and say that Bill C–40 will bring some good changes. However, it fails in many other aspects. I am specifically making reference to the elimination of the national unity clause for CBC, the creation of two programming committees for French and English within CBC's board and the duality of powers by the Governor in Council over the CRTC. These are three major concerns that I want to bring forward to the House regarding this bill.

The 1969 Broadcasting Act required that the CBC contribute to the development of national unity. This reference has been dropped in Bill C–40. I believe that developing its national personality and building its sense of national identity and consciousness are factors needed to build Canadian national unity. We need a strong national institution like the CBC to weave all regions and the diverse participants in Canadian society into one unified force.

Arguments have been made that the national unity laws will cause what the Minister of Communications called intolerable interference and a constrain on freedom of expression.

We have seen in the last year extensive coverage by the CBC on issues which have severely divided our country. Examples are the Meech Lake Accord, the Brockville incident and, obviously, the clause on national unity did not interfere in any way with the coverage CBC gave to these events.

Pierre Juneau, the former President of the CBC, said he had no trouble with the national unity mandate during the time that he held his post. I fail to see any credible reason for eliminating the present national mandate of the CBC.

The Chairman of the Communications and Culture Committee has said: "Removing the pursuit of national unity as an objective of the Crown owned radio and television network has a negative connotation about unity. Dropping such a phrase now would indicate we are going in two separate ways. It would be most unfortunate.". He said that on May 9, 1990.

Now, if the government will not listen to the opposition or industry experts perhaps it should listen to the member of its own caucus and also the Chairman of the Communications and Culture Committee.

To remove the national unity clause is to say that there is no Canadian unity and, therefore, no common values that Canadians share from coast to coast to coast. I do not believe that that is the case. We certainly have our differences and that is healthy. However, the share of values that we hold as a nation have to be well represented through our national institutions and that is what CBC is, a national institution. Let us keep the national unity clause where it is.

I also want to state that I disagree with the creation of two separate standing committees on English and French language programming at the CBC. CBC executives have also expressed their disagreement with this form of management. Why create two committees to administer the CBC? While the CBC is trying to cut operation costs because of this government's budget slashing, I fail to see how this committee system will aid CBC management in its own objective of cutting costs. In fact, I think that it will probably cause an overlapping of work and increased administrative costs. I do not see any particular purpose to this two–committee system, other than it seems to continue promoting division within the country.

Patrick Watson, the Chairman of CBC, had this to say about the two–committee system: "This is perhaps the most outstanding and strongly felt concern of our board on the proposal that there be created a French and English programing standing committee within the board of CBC."

Gerard Veilleux stated the following regarding the same issue: "I do not know how to tell you that I do not look forward with a great deal of enthusiasm to having to split my staff, the staff of the CBC and Radio–Canada, and I say to you that this is very, very dangerous."

Finally, Keith Spicer, who said: "Personally, I would not be in favour of creating two separate committees." Therefore, I think at some point, in addition to a very strong, secure representative and representation of the English and French sides of things, we must have a national view as well.

The last thing Canadians need at this point in time is a further erosion of national institutions like the CBC which plays an integral role in unifying this country by promoting our common values.

I also object to provisions of Bill C–40 which will reduce the term of office for the president of CBC and the chairman of the CRTC to five years compared to the previous seven–year term. It is important that both these agencies keep their ability to operate at arm's length from the government.

Furthermore, a seven–year term brings more stability and consistency with both organizations. I believe that the seven–year term should be restored.

The government has also failed to ensure, in Bill C–40, the continued presence of the parliamentary service, Radio Canada International, an all news service and a northern service. All these services are important to a country which is geographically large and serves to unite Canadians from one region to another.

Furthermore, the submission is contrary to the unanimous recommendation of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture in its 1987 sixth report. I am particularly concerned about the parliamentary channel which is considered a key window for Canadians to view Parliament and its proceedings.

Through this particular service, all Canadians have the ability to examine what their representatives are saying in our national forum, the House of Commons. I believe that it helps Canadians to better understand the issues and events that shape our country and our world.

Bill C–40 also fails to recognize the right to Canada's aboriginal peoples to receive service and representative native languages where numbers warrant and as public funds become available.

Liberals believe that the maintenance and support of the aboriginal languages and, through them, the transmission of native cultures is so important that the new broadcasting act must provide such a strong affirmation.

The northern services which extend to 98 per cent of all Canadians living in northern Canada is omitted from Bill C–40. In the northern region of our country, this channel provides services to 100,000 natives and non–natives in seven different languages. As well, CBC northern services produce recordings of native singers and musicians.

Many of the native languages and cultures are being forgotten and threatened by extinction. This government has the duty to do everything in its power to help aboriginal people to preserve and promote their language and culture. Also, I am particularly perturbed about the dual powers of review by cabinet over CRTC decisions.

This new power will jeopardize CRTC's ability to carry out its role as an expert in an independent, quasi–judicial body. If Bill C–40 becomes law, the cabinet will have the right to issue policy direction to the CRTC while retaining the right to set aside a decision of the commission on the basis that the decision derogates the attainment of the objectives of the broadcasting policy or of a direction issue to the commission.

Giving these dual powers to cabinet is potentially very dangerous to the Canadian broadcasting system. The power to review CRTC decisions puts the independence of the commission in jeopardy. It is extremely crucial for the commission to be independent and appear independent from any political interference.

It is not acceptable to leave the impression that the CRTC is being directly or indirectly controlled by the government. The commission was created because there was a need for a body to regulate in a consistent and non–political approach.

As far back as 1928, the Aird Report noted that this independence would also protect the government of the day from any political pressure inevitably exerted upon it as it ensures that the competing arguments put forward to the decision makers are weighed as objectively as possible.

If Bill C–40 is adopted, it will create a very dangerous precedent in the way the government establishes its relationship with organizations functioning at arm's length with the government.

I believe that the independence of the CRTC is seriously undermined through this legislation. The loss

of independence will result in a disruption of the present functioning of the system. The government is placing itself in a position that will promote the perception in the general public and in the industry of favouritism through political means. The public and the industry expect the CRTC to look at all views without interference. This objective is compromised under this new legislation.

• (2130)

The CRTC is strongly opposed to the dual power of cabinet. In its presentation to the legislative committee it pointed out the consequences of giving these powers to cabinet, and I quote: "The government of the day needs an independent regulator in broadcasting if it does not want to find itself besieged by long lines of petitioners and complainants who, perceiving the commission to have become a mere anti-chamber of power, would ignore the commission's public procedures in favour of lobbying within private cabinet corridors. It could also lead to a belief that decisions, some of them of fundamental consequences, are not being made in a dispassionate way, openly, and in the interests of the communications system as a whole, but are being dictated or influenced by parochial political pressures".

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I apologize but I am not sure if the member intends to speak for 20 minutes or to split his time with his colleague.

**Mr. Wood:** I intend to speak for 10 minutes and I would like to share the time with my fellow member from the Arctic.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** One moment please! I would like to make sure that this is understood. You want to speak for ten minutes and your colleague as well. In that case, I must cut you short and recognize the other member, if that is what was agreed. Does the House agree?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** In that case, I recognize the hon. member for Western Arctic for a 10-minute period.

[*English*]

**Ms. Ethel Blondin (Western Arctic):** Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred to defer to my colleague because he is so learned and eloquent on the matters of broadcasting, being a former broadcaster, if one can ever be a former broadcaster, for that matter.

In relation to Bill C-40, I have three major concerns with this new broadcasting legislation. There is no legislative base because the amendments were defeated in three areas: the CBC northern services, no legislation or amendment for the use of aboriginal languages although there is reference in the text of the Broadcasting Act to it, and no legislation for CBC's contribution to the development of national unity. I find that quite sad and quite a sorry statement for the institution of national unity.

I would like to establish a case for there being an amendment with reference to CBC northern services. I cannot understand why there is no legislation for the CBC northern services. CBC northern services are responsible for CBC services throughout Yukon, Northwest Territories, and northern Quebec, over one-quarter of the land mass of Canada. What does that include in the Northwest Territories? Most communities in the N.W.T. receive both radio and television service. Anti D satellite capacity is leased by the CBC to carry radio and television signals for the Northwest Territories. Through CBC's accelerated coverage program, all communities with a population of over 500 now have a satellite receiving dish and low-level transmitter. Similar equipment is supplied to communities of under 500 through the Government of the Northwest Territories Department of Culture and Communications.

The CBC operates four radio production stations in the Northwest Territories. Programming is produced in Yellowknife for the Mackenzie region, Inuvik for the Mackenzie Delta, Iqaluit for Baffin Island and Eastern Arctic, and Rankin Inlet for the Keewatin.

Yellowknife, Inuvik, and Iqaluit produce daily northern newscasts and current affairs programs in English and a variety of northern aboriginal languages. General programming is a mix of northern and national production. The CBC access policy provides equipment, training, and access to CBC radio transmitters to allow remote communities to turn off CBC and substitute their own programming.

Some 30 community radio services are in operation. There is one commercial AM radio station in the Northwest Territories, in Yellowknife. A commercial cable television company also operates in Yellowknife with 10 channels supplied to subscribe to through satellite. Local programming is produced and pay television is available in Hay River, Fort Smith, Iqaluit, Inuvik who also have cable television. CBC television has northern production studios in Yellowknife, and national programming is uplinked from Toronto on two channels. Inuit Broadcasting Corporation with production studios in Iqaluit has been given access to the eastern Arctic,

Keewatin channel at various times during the week. Some programs are simultaneously broadcasted in English and northern native languages through the use of CBC Radio.

In the spring of 1981, native organizations in the western N.W.T. received CRTC approval to broadcast through the Cancom system. The Native Communication Society of the western Arctic in Yellowknife subsequently developed a training program for native people interested in radio and television. They now have a full-scale operational radio studio and full day broadcast, including three hours in live programming with the news and aboriginal programming.

Inuvialuit Communication Society in the Inuvik region established in 1983, has the television production studio in Inuvik and has broadcast through the CBC network since 1985.

With all this, the government does not believe legislation is required. This is very confusing for many people, with the amount of activity and the amount of resources that have been expended to train people to deliver programs in a very challenging field, the field of aboriginal languages. Even developing the terminology to accommodate modern concepts is being denied the opportunity to flourish.

My specific concern with regard to national unity is best expressed by one of my constituents who on July 24, 1989 wrote a letter to the Prime Minister. She wrote: "I am writing to protest the budget cuts to the CBC contained in your government's Budget". Even at that time, that was a concern. She said that the CBC plays an essential role in maintaining Canada's identity as a separate nation from the United States and that this role would become even more important as free trade erodes our identity as Canadians. "Please reconsider your intent to slash the CBC's funding and ensure the CBC receives the resources required to continue to act as a strong, cultural unifying force for Canada." This was put forward by one of my constituents.

I have received numerous concerns from my constituents, one of whom is a broadcaster and a person who works in the field of broadcasting. He takes much exception to the whole idea of privatization of CBC. This constituent is not only a broadcaster, but also an artist and has had the opportunity to express some northern interpretations of his artistic endeavours through a recording by CBC.

So have other renowned northern artists such as Charlie Panagoniak. There are many other young artists who I can think of from the communities who have had the opportunity to produce records and to express in their aboriginal languages the very essence of who they are in the songs and in the music of their people.

We have had numerous applications that have been put forward to numerous sources for moneys to produce recordings of Inuit music or Dene music that express the cultures of the north. These are the kinds of things that were supported by CBC. Many of the people who are trained and dedicated to the whole idea of broadcasting for the north are fearful if in fact there are cuts. I know that it is being denied across the way by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Communications that in fact there will not be those kinds of cuts.

Well, it is very good to hear because for many of the people who are trained and dedicated to working for the northern broadcasting service it is more than just a job for them. It is a labour of love. It is something they believe in and something they are very studied in. It is a commitment on their part to bring to southern Canada and to bring to northerners, not just news and information from the south but from the whole world. It is also a commitment to bring knowledge from the various parts of the north.

• (2140)

When we speak about the north, we are at the stage in development of the north that is very important. I guess we are on the brink of our true constitutional development, where northerners will take their true place in Confederation. There is lots of talk about many issues that are important to the north.

Who brings to the north the importance of what happens at the national level or what happens in the Persian Gulf? It is CBC. Usually it is CBC television and CBC radio. Who brings to the north the importance of what happens in one region? In Nunavut, it brings the news of what is happening with the land claims in the eastern Arctic to the west. Who brings the news from the west to the east? It is CBC. It has always been so.

In years gone by we have had limited capacity. We relied heavily on radio. Now we have CBC television broadcasting. Many of the communities get Newsworld. It has been a plus for northerners who do not have the opportunity to get out into mainstream Canadian society by way of travel, because it is very isolated and very remote. We have the opportunity through CBC to share with the rest of Canada what the north is all about and also to get the message to the north of what Canada is all about, in all parts of the country.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Finestone:** Mr. Speaker!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I am sorry but I cannot recognize the hon. member for Mount Royal because she is not in her seat.

[*English*]

**Hon. Alan Redway (Minister of State (Housing)):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to say just a very few words in connection with Bill C-40, as it proceeds on third reading to final passage and on to the Senate.

You may not recall it, Mr. Speaker, because as I recall you were not with us during the last Parliament. However, all of your associates in the chair will recall very well the fact that during the last Parliament a very similar bill was put forward by the government with many similar provisions relating to broadcasting. That bill proceeded through the House, was finally passed by the House, went on to the Senate, and then, when the election of 1988 was called, it died because it had not been passed by the Senate prior to the election call.

That bill contained some provisions which caused some great concern to a good many constituents of mine, particularly residents of condominiums. They felt that the provisions of that former bill—and I must say that I agree with them—were discriminatory with respect to condominium owners because of the fact that they were treated differently than those who were the owners of single family detached dwellings. In fact they opposed that bill quite vehemently. They presented their views on many occasion, sometimes by letter, sometimes by telephone calls, and ultimately by representations before the legislative committee that considered that bill, asking for amendments that would have placed condominium owners in the same position as those who were single family detached home owners.

Mr. Speaker, others who sat in the chair that you are sitting in at the present time,will recall that I took a very strong position on behalf of my constituents at that time. I too put forward amendments to that bill in an effort to try to bring about some changes which would put condominium owners on an equal footing with those in single family homes, to the extent that when that bill was at report stage and notwithstanding the fact that I was a strong supporter of the government and continue to be, I did not vote for the bill at report stage. Today we have a brand new bill before us but it has provisions which are very, very similar to the provisions contained in the previous bill that was presented before the Thirty-third Parliament.

I have a great many constituents who are very supportive of this particular bill. In fact, they have written urging me to support it. I have received some 18 letters with respect to this bill from people who are my constituents and who are also members of an association which you are familiar with, Mr. Speaker, known as the Friends of the CBC. Understandably, they want to see this bill passed because it has been a long time since we have had new legislation governing either the CBC or broadcasting in this country.

The previous Minister of Communications in the last government brought the bill forward because it had been years and years since we had had legislation to catch up with the many technological changes, if nothing else, that had occurred in broadcasting since the passage of the last legislation with respect to broadcasting.

Notwithstanding the support that this bill receives and the understandable feelings that we need new legislation, I still truly believe that the owners of condominiums have a legitimate concern with this bill, as they had with the last bill, concerning the impact of satellite receivers. With the prior bill and with this bill, condominium owners feel it is discriminatory and that they are not treated the same way as single family home owners.

If they are regulated under this legislation, they will have no alternative but to become captive receivers and captive subscribers to cable television, whereas the single family home owner is not in that position. If the single family home owner was regulated, he or she could very well drop the subscription to cable television, set up a satellite receiver in their own backyard and have no problems whatsoever.

Very kindly, the parliamentary secretary in his remarks this evening has pointed out that there is some protection, if not in the legislation, at least in the hearts of the government, the minister, the parliamentary secretary and the department for the condominium owners in this situation. I have no reason to doubt the words of the parliamentary secretary. I applaud his words and I thank him for them.

However, you and I know that he will not always be the parliamentary secretary, the present minister will not always be the minister and the present government will not always be the government. With great respect, I fully understand that with a democratic system, Mr. Speaker, from time to time—it may be a long time and, hopefully, as far as you and I are concerned, it will be a long time—one of these days there will be another government, another minister, another parliamentary secretary and who knows what their views may be.

And so tonight, while I speak in support of the bill, I want to voice my concerns and the concerns of my constituents who are condominium owners, and there are a great many of them. I want to point out as well with respect to the bill in the Thirty-third Parliament, there were some 266 individual residents of my riding who voiced personal concerns about that bill.

• (2150)

With respect to this bill, some 158 of my constituents in the York Valley condominiums in particular have voiced concerns. I want to put it on the record that they have very legitimate concerns. I will be continuing to work with the minister, the parliamentary secretary, and the government to ensure that their concerns are met and that the government continues to make sure that they are treated equally with other homeowners. Regardless of what happens with this bill, condominium owners will not have to fear discriminatory treatment and I will continue to work on their behalf.

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, the member talks about the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and its functions as a national entity.

I just want to point out that one of the main problems we have seen with respect to this government's direction over the last few years has been the consistent cutbacks to the CBC budget.

I point out that in 1984–85, the operations budget was some $943 million. In 1989–90, that has been cut to $812 million. In terms of the total budget, about $140 million will be cut over four years starting in 1990–91.

I want to point out that the CRTC said in its most recent licence renewal that the CBC could not fulfil its mandate at current funding levels. Since then we have seen further declines in the expenditures.

I would like to quote a comment from the CBC vice-president, Mr. MacEwen, who said: "You're right. We are getting squeezed each year. We have to factor in how we are going to do that. This year, which is 1989–90, they lost a 1 per cent real cut across the radio system. They managed to sustain their activity for one more year, but if we keep going, something is going to have to give."

As I mentioned to you earlier tonight, we heard announcements of major lay-offs in the CBC. I have the Library of Parliament at this time trying to find the details of just what are the extent of those lay-offs, but we understand they were announced tonight.

I would like to ask the member how he can justify the government's supposed commitment to a national broadcasting system in this country, a system that is responsible for defining our national unity and our national identity as a symbol of Canadianism. How can we continue to do this when in fact these substantial cuts in budget allocations to the CBC are being now realized in major job lay-offs? They are already short in terms of their ability to fulfil their mandate. How do you suppose they can continue to do it when they have to lay off even more workers?

**Mr. Redway:** Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the member's question. Regardless of my own personal views on the matter, and regardless of the member's personal views on the matter, he and I both recognize that there is a difference of opinion with respect to the budgetary matters relating to the CBC.

That was pointed out very vividly on November 27 in a column written in the *Ottawa Citizen* by Marjorie Nichols in which she said that this fiscal year the CBC's budget is $1.4 billion of which $1 billion is a direct grant from the federal treasury. To put the CBC into perspective, it costs Canadian taxpayers as much as the RCMP, which received $1.2 billion this year. Actually the federal police generates more revenue, $526 million, than does the CBC, $439 million. The 10,500 CBC jobs theoretically cost the taxpayers of Canada about $100,000 each. If the CBC were sold, many of those jobs would be transferred to the private sector. If the CBC were privatized, absolutely everybody would be better off.

Marjorie Nichols goes on to say: "Given the new broadcasting act that provides the federal cabinet with expanded powers over broadcasting, the need for action is urgent. For the sake of Canadian democracy, the CBC ought to be put on the auction block."

I do not think everybody agrees with Marjorie Nichols, but that is the view of some Canadians. There is a difference of opinion with respect to this matter, and I think that is what democracy is all about. We are here to debate the various points of view. Marjorie Nichols' opinion is one thing, and the hon. member's opinion is another.

**Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could inform the House what radio or television stations are being closed by the CBC and how many people are being laid off by the corporation?

**Mr. Redway:** Mr. Speaker, it is very kind of the hon. member from Newfoundland to ask me a question of that sort. I am afraid I do not have those figures. Perhaps the hon. member has them himself, but I have to say that my concern with this bill does not really rest with the CBC although many of my constituents are most concerned about it. They want to see it continue and that is understandable.

As the hon. member knows, the CBC was put into effect originally by the Conservative government of former Prime Minister R. B. Bennett, and it has continued to flourish since that time. It continues to carry on its good work to the present time.

What I am really concerned about with this bill is its impact on condominium owners. The hon. member well knows that because he was here in the last Parliament. I am sure he sat there with bated breath listening to my comments.

He realizes as well that I have the same concerns with the impact of this current bill on condominium owners. I am sure that he applauds my actions, and that he agrees wholeheartedly with me. If and when he is ever part of a government in this country, I hope he will ensure that condominium owners are not discriminated against, but will be fully protected as single family detached home owners are.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I was in the prior Parliament with the hon. minister. I can recall with a great deal of precision many of his interventions which were very enlightened and very well formulated.

I also remember that Stan Graham and Jack Scowen who used to be in this House shared his views. Behind the curtains, we had many little conversations as to how we could have the Minister of Communications, the then member for Kingston and the Islands, Flora MacDonald, try to include this in the bill.

I bring to the member's attention that we did debate MATV systems, and those concerns for condominiums in this House under Motion No. 6 which the government, as you know, Mr. Speaker, did not accept.

I would like to believe that we could count on the goodwill and the interest of the government to ensure that condominium owners and private dwellings or apartment buildings, and the hotels would not have any further problems.

I would like to bring to his attention that, right now even though we have the private right of action in this bill for which I am very appreciative, in my own city in the Westmount riding there is a very large condominium and apartment complex that is at this very moment in CF Cable territory but is not using the CF Cable services.

CF Cable has been asked many times to come in because the MATV system is working outside of the law. The MATV system is bringing in HBO and ESPN, and all the programs that we say have no place on our system as we have complementary services. It does not bring in the parliamentary channel. It does not bring in many of the other services that are so important such as the educational channels, et cetera.

• (2200)

With what kind of sense of comfort does he feel that he can depend on the CRTC that never bothered to use the Holiday Inn decision that came down in Winnipeg effectively? There does not seem to have anything in this bill that would direct the CRTC at this time. Does the hon. minister think that he is comfortable enough with the new provisions under the private right of action that they can answer that question?

**Mr. Redway:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked me if I feel comfortable with the situation as it now stands. I must say that thinking back to the situation in the last Parliament, I can recall many discussions with the hon. member then as the critic for communications, as she is now, on this very subject. My recollection is that she was not supportive of condominium owners at that time and, in fact, she voted against it. My motions that were put forward at that time were not supported by the opposition or we would have had a vote and I would have had a chance to get on the record formally on that issue at that time. I have the *Hansard* from those debates of August, 1988 right here, as a matter of fact, and I can tell you that I see no evidence that the hon. member was supportive at that time.

It is quite surprising now that she should be taking the position that there is some problem with the bill, particularly because I do not recall any motion that she moved. The hon. member for Beaches—Woodbine moved a motion in support of condominium owners in the debate at report stage, but I do not recall any motion that the hon. member moved in support of condominium owners.

To the best of my knowledge, based on the comments she made in the past and the comments that I recollect she has made in this debate, she is not supportive of equal rights for condominium owners. I hope that if she ever gets a chance to form a part of a government that she will change her mind and be supportive of the rights of condominium owners and not discriminate in that regard.

**Mrs. Finestone:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not like to contradict my hon. friend, the minister, in the House, but it was with persistent questions to the minister of the day, both in committee and in the House, that we were able to get—

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but this is a matter of opinion, not a point of order. I will therefore have to revert to debate.

Resuming debate. The hon. member for Winnipeg North.

[*English*]

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak on third reading of Bill C–40, an act respecting broadcasting and to amend certain acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunications.

Before I proceed, allow me to thank my colleague, the hon. member for Mount Royal, for her leadership on this issue on behalf of our Liberal caucus.

This bill, in essence, should shape what we see on the television landscape in the future. It should make sure television will promote a sense of Canadian unity, a sense of our character as a people, of a people proud of our different origins and of a people with common shared values. But the bill is not clear in its vision and the government lacks the courage to commit funds to achieve the goal of promoting the Canadian nation on television.

This bill would have the power to change what Canadians see on their television sets. This is very important since broadcasting impacts on the way most people get their news, their entertainment, and their understanding of our multicultural diversity. The medium of television should support a sense of shared values and a sense of national being. But there can be no genuine national being if we do not insist that the CBC is, at all times, to foster national unity. A renewal of this national mission as a mandate of CBC is vital to the continued survival of our nation.

Reaffirming national unity as a mandate is most relevant today, particularly when we witness segments of our country feeling alienated from each other and from a common whole. Our geography, our different languages and cultures and our common economic problems require a link if we are to continue to survive as a people and as a nation. Broadcasting serves as this essential linkage to bring together our aboriginal peoples, our founding settlers and our new citizens, adults and children, as Canadians.

Hence, I am pleased to see the retention in the proposed Broadcasting Act of the principle enunciated in the original Broadcasting Act of 1968:

> The Canadian Broadcasting system shall be effectively owned and controlled by Canadians so as to safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada.

Unfortunately, only about 5 per cent of the programs presented to Canadians today on English television are Canadian in content. That is what we see, that is what our children see.

Since most of our children spend a lot of time watching television and learning from it, I fear that our children do not see enough programs that reinforce to them what it really means to be a Canadian.

Hence, ownership and programming content are two of the fundamental issues which a new broadcasting bill must address if it is to prove effective in the future. This bill fails in these twin challenges.

We have already seen the arrival of satellite communication and other technologies. The boundaries between nations have blurred. Broadcasting has made our planet truly a global village.

At the same time, there is palpable concern that these new technologies are being built only by a privileged few. This is not inherently wrong, but a danger lurks nearby. What the world will see, read and hear in the coming century could be coming from the hands of a few through mergers and take-overs. For example, new on-demand television services will likely fall in the control of a few, and if not licensed and regulated for Canadian content, would unduly profile and promote American and not Canadian programs.

Today, we have a watchdog organization that is supposed to ensure that the television medium is not concentrated in the hands of a few who can ignore important Canadian programming. That watchdog is the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, the CRTC. But the CRTC has long been acknowledged as being somewhat of a toothless watchdog. Although it has the mandate to punish broadcasters who do not adhere to Canadian content standards by revoking their broadcasting license, the commission has never been strict with broadcasters who break the rules.

Bill C-40, instead of strengthening the watchdog duty of the CRTC, weakens that punitive power by adopting the approach of performance incentives. That is, it will reward networks who broadcast a sufficient number of programs with the stipulated Canadian content quota by waiving the annual license fee, which can be as much as one-third of a million dollars based on advertising revenues of $10 million. It will punish those who do not fulfil their obligations by making them pay part or all of the license fee.

But let us be realistic. The CRTC was always reluctant to use its power before, what reason do we have to believe that it will change now? Worse, the government will now have more veto powers over the commission's decisions. Hence, the networks can lobby the government to overrule unwelcome CRTC decisions. Besides, we all know that one-third of a million dollars fee is not enough to scare potential delinquent networks into showing more Canadian programs. These networks are some of the top money-making corporations in North America today. "The big networks can well afford to pay a $300,000 slap on the wrist", said Matthew Fraser of the *Montreal Gazette* in his column recently.

• (2210)

I believe the underlying issue behind this debate is money. Under Bill C-40, the CBC must "contribute to shared national conscience and identity", and make space for more cultural programs as opposed to commercial shows. These are admirable objectives, but I do not think the government has given much thought to the price-tag of its goals.

During its past four years in power, the Conservative government has cut $140 million from the already suffering network. Tonight in debate, we heard from the hon. member for Winnipeg—St. James, based on some advance information he has, that at least another $100 million will be cut by the CBC affecting at least 10 radio stations, Radio Canada International, and the parliamentary channels.

One way in which the CBC has coped with these heartless cuts has been from the income the corporation gets from airing commercial programs. Now the government is telling the CBC to produce more cultural programs and move away from commercial programming. It costs a lot more to create a program than to buy one. One doubts that in this time of economic recession the government is going to give the CBC more funding in its next budget. I only hope that this pessimism would prove to be wrong.

Verily, I do not think the government is taking the important role of the CBC seriously. Telling the network to do more with fewer financial resources is unacceptable.

In conclusion, the CRTC and the CBC have very important roles to play in promoting a Canadian soul. The CRTC must be a watchdog with teeth. It must be able to ensure Canadian content quotas are filled and that the power of the television medium does not rest in the hands of a privileged few. The CBC must be given ample funding to produce good Canadian programming as well.

Bill C-40 does not properly address these issues. It should be a bill which promotes our sense of Canadian unity. We need a Broadcasting Act to make a difference to our airwaves. There will continue to be a deficit of programs showing who Canadians really are unless the government gives more power to the CRTC and more money to the CBC.

Canadians need to be shown the vision and the leadership with which to attain that vision. This side of the House is ready to form the government and to lead Canadians to a united country and people, linked via a new Broadcasting Act, an act that will broadcast to the whole world the true Canadian soul—united, caring, compassionate, and just.

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the member on his fine presentation. I think he had a lot of very salient points to make.

I was particularly interested in the comments he was making on the CBC and its mandated function to serve as an instrument of national unity. He referred to these consistent cutbacks, $140 million more dollars slated over the next few years, and now we hear earlier tonight of even greater cuts in the offing. He raised the question as to how the CBC can possibly fulfil its mandate when it is essentially being knee-capped economically by the government that is looking to emasculate the corporation in terms of the role that it has to fulfil.

I do not know whether or not the member was here earlier tonight when I was speaking, but we had learned of just recently announced lay-offs in the CBC.

They were announced tonight. We did not have many details at that point. A little bit more has filtered in. In my discussions with the Canadian Press I found that these cuts are going to result in the closure of 10 regional stations that will either close completely or will be reduced to storefront operations. These are regional stations, regional centres, which have fulfilled a very important function in getting the Canadian news out to the scattered regions of this country.

I would like to ask the member the question I have been trying to ask the government. They certainly will not answer me. Perhaps the hon. member from the Liberal Party would care to comment on how these cutbacks and resultant layoffs can possibly be helpful to a corporation that is struggling to fulfil the mandate it has been given when it already knows it is short of funds and now, obviously, short of manpower.

**Mr. Pagtakhan:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his comments and for his question. He has truly identified the hypocrisy of this government, on the one hand trying to tell us that it is promoting the broadcasting institution in our country, and on the other hand trying to amputate it by cutting the financial resources necessary to support such an undertaking.

I cannot help but fully agree with my colleague and his concerns and I hope that before we vote on this bill the government will make a commitment, renew itself, change its heart, restore funding to this institution so that truly we can promote Canadian unity in this country.

**Mr. Jim Edwards (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to my friend's intervention in this debate and I thank him and congratulate him for it. It was very thoughtful and well presented. I hesitated even to make an intervention, but I do it in a spirit of collegiality. I think I may have misunderstood the hon. member.

What I understood him to say is that, in the context of the financial crunch in which the CBC finds itself with declining commercial revenues, the government was telling the CBC to program more cultural offerings.

Perhaps I have missed something, but I am not aware that the government has ever told the CBC what to program.

I wonder if the hon. member could answer that.

**Mr. Pagtakhan:** Mr. Speaker, what I meant when I said that the CBC must be mandated to have Canadian content in its programming is that with this kind of mandate it has to create new programs of Canadian content. As yet we have very little of that in Canada. That type of undertaking will need support from the Canadian government. That is what I meant, Mr. Speaker.

**Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to one side of broadcasting and later about the erosion of the CBC.

Broadcasting is a powerful, unifying medium.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, is there anyone in this government who believes in the unity of this country? If so, why do they not stand up and defend federalism? Canada is falling apart, and nobody on the government side seems to care.

Mr. Speaker, withdrawing from the CBC's mission its mandate to promote national unity and to provide a forum for expressing our Canadian identity is only the tip of the iceberg.

[*English*]

Recently the Prime Minister highlighted the importance of national unity by saying: "Everything that we have accomplished as a country can be traced back to our sense of national purpose, to our national unity". If he really believes this, why did he remove the CBC's national unity goal? That is a quote from the hon. member for Mount Royal, who has led our party through this bill.

• (2220)

Why have we not heard of the Prime Minister going to his province and fighting for his country? He is willing to send Canadians to fight for Kuwait but he is too scared to venture into his own riding to fight for its place in Canada. The same goes for other ministers from Quebec. I find it completely reprehensible that ministers of the Crown have a half-hearted defence for the country they are sworn to defend and represent. I am tired of Conservative double-talk that tries to pander to both Canadian unity and Quebec independence.

The Conservatives and the New Democrats seem to be in the same boat on this issue. Their leaders cannot rely on their members from Quebec to stand up for their province's role in confederation. Mr. Speaker, I and my leader, the Hon. Jean Chrétien, stand for a strong Canada with Quebec as a strong and prosperous partner in confederation. It would be a symbol of good faith to all Canadians, which includes the citizens of Saint-Laurent—Cartierville, to reinstate the CBC's role of promoting national unity.

It is the legitimate interest of a national body, such as the CBC, to make sure that our country is united and strong. It is for this reason that, without this mandate, I cannot support this bill at third reading.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, is that the way this government expects to create some harmony? Is it because the country is in such a mess that the government insists on removing from the CBC mandate the development of national unity and the broadcasting of some sense of Canadian identity? Is it because this government no longer believes in Canada, that it is gradually removing the development of national unity from the mandate? Naturally, the Minister will deny that it is his objective, but the facts tend to show that the reverse is true.

[*English*]

At a time when Canadians are divided over issues such as free trade, the GST, and the Constitution of the country, the country's national public broadcaster should be the purveyor of national unity. If we are to have a national personality, we have to weave all regions into a unified force. It is not by cutting funds that this government is helping Canada stay together. But, could that be its hidden agenda, letting Canada split apart and saying, "we did our best", knowing full well that they did not?

It is indeed sad to see that while this country is on the brink of disintegration, its national leadership has shirked its responsibility of fighting for a strong and unified Canada. Instead of the Prime Minister going on the road to hear how this country feels, instead of him going into Quebec and fighting for this country, he has reneged on his responsibility. It seems that the Minister of Communications has shirked his responsibility as well. He has withdrawn from the fight for Canada. He is obliged, by his duty to this country, to fight for Canada's unity. It is for this reason that he must reintroduce the national unity objective of the CBC.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, how can the government ask the Canadian people to weave a stronger seamless web of national unity, when it does everything it can to tear it? Canadians are already offered very little cultural programming, especially outside Quebec. Does the government think that by cutting funds to the CBC and removing the development of national unity from its mandate, it will be able to offer better cultural programming to the French-speaking population of this country, and in particular better local cultural programming? Is the government genuinely interested in it or is it only a façade?

Why now, Mr. Speaker? The unity of the country is holding only by a thread and it is now that this government wants to remove from the CBC's mandate the promotion of national unity and the expression of the forum to express Canadian identity. What is going on? What is this government afraid of? To take a stand?

Mr. Speaker, Quebec is already very seriously questioning its place within this country. If the state broadcaster is withdrawing from its promotion of national unity because this mandate is taken away from it, does that imply that this government has also decided to let Quebec go adrift? Is this the beginning of the quiet changes to allow for the possible break-up of this country?

[*English*]

It may seem like a small issue but it is with negative small issues that we break up a country. Liberals do not want this, nor do the Canadian people. You know who will be the person who is remembered for the dismantling of this country, this Prime Minister.

We need someone who will be committed to Canada. That is the Liberal Party and Jean Chrétien. We can offer this vision to all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, we heard a lot from the members of the Bloc Québécois. They told us that promotion of national unity is Canadian propaganda. I am sure the majority of Quebecers disagree with them. More than ever, Mr. Speaker, we have to create ties across Canada if we really care about this country. This move to take away the mandate for the development of national unity is a step in the wrong direction. We, in the Liberal Party, want to put the government back in the right direction. That is why we are absolutely against Bill C-40.

[*English*]

I would just like to touch on the gradual erosion of the CBC. The parliamentary secretary talked earlier about tax and sort of glossed over that there were not any, and that the CBC was servicing regional needs.

I quote the hon. member for Mount Royal again: "In 1985, this Conservative government began by cutting $85 million. In 1986-87, $5.6 million; 1987-88, $21.1 million; 1988-89, it came to 5.6 million; 1989-90, $5.8 million; and for the year 1991, $25.9 million".

When the hon. member for Mount Royal asked the minister to assure that there would be no further cuts to the CBC, he refused to say no. His only remarks to her were "It is with great pleasure that I note the member's suggestion".

One other point that the parliamentary secretary raised was the decision about national unity. I am not quite sure of his exact words, but he talked about the division of the board with a francophone committee and an anglophone committee. He said that this was approved by the chairman of the board. I wonder if he was talking about the chairman of the board of the CBC, Patrick Watson. I understand that when he appeared before the legislative committee, he expressed grave concern about dividing the CBC along linguistic lines. He is the chairman designate, and speaking with unequivocal and unanimous support of the CBC board of directors, he said: "Let me say that the board unanimously felt that this was both divisive in terms of the obligation of the corporation to be one".

I would be interested in hearing what the parliamentary secretary means when he says that we are not dividing the board of the CBC and that there were no parliamentary cuts planned. I hope the parliamentary secretary is right but we have yet to hear him say there will be no cuts. Could you please elucidate on this point?

• (2230)

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, we have been speaking back and forth all night about the impact of the government's legislation and the impact of the government's continued expenditure cuts on CBC.

As we have been talking, the news has been filtering in and it has just become dramatically clear to us, startlingly clear to us, that the cuts that we are seeing take place tonight, that have just been announced, are the most severe cuts to take place in the history of the CBC.

It is estimated that the cuts are going to axe 1,200 people. They are going to eliminate local programs and are going to result in the closure of some 10 regional centres. This is just coming through the news now. The big loss will apparently be in local services. We already lost some 472 jobs earlier in the year. If the cuts go through, by next April a total of 1,600 jobs in the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation will have been axed.

The stations that will be axed, according to reports, are the regional stations in Calgary, in Saskatoon, in Windsor, Radio-Canada in Toronto, Quebec operations, the Goose Bay operation and operations in Newfoundland. It is a response to this government's $140 million cutting of the budget for CBC that is forcing the CBC board to have to take these kinds of drastic measures in order to make ends meet.

The argument that we placed earlier and the argument that is made ever more clearer tonight, is that this government is emasculating the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. It is essentially kneecapping it economically so that it can no longer fulfil its function. I wonder if my colleague who has just been speaking may wish to question the government as to how the CBC can continue to fulfil its mandate when this is the scenario that is facing the corporation right now.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Maheu:** Mr. Speaker, since I did not hear the news that were just announced—I hope that it is not the CBC—I am astonished. If the parliamentary secretary could explain another time what he meant when he said that there would be no cuts, because five minutes later, we heard that 1,200 jobs were cut and that 10 television stations would close. What does that mean? Could it be possible that he unintentionally mislead the House? Or is he trying to make Canadians believe that the government is not really interested in national unity?

[*English*]

**Mr. Edwards:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked a question and I will, by way of question and comment, endeavour to respond to it. I did make it clear earlier this evening that whatever announcements CBC will make tonight or tomorrow—I do not believe any announcement has been made.

**Ms. Clancy:** It was on the news.

**Mr. Edwards:** Lots of things are on the news. That does not mean that they have been announced or that they are factual. Mr. Speaker, as an expert former newsman yourself, I ask you where in the world would news people be if only facts got on the news. There would be a lot of dead air. But, the fact of the matter is, as I understand it, and I believe the record should be very clear on this matter, although members opposite seem to enjoy suggesting that the government is proposing to apply some cuts to the CBC, the only cuts that the government has applied to the CBC since April of 1989 were the $140 million in the April 1989 budget and the $1.7 million last week to aid in the financing of the Persian Gulf operation.

Further cuts are not contemplated today, tomorrow, or in the foreseeable future. Indeed, if hon. members have the patience to wait for the announcement that it is believed will be made by the president of the CBC tomorrow, they may find that the government is assisting the CBC in its current difficulties.

Therefore I think it would be very inappropriate to cry havoc and raise alarms to the extent that it is implied that the government is butchering the CBC. The government is doing nothing of the sort. The government is endeavouring, in a time of difficult financial restraint, to nurture the CBC as best it can.

**Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls):** Mr. Speaker, the cuts referred to by the parliamentary secretary are absolutely outrageous. It is an outrage in Canada for the CBC to be announcing tomorrow the closure of two operations in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Just imagine, a total closure of one station and a partial closure of another station. Of 10 cuts in Canada, two are in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Could the parliamentary secretary or the minister, if he intends to come along to the House, explain why the Government of Canada is allowing the CBC totally to destroy its service to a great portion of Newfoundland and Labrador?

We have taken more cuts than any other province in Canada. It is an absolute outrage. Somebody from the government side should make an announcement tonight that it is going to object to those cuts and it is going to cancel them.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Maheu:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, because since it is our 20 minute period, I do not want to give the minister the opportunity to take the floor again.

[*English*]

He is the parliamentary secretary, I apologize.

We say that Tory times are tough times. When I listened to the parliamentary secretary talking earlier about no budget cuts, he was saying: "Don't worry, be happy". How can we be happy if indeed it is true that there are 1,200 jobs on the line and 10 stations? I hope for once the government will be ready to stop cutting and this time start giving a little.

**Mr. Edwards:** We are giving; we are not cutting.

**Mrs. Maheu:** I accept that.

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, I realize the debate is getting rather circular, but many comments have been made reflecting the recently announced cuts which the media brought forward tonight.

The parliamentary secretary has essentially said that the government has had no part in these cuts. This is an argument that has gone back and forth between the two sides of the House tonight.

I wanted to make clear to the House and to the people of Canada that it was indicated in the newscast that these cuts were the response of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in terms of a necessary plan of action to follow through with the $140 million reduction in government spending the corporation must incur in the next four years. It is responding to this $140 million budgetary shortfall with these job cutbacks.

It was very clear tonight in terms of the newscast. I think the parliamentary secretary should reconsider the comments he has made in that regard.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Does the hon. parliamentary secretary want to conclude his remarks?

**Mrs. Maheu:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I will recognize the hon. member for Saint-Laurent—Cartierville for 30 seconds.

• (2240 )

[*English*]

**Mrs. Maheu:** Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to put on the record again that the parliamentary secretary just told us that this government is not cutting but indeed is giving. Thank you again.

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence):** Mr. Speaker, we are debating Bill C-40 and the essence and the soul of this country as seen through communications.

Just before my hon. colleague from Saint-Laurent—Cartierville finished speaking, we had announcements on national television. We had what I would consider to be a near disaster in terms of communications, in terms of the means by which we not only bring the country together, and in terms of how we give an indication to all Canadians nation-wide what we are about. We are also talking about letting go 1,200 men and women with great expertise and experience in the communications field, in the electronics field, and in all other fields central and integral to the development of a high-tech, ultra-modern communications system, art system, and dramatic art system which identify and express for Canadians that element of Canadianism. All those people will be let go. The parliamentary secretary said that the government—and I think I am quoting him correctly; the "blues" will bear me out—is aiding, not cutting funds to the CBC.

It is almost outrageous that we should hear those kinds of statements. His colleague, the former parliamentary secretary for communications, earlier in the evening said: "I regret that there will be cuts"—and again I am sure that the "blues" will bear me out—"but when they come it is because they have to come".

Two hours later they came. They came with a slash. They came with a bang. Some 1,200 people, in addition to the 476 who have already been let go, will be let go by April 1, 1991 in order to make up a shortfall of $100 million, thanks to this government's lack of commitment, desire to kill the CBC, and any national means of communication, any national means of news, any national means of bringing Canadians together on a cultural point, on a news point, or on an information sharing point that was already there. The mechanism was there, and the government has decided that it is no longer worth maintaining.

We are seeing that through this Bill C–40. It is ironic that these announcements would have come on the eve of third reading of Bill C–40, which has been designed through this institution to bring awareness to all Canadians of the value of all institutions and instruments which make up our soul and our character. To have this kind of announcement tonight of all nights tells us that in essence what is being debated this evening is all for nought.

Parliamentarians will be unable to bring to the attention of all Canadians or convince them of the significance of this debate by bringing forth all important elements for consideration. In fact one of the lambs that will be sacrificed in these cuts will be the parliamentary channel, the vehicle for bringing our debates into the homes of each and every Canadian.

In addition, we can see from some of the cuts that the government is giving up on its sense of what Canada must be. I refer with great regret to one of the stations that will be cut. As a result of this government's action, one service that will no longer be available is Radio–Canada emanating in French from my own city of Toronto. There is nothing worse that one can say about establishing the whole concept of bilingual Canada, a Canada that is enriched by the differences that make up its whole, than to say that Radio–Canada will no longer be able to function out of the city of Toronto. It is a shame that this government would be associated with that kind of decision. It is an absolute criminal shame that the CBC would be put in a position where it has to make that kind of cut, because in addition to having to make up the shortfall of government finances toward the operation of this national institution, we learn through this report just a mere one–half hour ago that we have to make up for a shortage of advertising revenues.

Advertising revenues that this government was mandating will no longer be allowed to go to the CBC because, of course, what we have to do is encourage the private local entrepreneur, the local broadcasters, who have been asking for that rich advertising dollar. I think it runs in the vicinity of $200 million in the province of Quebec alone and is at least equal to that throughout the rest of the country.

With the cuts we have seen this evening, we take a look at where we are going with Bill C–40. We can see that we are no longer engaged in an academic discussion. We are no longer talking about the esoteric merits of a communications system that may or may not satisfy the arts community, that may or may not satisfy those people who are in the broadcasting industry as journalists, as reporters and other announcers. No, we are talking about Canadians, each and every one of us, and when the government decides that it must take a cold, hard look which it suggests is the method with which it approaches everything because it is a good financial manager and, as a good financial manager, what it will do to make sure the bottom line is black. As always, what will happen is it will tear this country apart.

It was not that long ago that nations throughout the world decided that what they needed to do in the interests of establishing a national character is they would have to devote the energies and the resources of their nations toward the education of their people, to give them the sense of what each other was like. They did that through an education system.

They did it as well through a military system in order to bring people from various regions together through military service. They exchanged ideas, let everybody understand what the other was like. This gave them a sense of closeness through the regions, a sense of familiarity about culture. It broke down the barriers that come with linguistic differences, and encouraged and nourished and, in fact, cultivated all of those expressions of individual aspirations, community aspirations, regional and cultural aspirations that come through the expression of literature, prose, drama and theatre, all of those things which we would have hoped would have firmly imprinted themselves on the character of this country that we have all come to love.

We have all come to love this country, because for someone like me who had to come to this country thanks to the good decisions of his parents, but who now has his own children rooted deeply into the country and who now must decide on their own as to the Canadian character. Thanks to this government we no longer will have a vehicle to serve the interests that once were identified through an education system that would have imprinted a character.

Now, through this high-tech age, we see it is the communications system, a national system like the CBC that would have given us the opportunity, not only through the news, but through the arts, dramatic arts, prose and even through dubbing some of the productions emanating from the various regions, such as those from Quebec, southern Ontario and western Canada, and to be able to allow us to see each other as we are and as we would want others to see us and provide us with an opportunity to be sensitive to the issues of the day in Canada.

They are not only constitutional issues, they are economic issues, they are environmental issues. They are the issues that will determine how we will live in this country tomorrow and how we will see each other in the next century through that medium that could produce the appropriate documentaries, programs and bring together the experts who have the interests of this country at heart, to bring them together and to allow our children to allow us to be able to become informed and make the decisions that are environmentally appropriate, economically sound and culturally homogeneous for all of us, homogeneous in the sense of people who in their differences could still remain united. Mr. Speaker, the kind of cuts we have seen this evening bear out what Bill C-40 was intending to do, essentially balkanize and allow the regionalization of Canada by doing the same thing to the one system that held Canada together.

• (2250)

I do not need to remind my hon. colleagues on this side of the House. They have been most vigilant throughout this debate. I say that without appearing fawning, but most members in the House, not just from my caucus, have developed a great respect and admiration for our critic who has been absolutely terrific in bringing out all of those discussions, the technical components of this bill, and who has as well pointed out the philosophical repercussions of each and every one of the motions, of all of the changes, that are being applied through this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to lose the opportunity, thanks to Bill C-40 and the government's action, negative, or inaction, which is at least dilatory, on issues that show the world what we as Canadians are. We have had some indication that perhaps, for example, Radio-Canada International might survive. We do not know for how long, but certainly it is a half-hearted commitment. It is no longer in the country's interest as far as the government is concerned.

Yes, there is the all-news service, but with the cuts we are going to find we will be unable to keep up with the demands and the rigours required in order to make sure that all Canadians receive the news on time, all the time, and in the fashion that would do professionalism honour, and in a fashion that would give an indication that the cultural differences, linguistic differences, regional differences, are put in the light which gives them the most favourable impression to all Canadians.

That is what has been missing in this country over the course of the last year and a half. We have not been given the opportunity to have the kinds of favourable impression we ought to have about each other, about each and every one of us, all of us, neighbours, friends and brothers and sisters in this country.

The government has not wanted to provide the appropriate legislative guarantees for such a mechanism. As I said earlier, it is interested more in ensuring that the regional approach to communication and through the ways we regulate, observe, and monitor that communication system, the CRTC, take place.

My colleagues have already pointed out how we have regionalized and balkanized the operations of the CRTC and we have essentially said we do not need nor do we want a national dimension to the kinds of decisions they will bring to bear on the broadcasting and communications system. I do not know how many ways that a parliamentary secretary, minister, or members of the government side can try to hide that fact, but the fact of

the matter is that when we no longer require a full executive of the CRTC to engage in decisions that relate to the communications system of this country, then we are essentially washing our hands of any kind of commitment that we ought to have to the national character of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I know you will be at one with me in this, a national character that allows for differences. It nurtures those differences and it recognizes that those differences actually provide energy and vigour to the character of Canada.

Bill C–40 for me, prior to hearing the cuts of this evening, already had meant that essentially the government, in addition to washing its hands of the duty, the obligation, the mandate to engage in establishing the national dimensions of this country was essentially opening the doors to what is already an insidious and all too pervasive effect on Canadian communication. That is the Americanization of both our culture, our language, our habits, and our views and perspectives on how the world should unfold, let alone how we as Canadians should develop our own potential. Colleagues on this side of the House have pointed out the vast majority of programming entering into this country viewed by our children. Maybe our children do not know enough yet, but at least we are in a position to make a choice. In making that choice we are offered few options; we have the American view of North America and we have the North American view of the world.

Thanks to Bill C–40, we no longer have the one unifying means, the financial resources and the mandate required to ensure that those resources bear themselves out in the kinds of programs that will give us a truly Canadian perspective, no matter from what region that Canadian perspective comes, a Canadian perspective nonetheless.

It has been of great sorrow to me to hear that the government, with Bill C–40, no longer feels that it is necessary to have any cautions in legislation to the infusion of more and more American broadcasting services, and yet there was a unanimous recommendation of the Communications and Cultural Committee of a mere three years ago that additional foreign networks not be allowed unless, of course, their programming was complementary to that of licensed Canadian services already.

No. It seems that the government is unwilling to strengthen the one instrument that would be there to enhance the Canadian character and in reneging on that opportunity it is essentially, deliberately weakening the possibility of a Canadian character.

We see that it is almost a logical consequence that the government would remove from Bill C–40 the national unity clause that was part of the CBC mandate.

I might remind the members, colleagues and one and all, those who feel especially strong about the CBC, about its potential. I do not want to get involved in the discussions of the mechanisms and the details one by one of the CBC programming and the hierarchy and the structure of the organization. I refer to the concept, to the potential that exists with that means of communication. That mandate that we are dropping from C–40 essentially told the CBC that it had to contribute to the development of national unity and to provide for a continuing expression of the Canadian identity.

By removing that clause, by no longer keeping us there, we are losing an opportunity to identify that Canada that is emerging. We are refusing to recognize the merits of those nations that have been part and parcel to the Canadian character as it has emerged through its first century of creation and, in fact, we are going to lose that umbrella organization that could reach out to all the emergence of a new Canada that is there, that is going to take its rightful place in the 21st century. Despite what this government would like to think, it is not the Canadian way to be immersed solely and simply in a parochial atmosphere of a North American environment with a very aggressive and very large neighbour. We have a country that is emerging because of the kinds of demographics that are allowing us to develop.

We have an opportunity to identify this new Canada. I cite, for example, just my own city of Toronto new Canadians see all of their news through three channels—Chinese, Portuguese and Italian. In combination, those three, on one local television area, represent more viewers than there are for the highest viewership of English language news. The CBC has an opportunity to focus in on that emerging type of Canada, to bring that and integrate it in with the already established mainstream cultures of Canada and, thereby, impress more of a new Canadian character on it. It can integrate the four

together, all the other new elements that come and without danger to each and any one of them, to give us an opportunity, through a vehicle such as the CBC, to learn more about each other, to identify each other, to familiarize each other with ourselves and to recognize all those common aspirations which we call Canada.

• (2300)

**Mr. Jim Edwards (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the hon. member for Eglinton—Lawrence who, in a passionate way, covered a lot of bases.

First, I would like to ask him: Who said Radio-Canada would not operate out of Toronto? Those were the words he used, that Radio-Canada would not operate out of Toronto. I think he will find, since our only currency in this place is credibility, that that statement is not credible and perhaps he should check again.

Again, I would caution that it is pretty exciting, when we have a broadcasting debate going on and there is a big broadcasting story out there, to bring it in here. That is part of the game. We do those things. But I think we ought to be careful about the rumours or the stories that we present as facts in this place, because maybe this channel is being watched too tonight. We should, I think, give the CBC a break in terms of giving it some credit for its capability in managing its affairs which is, what I think, it is in the process of doing at this particular time.

The CBC is not the only instrument for Canadianization. It is the prime instrument, but not the only instrument.

I listened with some wry amusement to my friend when he was talking about the necessity to dub shows. I am sure he really did not intend it this way, but he was talking about dubbing shows from Quebec so that they could be understood and appreciated in English Canada. He went on to say that perhaps some from southern Ontario and even western Canada could be dubbed as well. He did not use those words, but the implication was there. I think I do not need dubbing to be understood by the hon. member.

The Americanization of the country, he felt, through the airwaves, would follow from the Balkanization that would exist within the CRTC. That is, I believe, the string of logic that we were offered and challenged to follow. More and more Canadian programs are being viewed and many of those are produced by the private sector. Most of them are produced by the CBC, but many are produced by the private sector. I think we ought to give credit where credit is due.

I give just one example which was originated, with the help of Telefilm, by a broadcaster in my own community and that was *Bye, Bye Blues*, one of the finest Canadian films to have been produced in recent years.

Finally, I do want to comment on the hon. member's challenge, which I share, and that is that the Canadian broadcasting system, as a whole—and he singled out the CBC—ought to reflect the new Canada and its various components. Well, there may be some things that the framers of this legislation—and I include my friend, the hon. member for Mount Royal, as one of the framers of this legislation.

**Mrs. Finestone:** I'm feeling uncomfortable.

**Mr. Edwards:** She is getting uncomfortable.

There is one thing that we succeeded in doing and of which we can all be proud and it is that the system—not just the CBC, but all components of the system—is mandated by this bill to reflect Canada in all its diverse glory, but at the same time to stimulate a national consciousness and identity.

I come now to the multicultural reality of our country and the multicultural mandate which is imposed on the system, for the first time, in this bill. I would say, Mr. Speaker, not only in that which is portrayed on the air, in radio and in television, but more particularly and most significantly—and my friend from Mount Royal fought with me on this, and Lynn McDonald fought with us at the outset, on the same side I should rush to say—that the operations clause of this bill mandates that stations in their operations will also reflect the reality of the new Canada. That means that there is no escape by way of the floor of 100 employees such as with the federal employment equity legislation. There is no such floor. Every broadcast operation—be it cable, radio, television, or whatever—must follow the appropriate methods to make sure that the operations of that station and what goes on the air reflect the reality of the new Canada.

**Mr. Volpe:** Mr. Speaker, one is almost encouraged by the manner, if not the content, of the hon. parliamentary secretary because he has essentially been saying this is a very credible bill. He has pointed out—and I want to start from the last point, to do him credit—that there is an element to the bill that is encouraging, and has been received positively by all members of the House. That is that the CBC be required to reflect the new ethnocultural, multicultural, multi-racial character that is Canada.

**Mrs. Finestone:** In the private sector as well.

**Mr. Volpe:** Yes, in the private sector as well, as my colleague for Mount Royal says. That is a positive step.

I know that the parliamentary secretary will recognize that by the turn of the century, close to 50 per cent of the population will no longer be associated with the initial two founding nations, in the constitutional sense, of the country. I know that there is much debate about that and that is why I say, in a constitutional sense. This is no aside to the groups of aboriginal Canadians who are very much a part of the Canadian character.

We have to move from that point which is acceptable and I thank the parliamentary secretary for having worked hard to ensure that that that be one of the items in Bill C-40.

On the others, I think we have to come back to a word that he used earlier on and that is the question of credibility. The government has its own vacuum of credibility when it comes to many of the issues that the parliamentary secretary is attempting to defend.

When I made reference to the newscast of about 20 minutes prior to my intervention, I have very good reason to believe that that national broadcast was based on information that all of us will share once again tomorrow morning. The retelling those facts as they were projected gives us an opportunity to enrich the debate. If some of those broadcast facts are not correct, then I think that the debate tomorrow will point that out, just as the debate today is pointing out all the vacuums and shortcomings of the government's position on this bill.

One of the things that is important for us to understand is that, if all of the consequences of Bill C-40 come to pass, as we have been given an indication that they are already coming to pass, we will not be favourably served by small private sector corporations that will fill in the vacuums of CBC at a local level, if in fact they will have the potential for so doing. What will those people from Calgary, Corner Brook or Windsor do? They are accustomed to getting a first-class news service, a first-class exchange of the character of Canada. What will they do and to whom will they turn?

One can see that once we remove another Canadian channel, another component, a subsidiary of CBC, from our dial, the vacuum is quickly filled. It is a fact of life, because we live along the American border, that many of the American stations will receive much more attention than they normally would. We will suffer as a result because we will not have the same access to that which is essentially Canadian that we had a mere few hours ago.

**Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq):**

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

• (2310)

[*English*]

I am very pleased to speak on this Bill C-40, the new Broadcasting Act for Canada. I am pleased to participate in this debate, because it has taken the government several years to get to this point.

In 1985 the Ministry of Communications established a task force on broadcasting policy. Its report, also known as the Caplan-Sauvageau Report, was reviewed by the Standing Committee on Culture and Communications. That committee submitted four reports with numerous recommendations to the government for the drafting of the new legislation.

In the last Parliament in June of 1988, the government brought forward Bill C-136, but because a federal election was called Bill C-136 did not get through the Senate. Bill C-40, introduced in October 1989, is virtually identical to Bill C-136 which died on the *Order Paper*.

There is a general consensus that a new Broadcasting Act is needed. The current Broadcasting Act goes back to 1968. Communication technology has outpaced the 1968 act in many ways and in many respects. There is a need to take into account technological developments since 1968 and the present global realities.

This bill, however, is not perfect. It has flaws and deficiencies which my colleague, the hon. member for Mount Royal, has tried to correct by proposing amendments both in the legislative committee which studied this bill and at report stage over the past several weeks.

My colleague from Mount Royal, my party's spokesperson on the communications issue, has spoken ably and eloquently about the concerns we have about Bill C–40. I will touch on some of them briefly.

We are concerned about the possible constitutional challenges to this bill. We are concerned about the government's decision to drop the CBC's mandate to contribute to the development of national unity and to provide for a continuing expression of national identity. The government instead wants the CBC to contribute to national consciousness. That is a cop–out. This government is copping out on Canada.

It is no wonder this country has gone through so much constitutional agony and turmoil under this government. This government does not want the country's national broadcasting agency to contribute to the national unity. Unity encompasses so much more than a simple consciousness. We can be conscious of a lot without being unified.

We regret as well that this bill will not make Radio Canada International, the parliamentary television network, or the CBC northern service part of its mandate. Both the Caplan–Sauvageau report and the Standing Committee on Culture and Communications have recommended that these services be incorporated into new broadcasting legislation. Each of these services is a vital component of our Canadian broadcasting system and incorporating them specifically in this bill would have given them official recognition and a parliamentary confirmation of continuity.

I would like to take a moment to elaborate on the CBC northern service. This service is absolutely vital to the northern communities, some of which have no other available broadcast service. We do not want to see any reduction in the northern service. CBC's northern service covers the Yukon, N.W.T. and the James Bay and Nunavik regions of northern Quebec. The service spans four time zones and more than one–third of the total land mass of Canada.

There are 100,000 northerners living in the northern service region, most of them aboriginal peoples. Cree people constitute 90 per cent of the James Bay population. The Inuit are 85 per cent of the population in the Beaufort, Central, Keewatin and the Baffin regions of the Eastern Arctic, and also of northern Quebec.

In the rest of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon, native people make up about 30 per cent of the population and are the majority in most of the smaller communities in the far north.

CBC northern service radio produces more than 200 hours of programs each week. Half of those hours are produced in seven aboriginal languages: Inuktitut, Slavey, Dogrib, Chipewyan, Inuvialuktun, Gwich'in and Cree.

CBC northern service television produces four weekly program series: *Focus North*, which is a weekly northern current affairs program; *Denendeh K'eh*, a multilingual Dene language program which combines life style features with topical current affairs; *Aqsarniit*, an Inuktitut language current affairs information program based in Iqaluit; and *Maamuitaau*, a Cree language program of features and issues produced by northern service in Montreal.

CBC northern service also assists six northern native broadcasting societies in distributing their programming. One is IBC, the Inuit Broadcasting Corporation for the Eastern Arctic, which just recently had a $600,000 cut to its budget and is now in danger of cutting more programming. It has already cut one regional office in Cambridge Bay in my riding. It is also in danger of cutting a very popular TV series which is produced in Baker Lake and is enjoyed by many, many children in the eastern Arctic because it is in the Inuktitut language.

We have also received support from various people from the north, including the regional director for the government of the Northwest Territories in the Keewatin region. He would like us to make sure that there are no cuts to any Inuktitut programming in the CBC northern service as well as other people from Iqaluit and elsewhere in the eastern Arctic.

These aboriginal communications societies are essential components of the Canadian broadcasting system because they do a lot to promote the cultural identity of the aboriginal people in the far north.

We appreciate the references made to the aboriginal people in the bill, but we fear this government is just paying lip service to aboriginal communications needs. We found two references to aboriginal people in Bill C–40. One reference says that the Canadian broadcasting system should reflect the special place of aboriginal peoples within Canadian society.

The second reference says that programming which reflects the aboriginal culture of Canada should be provided "as resources become available for the purpose". There are two points that I would like to make on this comment: Why has the government refused to include aboriginal languages in this bill? Why is programming reflecting aboriginal culture limited by available resources when throughout the last number of months the emphasis by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and by the Prime Minister of Canada has been that it is doing more for the aboriginal people than has ever been done. On the other hand the government is cutting aboriginal languages programming and also cutting the means of communicating among the aboriginal people.

I would like to comment that the National Aboriginal Communications Society's office had to close because of cutbacks.

• (2320 )

Their *Micmac News* has been shut down. Those are some of the aboriginal means of communications which have been cut by this government.

This clause that I pointed out earlier means nothing in the light of massive cutbacks that the government made to the aboriginal communications in last April's budget.

I repeat: Budgets have been cut. Papers have folded. Offices have closed, and employees have lost their jobs.

The impact of the cuts have been devastating. Why did the government do this? We cannot believe this government is sincere about supporting aboriginal culture with this bill when it is directly responsible for the demise of several aboriginal media, since this bill was introduced in October 1989.

It is a sad but telling fact that the government restored almost all of the funding it cut to women's centres in last April's budget but would not do the same for the Aboriginal Communications Society.

I am glad that the women's centres got their funding back, but women voters outnumber aboriginal voters. The women had an ally in this instance in the Minister responsible for the Status of Women. She intervened.

Aboriginal people, unfortunately, had no such advocate. The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, who should have intervened on our behalf, did nothing. In fact, he said that aboriginal communications had enough funding. Meanwhile, they are closing their offices, newspapers, and programming on radio and television were being cut.

It is because of situations like this that aboriginal people have no faith in the government's words. This government says one thing and does the opposite. This government professes support for the aboriginal people out of one side of its mouth, while on the other side it is cutting and slashing that support.

In conclusion, I can only be cynical about this bill. I am cynical about this government's commitment to aboriginal communications, to the CBC and the CBC's northern service.

We want to see the components of our national broadcasting system protected and enhanced. We want to preserve national unity within the CBC's mandate.

The CBC has for years been a bond which linked us from sea to sea to sea, and we share it like we share no other Canadian Constitution. The railway went east to west. CBC went east, west and north. Removing national unity from the CBC's mandate is a big mistake.

I urge the Government of Canada to rethink its position through this bill, and realize that it helps in a small way in keeping national unity by retaining the promotion of national unity as part of its mandate.

I stress that the national unity component has to be retained because this government does not understand how to promote national unity. Its concept of promoting national unity is by rolling the dice. I do not think that is a very good way of promoting national unity.

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments that my colleague in the Liberal Party has made with regard to the implications of Bill C–40 respecting the native broadcasting programs.

It is this, in particular, that I wanted to go into depth a little more with. Since the Northern Native Access Program was established in 1983, it has been cut back substantially. I should point out that it was created at that time to ensure that northern native people have fair access to the distribution systems to help maintain their languages, cultures and that programming that was relevant to native concerns to ensure that these programs could be produced and provided in the northern communities. When it was originally created, it had a budget of almost $40.3 million over four years. In 1985 and 1986, this was reduced to less than $34 million and in subsequent years was reduced again and again. The 1989-90 funding was frozen at $13.2 million and now in this last hatchet job to the program, it has been cut back to $11.3 million. We have seen a drop from $40 million for the native northern broadcast access program to $11.3 million, an incredible decrease in expenditures for what should be a priority commitment of this government in terms of allowing the expression of a native identity in our north country.

According to the Nielsen task force when it made comment on the program, it stated with regard to the program: "It shows promise as an effective tool for meeting special native broadcast needs and should be continued".

I just want to quote comments made by the Waterways Native Communication Society when they were discussing with the communications committee on a previous bill, Bill C-126, but it reflects on this particular bill. They noted the importance of having a native communications system in the north. They said:, "It is the Waterways' view that there needs to be more aboriginal language productions, programs produced by aboriginal people for aboriginal audiences. Special emphasis must be given to the production of children's programming. The production of more aboriginal language programs should at least begin to counter balance the heavy influx of irrelevant southern programming".

That is a pretty significant statement. In reference to that statement, and also in reference to the drastic budgetary cuts that we have seen take place, I want to ask the member, because I think he has perhaps very particular knowledge of the impact of these budgetary cuts, just how specifically can he see the latest round of cuts and the over-all strategy of sort of economically strangling this northern native broadcasting system? How does he see it impacting with this Bill C-40 legislation?

**Mr. Anawak:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. One of the things that we have often heard in this House through my colleague from Western Arctic and myself as well is the danger of something like 38 aboriginal languages being forgotten because of the assimilation of the English and French languages. I would like to stress that there are a few languages that have a very good chance of surviving, of which Inuktitut, my language, is one. However, that too can be in danger of going if the aboriginal language programming by the CBC is cut any further.

As my hon. colleague pointed out, a cut of something like $28 million in a seven year period does not only reflect that it has gone down to $11.3 million. Over the years the cost of living, the cost of services, everything has gone up but the funding has gone down. As much as we appreciate the hard work that our regional directors in the north in the aboriginal communities have done to ensure aboriginal communications programming within the CBC within their ability to promote aboriginal languages, it is getting extremely difficult to keep going, especially among the communities which are a minority within their province or within their regions. We are very lucky in the eastern Arctic that we are a majority and, unless there are more drastic cuts in the CBC northern programming—which I would dearly hope not—we have a good chance of keeping on with our Inuktituk programming.

• (2330)

As I pointed out earlier, programs that are closely associated with the CBC northern service have been cut because of the government's willingness to cut, through the Secretary of State, the programs that were very popular among the children. I again would like to refer to that children's program and another program where there was a character called *Johnny* in the IBC program. It is in danger of being cut as well.

As I pointed out earlier, there has been offices closed. I, again, thank the hon. member for his question and I would like to stress how important it is that not only should the government not cut any more, it should raise the funding to more acceptable levels within the aboriginal communications societies and communications programs.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Resuming debate. The hon. member for Malpeque.

**Ms. Catherine Callbeck (Malpeque):** I appreciate this opportunity to participate in this very important debate on Bill C–40, an act that removes the CBC's mandate to promote national unity and provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity.

Throughout my lifetime and, I am sure, for generations, dating back to Confederation, Canadians have often posed the questions: What is a Canadian? What is our identity? Are we any different from the British or the Americans? What is there to being a Canadian, and what is it that binds us together?

These are questions on which a thesis could be written and they are questions to which certainly I cannot do justice tonight in this short period of time, but I would like to share with this House some of my thoughts on Canadian identity and why it is essential that we continue to protect and promote it through vehicles such as CBC.

We are certainly unique from all other peoples and all other nations. For instance, there are few Canadians who would accept being considered one and the same with Americans. Now this should not be mistaken as anti–American. It is simply that Canadians consider themselves somehow distinct from our neighbours to the south.

Canadians have a reputation for being a tolerant people, exacting, even welcoming diversity, a people who love the land and the outdoors, a nation that promotes individual freedom yet respects the rule of law.

Some people have said that Canada lacks a common culture or identity because we are too diverse. I disagree with that statement. In fact, I believe that diversity has traditionally been a major component of our identity, while tolerance is our Canadian way of life.

We have heard an analogy of the quilt made of rags. Alone, a rag does not produce warmth or protection from the elements. When each rag is sewn together by a common thread to make up a quilt, what was once a pile of rags is now a quilt capable of keeping a child warm and secure on a cold winter's night. Like that quilt, our country is made up of many diverse cultures. When these cultures are woven together by a common thread, they make up one of the most beautiful countries of the world. However, if one removes that common thread, the quilt will fall apart. If we remove the common threads that hold us together as Canadians, we may well cause our country to fall apart.

CBC is a common thread that links Canadians together across our land. Because of our geography, there are few means at our disposal to link the dairy farmer in Prince Edward Island with the plight of Pacific coast fishermen, the lumberjack in British Columbia to the fishermen in my riding in Malpeque, or the anglophone Albertan oil rig worker with the francophone shopkeeper in Quebec, northern Ontario or New Brunswick.

If it were not for the CBC in my riding of Malpeque, Prince Edward Island, Islanders would be less likely to identify with the concerns and problems of other Canadians. In fact, we would be less likely even to be aware of those problems.

As *The National* news on CBC unites Canadians from coast to coast, in my province of Prince Edward Island the supper hour show *Compass* links Islanders from North Cape to East Point, the farmer from Clyde River to the business person in Charlottetown, the fisherman in Rustico to the tourist operator in Brudenell. What I am really saying here is that it creates a better understanding, a sense of community, where disparity seems to be the order of the day.

The province of Prince Edward Island is completely surrounded by water. Besides the ferry and the airplane, perhaps our most important link to the rest of Canada is the media and the CBC. The CBC provides Islanders with a national and provincial perspective on the issues of the day.

The federal presence in our province has already been diminished by the policies of this government. The Tories have already taken away CFB Summerside. They have closed some of our rural post offices. They have abandoned the CN freight rail services. They have cancelled our direct flight to the nation's capital from Prince Edward Island through Air Canada. They have cut our ferry subsidies which link us to the rest of the country. They have cut transfer payments to the province, reducing the federal commitment to our schools, hospitals, and social services. Now they want to remove from the CBC its mandate to promote national unity, which in this time of intense parochial and regional disparity may have the effect of further isolating Islanders from the rest of the country.

This government which has jeopardized the future of our country through its leader's roll the dice approach to national unity now wants to further put at risk our ability to come together as Canadians. The approach that this government has taken with this legislation is indicative of the government's over-all approach to national unity and its abdication of responsibility and leadership. Removing the promotion of national unity from CBC's mandate is not required, is not desired, and its timing could not be worse.

I am proud tonight to say that the Liberal Party is opposed to removing CBC's mandate to promote national unity. I thank you for the opportunity to stand in my place tonight to state my views on the ramifications that Bill C-40 may have for the people of Prince Edward Island and for all Canadians.

• (2340)

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I am rising to speak on third reading of this bill respecting broadcasting and to express my concern about this bill, as I did very briefly last evening at report stage.

In my view this is a most ill-conceived measure. We recognize in our party that the bill contains some good points. We needed a new Broadcasting Act in Canada, and this bill provides some assistance in that regard. However, there are serious shortcomings in the bill that we as an opposition, and particularly the hon. member for Mount Royal, has sought to correct by moving numerous amendments to this bill.

Today we witnessed the spectacle of the government voting down every one of those amendments. None was agreed to today; they were all voted down. Only amendments to this bill proposed by the government were accepted. I think I am correct in saying that, in every case. I find that a shocking contempt of Parliament, a shocking abuse of the rights of members to participate and discuss government measures and to try to correct them.

Certainly there is lots to correct in this bill. Even the parliamentary secretary, who I know missed that because he was very busy with other matters, would agree with me that this was a very high-handed approach on the part of his minister. Throughout the debate at the report stage, the minister refused to participate in the discussions, refused to propose the government's amendments by way of explanation to the House, and refused to comment on the very reasoned statements and speeches made by members on this side of the House. I think it showed a contempt of Parliament that we have not witnessed in this House for many years, and I am disappointed that the government took that approach.

Another indication of that contempt, I submit, is the requirement that we be sitting here at this hour of the night discussing this bill. The rules for parliamentary debate are pretty clear that the House normally adjourns at six o'clock. We were unable to obtain agreement from the government that a reasonable amount of time, that is more than one day, would be allowed for third reading debate on this bill. It was made clear that if we could not make such an arrangement time allocation would be used, and so we agreed to it.

As a measure to allow members on this side who wanted to express their concerns to participate in the debate, we had a motion passed yesterday. The government said: "We will agree to allow you to sit after six o'clock. You can debate this bill to your heart's content, but there will be terms".

What were the terms? Let us just look at the little motion passed in this House yesterday afternoon by unanimous consent. In part it read:

> That on Tuesday, December 4, 1990, the House continue to sit beyond the ordinary hour of daily adjournment, with quorum calls and dilatory motions not receivable during such period of continued sitting—

**Mr. MacWilliam:** They wanted to get it out of the way.

**Mr. Milliken:** What does that mean? What does it mean that there will be no quorum calls or dilatory motions? What it means is that the government does not have to ensure that there are 20 members in this House to keep the House sitting. That is what it means. That is why there is almost no one here. It also means that government members can all go home and go to bed, because they are not interested in participating in the debate. There has only been a handful of them participating tonight. I congratulate the parliamentary secretary for his efforts in that regard. He is the last one here. I congratulate him for participating, and I am glad he did, but his colleagues might have and they chose not to do so.

The reason they chose not to do so was that they did not want to sit here and listen to the criticisms of this bill, which this opposition is entitled to bring forward and raise in this House. Members of the government have fled because they do not want to listen to those criticisms. I submit again that that displays an enormous contempt of this institution, an enormous Tory arrogance of the worst kind.

They do not want to listen to criticisms. They say: "What we have proposed is perfect or as close to it as we are going to get, and no one in Canada can tell us that this could be improved in a way that we have to listen to or that we will make any changes". That is exactly what has happened.

The hon. member for Mount Royal has tried to make changes and even members of the New Democratic Party have tried to make changes. We have proposed amendments to this bill, and the government does not even want to sit and listen to the discussion. The government says: "You people can talk until nine o'clock tomorrow morning, all night if you want, but we are not going to be here and listen to you. You cannot move a dilatory motion, so there are no naughty tricks you can play on us. There are no quorum calls, so our members go home and go to bed", as they have done, "nothing can happen that will upset the House. It will continue to sit and we will not lose our bill".

That, Mr. Speaker, is contempt of Parliament. It is a disgrace. It is unfortunate that the opposition, in order to get its day in court on this bill has to agree to those kinds of terms and conditions to keep the government happy, to allow us to have a fair and reasoned debate.

I want to turn to my concerns about the changes this bill proposes to the CBC, particularly to the division of the CBC into two parts, the English wing and the French wing. That is exactly what the government has proposed in this iniquitous legislation.

This government is the architect of disunity in Canada. Never ever, since the conscription crisis in 1917 has there been so much discord and disharmony in Canada as we have today. The sole reason for that discord and disharmony is the actions of the Prime Minister and his cabinet who are incompetent, who are divisive, who have no idea how to govern this country, and who, since June, have been sitting here twiddling their thumbs, wondering, "What do we now?". They have no more sense of direction than the man in the moon.

**Mr. MacWilliam:** The roll of the dice.

**Mr. Milliken:** The roll of the dice signifies their policy. They divide the country. They pit region against region. They are tearing apart the federal government. They will give anything to the provinces. They will sell us all to the United States. They have done it all. They have done all of it in the name of trying to govern the country. They say they are a government. I say they are a disgrace. They should resign immediately because they are such a disgraceful government.

**Mr. Edwards:** Are you having trouble keeping a straight face?

**Mr. Milliken:** I have no trouble keeping a straight face on that one. The parliamentary secretary thinks this is a joke. This government is a disgrace.

As I say, the amazing thing was to listen to the Prime Minister in Question Period yesterday. I could quote him, Mr. Speaker, but I will not.

**Mr. Edwards:** Please do.

**Mr. Milliken:** He was trying to blame Jean Chrétien, the leader of the Liberal Party for discord in Canada. Of all the outrageous claims! Everyone else is to blame except the Prime Minister. It was the Prime Minister who weakened this country. It was the Prime Minister who started dismantling the federal government.

Let us go through the list of organs of the state that have been dismantled under this government. VIA Rail, slashed and cut. It was one of the first national enterprises we ever had in Canada.

**Mr. Edwards:** In 1977.

**Mr. Milliken:** 1997, my foot. VIA Rail was established by Sir John A. Macdonald, the Father of Confederation. It was built as a term of Confederation. VIA Rail has been slashed and cut by this government in a way that it has never been slashed and cut before.

Petro–Canada is now being sold. We have the bill before this House. It will be back here shortly, if it is not now. Fire sale prices for selling off the national assets of Canada for which Canadians paid millions of dollars.

Air Canada. Canada's national airline that provided essential transportation services across this country—sold off. The Post Office. Rural closures right across the country—slash, slash, slash, cut out rural services for Canadians. It created two classes of Canadians, those who in live in urban municipalities with door-to-door delivery and those who deal with supermailboxes because they live in new subdivisions; and those in rural Canada who had their service slashed and cut. That is what this government is doing.

**Mr. MacWilliam:** That's harmonization.

**Mr. Milliken:** The hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap says it is harmonization. It may be, but it creates a great deal of disharmony in the country. I am sure he would agree that that is so.

Then we have the free trade agreement where everything is sold to the United States. Give away our energy resources. Give everything away. I could go through that at length, Mr. Speaker, but I will not—

**Mrs. Finestone:** Even our water.

**Mr. Milliken:** Even our water, as the hon. member for Mount Royal says, is being given away.

Then we have the Prime Minister giving away the CBC by slashing and cutting. We heard about the cuts tonight. Ten stations across the country about to be closed and the parliamentary secretary says that these are not cuts. He says the government is giving.

I am afraid that his trip abroad has deranged him. He must have got something mixed up because when we hear these rumours on the radio, on the CBC particularly, they invariably turn out to be true, it seems to me.

I have hardly ever heard a CBC news account of rumours and stories about government cuts and slashes that have not turned out to be true. Usually they are on the light side. Usually the cuts are worse than were proposed in the story. If we on this side have been wrong in talking about the cuts tonight, we will hear about it in the morning. I hope that the parliamentary secretary will stand up and apologize to the House tomorrow if, in fact, all these cuts and slashes that have been announced tonight happen. I look forward to hearing him eat his words if that is the case.

• (2350)

Finally, if that list of destruction of federal government programs is not enough, then we can turn to the Prime Minister's roll of the dice for Canadians last summer. Talk about hypocrisy, talk about blaming the leader of the Liberal Party, who is not even a member of Parliament at the moment, for the problems that Canada faced last June.

The Prime Minister is the one who had the responsibility to lead this country, but he insisted on raising the stakes. Instead of saying yes, there may be a problem with the Meech Lake Accord we have negotiated, we may have to try and do something else, he said, it is sign or else. That was his message. That is what drove the wedge between the premiers. That is what so sowed disunity in Canadians hearts, because they said they are being forced into a take it or leave it proposition in respect of their Constitution and they did not like it. Canadians from coast to coast were up in arms about it and the Prime Minister kept denying it. He said everybody supports this.

There was serious disunity on the issue, but the facts never bothered our Prime Minister. He says, "I am not bothered by the facts, I don't care what Canadians think. All I care is that I got the votes from the premiers, they all signed, they have to then follow through and it is sign or else, it is sign or else!" He said it for weeks and weeks and weeks, right up until the last minute and then he did his roll of the dice and it did not work.

Now he is saying the reason it did not work is because of Jean Chrétien. What did he do, weight the dice? What did he do, jump on the dice when they were in mid-air? Did he catch them and throw them another way? What utter rubbish! Yet the Prime Minister has the nerve to stand in this House, of all places, and make that kind of palpable nonsense of a statement.

The parliamentary secretary says it is quite true. I think he needs his head examined, because I do not think there is another reasonable person in this room who thinks that that is quite true and I ask him to find one. Find another person in this room who agrees that the Prime Minister's statement is true. The hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap does not think so. The hon. member for Mount Royal does not think so. I am sure that the Speaker, learned as he is, does not think so. So who does? No one else thinks so. The parliamentary secretary is outnumbered and outvoted on that one.

In my submission, the government is absolutely incapable of achieving or working toward national unity in Canada. This bill is just another example of its abject failure in that regard. What the government has done by this bill is say that it is not going to even try to pull Canada together. It is not going to even try to keep the national broadcasting system of Canada as a national institution. It is going to divide it in half along linguistic lines, just what Canada needs. Instead of trying to create a bilingual, bicultural country that operates as a national unit, it is going to divide the CBC so that one group can speak one language and listen to broadcasts in one language and the other can do the other. It will simply tailor the broadcasting systems to suit the audiences and forget the idea of a national audience of national appeal, of a national system, of a system that tries in some small measure to unite the two language groups so that we share the common culture, we share some common values, we share some of the advantages of having two languages and two cultures operating in a country. I am not meaning to exclude any others by that statement.

This government is incapable of that kind of vision. It is incapable of that kind of understanding of Canada, if you like, and it has been an understanding that has been ingrained in thousands of Canadians for all of my lifetime. I have no trouble with the concept. I think it is a great concept. I think it is a great country we live in, but this government seems hell bent on breaking it up. Their whole attitude is cut services, break the federal government down so that Canada's constituent parts can go and do their own thing, weaken the ties that bind us from east to west, weaken the national ties that help hold us together through things like the CBC and let every province just go off and do its own thing, do it with the United States so everything will be north and south, forget about the east-west tie, make all trade deals south of the border and do not worry about trading with the other provinces. We are not concerned about a lack of free trade between the provinces is this government's approach. Why should it care? Because it is quite prepared to have us do all our trade with the United States, that is why.

It is quite prepared to say: "Well, if Americans come in and buy up all of Canada that is too bad for Canadians. It is the best thing because it is the marketplace at work". That is its approach.

It is not the right approach. It is not the way Liberal governments have done it and they have been in power for most of this century and have done an extremely good job of governing Canada.

What we have had since 1984 is the destruction of the fabric of Canada that has been built up through generations of governments in the past. The hon. member who is here must know that the CBC was, after all, a creation of a Conservative government, one of the few on the list. Nevertheless, it is there.

**Mr. Edwards:** Unemployment insurance.

**Mr. Milliken:** The hon. member says unemployment insurance. I do not think he is right in that. I think he will find that unemployment insurance was in fact done by a Liberal government. My recollection is that the amendment to the British North America Act as it was at the time which made unemployment insurance possible for the federal government was in fact passed at Westminster as a result of a request from this Parliament when it was under the control of the Liberal government. I believe it was in 1949. I may be wrong in my date. It was certainly post-war and it certainly was not a Conservative government. The first one after the war in my recollection was in 1957, and we all know what a disaster that government was. It was the worst one we have had in Canada before this one.

**Mr. MacWilliam:** Almost as bad as this one.

**Mr. Milliken:** Almost as bad as this one. To look at it from the other perspective, as the hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap has so ably put it. It is almost as bad as this one.

**Mrs. Finestone:** He doesn't agree.

**Mr. Milliken:** The hon. parliamentary secretary looks as though he does not agree. Probably the realization has just hit him as to how bad this government is. I am glad he has been sitting and paying such close attention to my speech so that message can sink in.

Mr. Speaker, I think my pleas in this case are falling on deaf ears. I would like to say "no ears" but the parliamentary secretary is here and I appreciate that. But I am afraid that even he will not be able to convince the minister that urgent changes are needed to this bill if it is going to be acceptable.

We can only hope that when the bill gets to the other place, if and when it passes on the vote tomorrow—and perhaps some of his colleagues will see the folly of their ways and vote with us to defeat it—we can hope there will be significant changes made by the other place and the bill will come back here and we can adopt those changes.

Sober second thought, Mr. Speaker, seems to work in some cases and possibly, although this bill has been before this House since what, March?

**Mrs. Finestone:** March 19.

**Mr. Milliken:** You would have thought that the government might have drawn a sober breath some time between March and now and realized that this bill needed change and might have adopted some of the amendments we proposed, but it has not worked.

Perhaps in the other place reason will prevail and we will see some significant changes to get rid of the more odious provisions in this bill, particularly the one that, in my submission, will lead to further division and discord in Canada by dividing the CBC effectively into two corporations. I submit that is not in the best interests of Canadian unity. It is not in the best interests of Canada. It is not in the best interests of the CBC, and it is definitely not in the best interests of a government which believes that Canada is worth saving as a single entity.

**Mr. Jim Edwards (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know quite where to begin but I am going to try to respond to some of the points my hon. friend from Kingston and the Islands has made.

It was his predecessor from that constituency who essentially was the architect of the bill that is now before us, and a wise and sage minister she was.

It is not proposed that the CBC be divided into two parts, and I think the hon. member knows it. The CBC is proposed to have two standing committees of its one board of directors, in each of which committee would participate the president and the chairman, in order to bridge the two solitudes in this country. That is the sole and only purpose of that particular proposal in the bill.

I did not say that cuts would not be happening to the CBC tomorrow. What I did say is that the government was not imposing any cuts on the CBC. In fact the government would be helping the CBC financially in the dilemma that it is now confronting.

On the question of national unity we heard again, Mr. Speaker, the line tonight that he or she who opposes the idea of liberal and socialist interventionism and statism is somehow not patriotic. That, Sir, is just unworthy of response. It is contemptuous of millions and millions of Canadians who have shucked off the idea of statism and intervention and say: "Let us stand on our own two feet in the world" and, yes, in partnership with the United States if we choose but not if we choose not.

• (0000)

Turning to the question having to do with the conduct of this bill through its various stages in our Parliament, I will not go through the history of it again because I have done so already tonight. However, to have it proposed to us that it is a shocking contempt of Parliament to allocate seven hours to third reading of this very significant bill is an unfair accusation. This bill, in the mother of Parliaments, would have had two or three hours maximum, but this is not the mother of Parliaments. This is a Parliament where the opposition has the maximum opportunity to make its point, and I think that nourishes democracy.

I find it rather strange and somehow shocking and disappointing that the hon. member who holds a responsible position within his party and who is something of an expert in the rules of Parliament has abused the terms of an agreement which his party entered into. He is abusing the very terms of an agreement which his party entered into. He suggested that the government has fled because it did not want to hear the arguments of the opposition.

I have already gone on record tonight as having said that I responded to every one of the opposition amendments fully. I explained and defended fully every one of the government amendments in the 11 hours that we spent going through detailed clause by clause study of this bill. Many of those amendments, in fact the vast majority of them, were withdrawn after that agonizing process had been gone through so that they could be reintroduced at report stage to tie up the business of the House further, after the issues had been thoroughly aired.

We have had this described by the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands as somehow constituting Tory arrogance, this allocation of so much quite properly to the study of a bill and the opportunity for the opposition to have its views made known on the bill and its provisions.

I knew the Tory great-uncle of this man. He would be spinning in his grave to hear history being rewritten and redescribed as it is being described here today. That distinguished great-uncle of the member for Kingston and the Islands married a lovely lady who remains my constituent in her late nineties. She is the daughter of the founding premier of the province of Alberta, a Liberal premier who later saw the error of his ways and became a distinguished Conservative.

**Mr. Milliken:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the parliamentary secretary's sentiments in respect of my relatives who live in his riding, but I assure the House that there will be no spinning in any graves except for the misconceptions that the parliamentary secretary is spreading.

Let us turn to one of the points. I do not want to deal with all of them. My arguments stand firmly on their own two feet.

**Mr. Edwards:** You cannot remember them.

**Mr. Milliken:** There is that difficulty, but never mind that. The fact is that the parliamentary secretary suggested in respect of the committee that he spent 11 hours slugging it out, as I admit he did. He worked. There is no question that when the parliamentary secretary is here he works. He worked away in this committee, slugging it out for 11 hours discussing these amendments. That may be so, but the fact is that those hours were spent when the committee was in clause by clause study. From what the hon. member for Mount Royal has indicated to me, that was in closed session.

**Mr. Edwards:** No, it was open.

**Mr. Milliken:** It was open but, as the hon. member knows, very few people attend those sittings. The committee hearings were not televised. Debate on report stage of this bill was on national television, so Canadians could see what the government was planning to do to the CBC. They could see what the government was planning to do by changing the rules under the Broadcast Act. That was the purpose of bringing the amendments in the House of Commons, so Canadians could see what was going on and make a public display of the despicable way the government is acting in respect of this bill and in respect of the CBC. That is why it was done this way and surely the parliamentary secretary knows that.

Yet, he says that seven hours of debate on third reading is generous. Rubbish, that is generous. This government, since this Parliament began, has taken it into its head—and the government House leader is largely responsible for this—that it somehow can limit debate to whatever it thinks is appropriate.

We can hear the government House leader say: "I think more than one day on that bill is too long." That is his view, but that is not our view. It was not our view when we were in government.

We gave the hon. members opposite all kinds of time when this party was in government. I have read *Hansard* where debates went on for weeks and weeks and weeks.

The hon. member for Saint-Denis is here. He can testify as to how many weeks the Conservative Party, when it was in opposition, dragged out debates—weeks and weeks.

The hon. parliamentary secretary thinks that seven hours is excessive. He said they would not allow seven hours in the U.K. Big deal. I do not care whether they allow seven hours in the U.K. As I said, this is not the United Kingdom. This is Canada and the hon. member should learn the difference. He cannot always cite the other for examples of how it works. The United Kingdom's parliament is a unitary parliament. There are no provinces. There is no provincial legislature. It passes all the legislation that we do in all legislatures and here for the whole U.K. It is a different kettle of fish. It is a different ball game and the hon. member should realize that.

The second point I wanted to make was that he suggested that somehow I was critical—I have forgotten his words—and that I did not agree with the agreement we had already agreed to.

I am saying we agreed to it because the choice was to have a two or three hour debate or have one that went on into the night. That is why I criticized it and I was very careful to criticize it on that basis. I am not being critical because we got the time or because we agreed to take the time. I am being critical because what we are doing to get the time is saying: "We will suspend all the normal rules and you guys do not have to stay around and listen. We just want to have our day in court and have our chat."

The attitude of the government is: "As long as you just want to talk, we will let you go. But if we have to sit here and keep order in the House and maintain an interest in the debate, then we do not want any part of it and we will not agree." That is the approach of the government, and I am saying that is a bad approach and it shows arrogance, Tory arrogance, pure and simple. It is arrogant, with respect, Mr. Speaker. It is arrogant.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** For only one minute, the hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap.

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, in listening to the debate tonight and watching the debates with regard to Bill C–40 take place over the last number of months, it is all becoming very clear what the government strategy has been.

We were debating Bill C–40 back in the spring when suddenly it was pulled. It was pulled when the government went into the Meech Lake crisis. I think it was pulled very specifically because the government did not want to be criticized for doing exactly what it is doing, undermining the national unity clause with this legislation.

Suddenly, it went silent and remained silent until the dust settled, until Meech was settled, and until Oka was over. Then, it brought it back in, only to pull it again and to bring it back in a third time. Suddenly, there is such a rush for debate that we had to cram it all into a few days.

The government sat absolutely silent during that debate yesterday. Not even the minister would stand up and defend the amendments and defend the legislation. We got absolute silence. Only tonight did we get the parliamentary secretary commenting, to his credit.

What has been the strategy here? What is the hurry for this sudden rush to put this bill through? It became clear tonight with the recognition of the fact that we have 1,200 people being laid off in the near future with the cuts to CBC, the cuts that had been instituted by the government. That was the strategy. They wanted to ram this legislation through to get it out of the House, to be dispensed with, so that when the cuts came down, when the axe fell, it was already finished.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Thirty seconds, the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

**Mr. Milliken:** Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap. There was an attempt by the government to hold this legislation back last June when it knew that it would be disruptive to national unity. The parliamentary secretary knows that was the reason it was held up last June.

The attempt was to jam this thing through tonight before these cuts got out. The government knew the cuts were coming. It may be that it was the CBC that did the cuts, not the government, but the only reason the CBC did them was because the government reduced the money it had available. It is as simple as that, and that is what has gone on. For the parliamentary secretary to suggest otherwise is palpable nonsense.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Resuming debate? Since no other hon. member wishes to rise, pursuant to the order at adopted on Monday, December 3rd, 1990, the division on all necessary question to dispose of third reading of Bill C–40 is deemed to have been deferred until 3 p.m., Wednesday, December 5, 1990.

Before I conclude, I wish to thank all the support staff who have worked very hard until this late hour.

**Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint–Denis):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The hon. member for Saint–Denis rises on a point of order.

**Mr. Prud'homme:** Mr. Speaker, I simply wish, at this late hour, to thank you for chairing so patiently this very long debate.

**Mr. Milliken:** Hear, hear!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** It now being 12 minutes past midnight, pursuant to the order adopted on Monday, December 3rd, 1990, the House adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 00.12 a.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Wednesday, December 5, 1990**

The House met at 2 p.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*English*]

### CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, for six long years the government has taken a meat cleaver to Canada's national institutions. It has slashed and hacked away indiscriminately at passenger rail service, health care services, old age pensions, Air Canada, youth employment programs, and the unemployment insurance program. Now it is the CBC that is on the chopping block.

Canadians are learning today that the CBC is closing as many as 10 of its regional TV stations, including a station in Sydney, Nova Scotia, that serves my entire riding, and a French language station outside Quebec, both of which are building blocks of national unity. As many as 2,000 jobs may be cut.

Surely the federal government has a duty and an obligation to enhance the quality of Canadian life and not a licence to dismantle those institutions that bind Canadians together. The people of Canada will remember this government for years and years, the black days of this government and the butcher from Baie Comeau.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Ms. Barbara Greene (Don Valley North):** Mr. Speaker, the issue of male violence against women is the foremost and most urgent issue confronting women in our society.

In Metro Toronto from 1984 to 1989, there has been a 48.4 per cent increase in violent crime and a 62.4 per cent increase in family violence. Weapons are now used in 45.7 per cent of domestic cases, compared to 30.9 per cent in 1985. To November 30 of this year, there have been 513 family violence incidents involving firearms, compared to 465 for the whole year of 1989.

Are large urban centres unique? No. StatsCan reports that in communities with a population of 5,000 or less, the homicide rate for the last 10 years was 3.1 per 100,000, as compared to 3.14 in communities of 500,000 or more.

Security of person is a fundamental human right denied to most women in our society everywhere.

* * *

### UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

**Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie):** Mr. Speaker, for 18 weeks several thousand families in my community have been trying to eke out an existence on $100 a week or less. We have failed to reduce the callback threshold so that employees will be eligible for unemployment insurance benefits.

The mood of steelworkers has gone from frustration to desperation to anger. These people are victims of an arbitrary, unjust, inconsistent unemployment insurance program which defies interpretation by even the federal courts of the country.

We ask Algoma to call back 1,870 people as soon as possible. We ask the local UI office to have staff available for the extra workload. We ask the minister to expedite the process, as she indicated to me the other day that she would. Perhaps she could delete the waiting period so that these families in Sault Ste. Marie can enjoy Christmas just like the rest of Canadians.

[*Translation*]

## COMMENTS MADE BY MR. LAWRENCE WILSON

**Mr. Fernand Jourdenais (La Prairie):** Mr. Speaker, I have always said there were smart people in the Liberal Party. Mr. Lawrence Wilson just confirmed this today in the *Journal de Montréal*. Chrétien's chief party organizer feels more comfortable with the ideas of Brian Mulroney. Last Sunday, Mr. Wilson was seen at the Conservative Party brunch, and this is what he said: "I like what I hear. I like the direction Brian Mulroney is taking."

Mr. Wilson also said that Mr. Chrétien was afraid to run in Quebec. He also objects to the Liberal leader's stand on the GST, and I will quote what he said: "I am in favour of the GST; Mr. Chrétien is against the GST, and I don't like the way the Liberal senators are behaving under the leadership of Mr. Chrétien."

Bravo, Mr. Wilson! Welcome to the Conservative Party. Again, I am sure the Liberals will finally get the message. Welcome to the Conservative Party, next to my leader, Brian Mulroney!

* * *

[*English*]

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Guy H. Arseneault (Restigouche—Chaleur):** Mr. Speaker, as we are all aware, the CBC is going to announce later this hour the most severe budget cuts in its history.

[*Translation*]

One employee out of ten will be out of a job, which means a total of 1,200 jobs lost. That is what this government has done, by forcing the CBC to cut its budget by more than $100 million.

The CBC is the latest victim of Tory attacks against our national institutions.

This action by the government has caused 10 regional television stations to be closed, four of which are in the Atlantic region.

[*English*]

These cuts will hinder national unity, prevent the CBC from operating effectively, and strangle the future development of the corporation. This is yet another blatant attempt by the Conservative government to manipulate and censor the media outlets in the nation.

It is also about time the national media wakes up and calls off the honeymoon with the Conservative government, as the Canadian people already have.

* * *

## THE LEADER OF THE NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

**Mr. John A. MacDougall (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment today about leadership.

The majority of Canadians are calling for lower interest rates. The NDP leader says she wants lower interest rates.

The majority of Canadians wish to see the GST cancelled. The NDP leader called for the GST to be cancelled.

The majority of Canadians want more money spent on the environment. The NDP leader wants more money spent on the environment.

The member for Yukon states she would like leadership, but she is prepared only to show Canadians leadership by followship. Like a hyper pup chasing its own tail, the NDP leader gets herself dizzy just by thinking about leadership.

* * *

## WORLD UNIVERSITY SERVICE OF CANADA

**Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my regret at the collapse of the World University Service of Canada and at the government's policy on it. It is not enough for the government to pay for the funeral. The World University Service of Canada needs to be sustained and kept going.

• (1410 )

However much bad luck of management is responsible for the problem, there is no suggestion of wrongdoing by WUSC or anything other than its long-standing dedication to service to humanity in a great Canadian tradition. That service has benefited both people abroad and

thousands of Canadians, often young Canadians whose commitment to service is validated.

I was a WUSC student myself when I was at the University of Toronto and so were many others in the House, including my seat-mate, the hon. member for Papineau. Nothing I did in school shaped my future as much as my WUSC time in West Africa.

It is more than an error, it is absurd for the government to allow WUSC to go under, and it is certainly not too late for the government to reverse its stand.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## NEW REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGIES

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert):** Mr. Speaker, on November 26, Dr. John Stephens appeared before the Royal Commission on New Reproductive Technologies. The services offered by Dr. Stephens consist in identifying the sex of the fetus. Unfortunately, some of his patients have used his expertise to abort female fetuses.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Stephens has decided to take advantage of the perception among some cultural communities that a male child is preferable to a female child. In a country like ours, where women are supposed to be equal to men, it is unacceptable that such practices should be tolerated, and I strongly condemn this application of a medical technique that equates the life of a woman with that of an animal.

* * *

[*English*]

## CORPORATION TAXATION

**Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, it is time once again for the corporate welfare bum of the week award.

This week's nominees are Empire Life Insurance, which paid no taxes in 1989 and made $8 million in profits, plus received $500,000 in government hand-outs; Insurance Corporation of B.C., which in 1989 paid zero tax with a profit of $90.1 million; and the third nominee is Sovereign Life Insurance Company, which in 1989 made $6.5 million in profits, plus received $500,000 in government hand-outs.

The envelope, please.

The winner is the Insurance Corporation of B.C.

Congratulations to all our life insurance nominees for this unrivalled longevity as the most successful tax busters. They are shining examples of how to live long, prosperous, and tax-free corporate lives.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## NATIONAL HOCKEY LEAGUE

**Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the NHL Board of Governors will select which North American city will receive an NHL franchise.

On any given weekend, I can visit hockey arenas on Hamilton Mountain and find dozens of young aspiring Wayne Gretzkys honing their hockey skills.

If there is any truly Canadian symbol, it is the sport of hockey. For these reasons, I urge the NHL board of governors to select a Canadian city as the new home of the NHL team. What Canadian city? Well, Hamilton, of course.

As chair of the Hamilton Wentworth regional caucus, I am pleased to inform the House that Hamilton's was the only bid to meet virtually every criteria set out by the NHL. The recently built Copps Coliseum seats 17,000 people. The level of enthusiasm in our city is so great that in a 72-hour period organizers sold over 13,000 season tickets.

An NHL franchise would relieve some of the pressure that the people of Hamilton are currently feeling under this made-in-Canada recession. Members of the city council estimate that a franchise would create over 200 jobs and bring $79 million into our local economy.

I call on the Prime Minister to publicly announce his support for a new Canadian NHL franchise.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**Mr. Clément Couture (Saint-Jean):** Mr. Speaker, the meeting of the Committee on Industry, Science and Technology, Regional and Northern Development held yesterday morning had been scheduled several days ago. The committee had to cancel its meetings twice last week because opposition members were absent. Yesterday morning, none of the opposition members were present at the specified time, which was 9 a.m. All

government members were present. Finally, forty minutes later, one of the opposition members had the decency to report to the committee.

Mr. Speaker, this committee was going through a very important phase because it had to finalize its report and submit it to the House. This is one more example of the careless attitude of the opposition.

* * *

[*English*]

### FISHERIES

**Hon. Roger C. Simmons (Burin—St. George's):** Mr. Speaker, last week the Minister of Fisheries confirmed to the House for the first time that in Atlantic Canada there would be a quota assigned to the inshore fishery. That is going to affect adversely tens of thousands of people in Quebec in particular, as well as in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. On top of that we have the Dunn report which calls for further cuts in northern cod. In short, we have a fisheries in absolute crisis, the inshore fishery. We have a minister who is not lifting a finger. I never thought I would have to say this, but he is not lifting a single finger. People out there are in agony. They are hurting. They are looking to him and to the government for some help in this crisis situation, and he is basically thumbing his nose at them. That is sad. It is uncalled for.

I ask him to return to his earlier attitude when he was a freshly-minted minister and do something for those people who are looking to him at this particular time.

* * *

[*Translation*]

### AIR TRANSPORT

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, Transport Canada increased the operating hours of the regional control tower at Val-d'Or in March 1989 in response to complaints from the airlines, but today, public servants in Ottawa and the Canadian government prefer a reduction in services and a commensurate reduction in wage costs.

From now on, the Val-d'Or control tower will start operations at eight o'clock, local time, to avoid overtime. The tower will close Saturday evening at 6.15, always in order to save money, with no regard for quality of service.

* * *

### ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

**Mrs. Carole Jacques (Mercier):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to congratulate the Solicitor General of Canada on his handling of the Maxime Gariépy case. As you know, two days ago, the Solicitor General signed Maxime's transfer to Canada. It is now up to the U.S. authorities to approve Maxime's transfer to our country.

Mr. Speaker, even when members do not rise in the House, it does not mean they are not doing a good job. We have the necessary tools to put pressure on ministers and senior officials, and I am thinking of our regional, national and provincial caucuses. In addition, the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General, of which I am a member, has discussed Maxime's case. So, chin up, Maxime, and don't despair. Soon you will be back in Canada!

---

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

### CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Today Canadians were shocked to learn that the CBC is shutting down stations and services in the Atlantic, Ontario, Quebec and the west, including places like Windsor, Ontario, that have no other Canadian broadcasting station. This is part of this government's effort, its campaign to dismantle vital national institutions and unravel the very fabric of this country.

The Prime Minister goes around making speeches about national unity. He spends millions of dollars setting up committees on national unity all over the place. When he has a chance to do something tangible about it, he goes in the opposition direction.

If the Prime Minister believes in the unity of this country, will his government give the CBC today the money required to maintain these vital services it is cutting, or is he saying to the people of Matane, Windsor and Sydney that to him they are not part of Canada? If so, I say to the Prime Minister that they and other

Canadians will never, ever accept this from him and his government.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is confusing the issue, as he so often does in most of his statements.

In a few minutes, the President of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation will announce a restructuring of the Corporation in order to cover a shortfall caused by a drop in advertising revenue and additional costs due to inflation, and also by operating costs incurred through exhaustive and unscheduled coverage of major international events and national crises.

I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that the Government of Canada did not make any new cuts in the CBC's budget.

[*English*]

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Communications talks of restructuring. It is not the restructuring of the CBC, it is the dismembering of the CBC, and this is being done because of this government. It is this government that told the CBC to cut $140 million from its budget in three years. It is this government that approved the corporate plan of the CBC. And, Mr. Speaker, this morning the president of the CBC met privately with the Conservative caucus and cabinet, which undoubtedly approved those cuts, just like they approved the slashing of VIA Rail, another vital national institution. I ask the Prime Minister again will he, today, provide the funding to the CBC to keep these services going or is he saying that what is going on is just a step toward the privatization of the CBC and the ending of it as a vital national institution?

• (1420)

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, the leader of the opposition mentioned that the President of the CBC met with government members. I think that the President of the CBC is willing to meet all parliamentarians, collectively or individually, to explain CBC's policy and its managerial responsibility. He would be honored and pleased to meet the leader of the opposition or members of the Liberal Party.

The leader of the opposition also suggested that the government made unwarranted cuts in the CBC. Quite the contrary, Mr. Speaker! In 1988–1989 for instance, the government provided the corporation with extra funding, some $65 million, for its rebroadcasting station project in Toronto. In 1988–1989, the CBC received another $130 million or so from the government for its broadcasting policy.

These new funds, Mr. Speaker, combined with the regular increases for salaries and other requirements, will add up to over $300 million for the next five years. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government would not do that were it not confident of the CBC. On the contrary, the government reaffirmed repeatedly its confidence in the CBC and will keep doing just that.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the Canadian people will have no confidence in the government in view of the cuts it ordered.

This government recently struck a blow to communities like Matane, Rimouski and Sept-Îles when it closed down their television stations. If it is really concerned with the well-being of these communities, then why not provide the funding required to allow the stations to survive? Is the Prime Minister serious when he says he wants to secure the future of these communities and that of the whole country?

[*English*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I think that the Leader of the Opposition is totally wrong. First of all, this government, year after year, had a greater percentage of augmentation for the CBC than for the general government as a whole. So when the Leader of the Opposition says that the government has been unfair to the CBC, I think this is false.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, the bill before this House states, and I quote, that "the programming provided by the Corporation should be in English and in French, reflecting the different needs and circumstances of each official language community, including the particular needs and circumstances of En-

glish and French linguistic minorities". In that regard, it will become a real joke if this legislation is passed.

Here is the question I would like to ask the Prime Minister: Does the government intend to withdraw the bill respecting bradcasting until such time as the conflicting mandates have been sorted out? Or is the government prepared to provide sufficient funding to the radio and television networks of the CBC?

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, every Canadian community will continue to be served by a CBC television station. The budget cuts will not affect the range of the broadcasting services. The Corporation will remain, as always, the mouthpiece by excellence of the Canadian people. In 1990, it is producing better programs directed to larger audiences than it did six years ago, when the Liberal Party was in power.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Anything to not take responsibility for their actions, that is this government's approach to leadership.

As the cuts announced today by the CBC make it impossible for this vital national public broadcaster to fulfil its legal mandate toward the special needs of the region as spelled out in the new broadcasting act scheduled to be imposed today, all we are now going to get is the voice of English from Toronto—

[*Translation*]

—and the voice of Quebec, of French, from Montreal.

[*English*]

Will the government restore the necessary funds for CBC to get to take on its regional mandate and to fill its legal commitments, or is it prepared to withdraw the bill until it can be properly concurrent with the needs?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, on the one hand, we have the mandate Parliament gives the CBC, renewed by the bill now before this House. On the other hand, there are problems with a shortfall in the CBC's operating budget. Regarding this shortfall, first of all, the CBC estimated that this year, advertising revenues would total $395 million. Recently, however, this estimate had to be revised downwards to $300 million. This shortfall is one of the problems facing the CBC, and all television companies in Canada are facing these problems, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister.

On November 7, 1984, just after the Prime Minister was elected to this House, in his first speech he said: "Give us 20 years and you will not recognize this country."

In less than six years, the awful truth of those words is becoming abundantly clear: VIA Rail, Canada Post, Petro–Canada and now CBC.

Important national institutions have been underfunded and privatized. Tools for building a better Canada have been abandoned, and now today's announcement of 1,200 jobs lost and 10 regional stations at CBC.

With the widening swath that this government has cut through the heart of this nation's achievements, what is the Prime Minister prepared to do to assist the CBC in retaining its objective of serving as an instrument of this nation's identity and unity?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, the member of the opposition has every right to recall the commitments made by the Prime Minister of Canada. A few years from now, this country will be quite different because the economic situation will be different and the government will be in full control of its spending. By taking economic measures we will be able to develop our social services and provide for the cultural, economic and social development of this country, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, during last night's debate on Bill C–40, the Broadcast Act, the parliamentary secretary said in the House that this government was doing everything it could to help the CBC.

I wonder if the Prime Minister might answer this question: Can the Prime Minister explain to the House how the hatchet job of $140 million cut over the next

four years and the loss of 1,200 jobs is going to do anything to help the CBC?

Can he explain how the closure of regional stations in Corner Brook, Goose Bay, Sydney, Sept Iles, Toronto, Saskatoon and Windsor as well as other areas will help the CBC to fulfil its mandate and its role as the heartbeat of Canada?

• (1430)

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to respond to the serious question raised by my hon. friend. This year the Government of Canada will provide over $1 billion in grants to the CBC, in addition to which the CBC has advertising revenue which, as the minister has pointed out, is in the neighbourhood of $400 million.

There is a shortfall on that which accounts in substantial measure for some of the CBC's problems this year, as there are shortfalls in private sector broadcasting, newspapers, and all media outlets across Canada.

**Mr. Tobin:** There's a recession, Brian.

**Mr. Mulroney:** My hon. friend yells at me that there is a recession. Indeed there is a recession, and all elements of society including the CBC must deal with this new reality, which means tightening our belts.

The total resources of the CBC, including commercial sales, have increased to nearly $1.5 billion this year. This is an increase of nearly 30 per cent since 1984. I think that every year since this government has been here we have given more money on a yearly basis to the CBC. We have proceeded with the construction of a new CBC headquarters in Toronto. We have authorized the creation of Newsworld.

I know my hon. friend is offended by the idea of privatization, but he is probably more offended by the fact that the post office is now making money.

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the 103 people in Windsor who have just been told their jobs are dead were told that the major reason for it was the lack of funding from this government. That is what they were told.

How can this Prime Minister and this government possibly justify the destruction of community news in a part of this country where there is no option, where there is a saturation of TV coverage from the United States?

Why is this government not prepared to keep 500,000 Canadians as part of our country by preserving community news in Windsor?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with my hon. friend, if that is the decision that was announced by Mr. Gerard Veilleux, the president of the CBC.

I point out to my hon. friend, and I hope he will agree, that in the six years since we have been here we have increased the amounts of grants to the CBC every single year. They are in excess of $1 billion a year.

The CBC's anticipated revenues from sales are down, but my hon. friend would acknowledge that they are down in the private sector in all areas of the media.

I point out to my friend that the total resources of the CBC have increased in the neighbourhood of 30 per cent over the last six years, while other government operations, which account for $17 billion—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** The right hon. Prime Minister.

**Mr. Mulroney:** Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out to my hon. friend, so that he can put it in some kind of fair comparison, that the cost of government operations, basically the cost of running the government which includes the personnel costs of public servants, administering government programs, and so on, in 1984 were $17.4 billion. This year they are $17.3 billion, a decrease of $100 million.

While the contributions to the CBC were going up by over $100 million, the entire cost of running the Government of Canada because of the frugality of the approach of this government has gone down by $100 million, and I think that is fair.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister and it is about the CBC crisis.

At the very time when Canadians are concerned about the future of this country, this government is taking away from the CBC its mandate to contribute to national unity.

But it does not stop there. We are told today that due to lack of funding certain regional operations of the CBC will have to be closed. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this will impair the ability of the CBC to keep this country together.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Harvard:** I know the Prime Minister has been—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member.

**Mr. Harvard:** I know that the Prime Minister is a bit run down these days, but I want to ask him: Has he lost all faith in public broadcasting? Have he lost all faith in the CBC, and has he lost all faith in this country?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt my friend, the Minister of Communications, but this was the political party that founded the CBC. Because of the management we are trying to bring to the public finances of the country, we are going to return sanity to the public finances so that the CBC can stay alive, grow, and prosper in the years to come. That is what it is all about.

My hon. friend can judge by the fact that when we were keeping our own governmental expenditures down by $100 million over six years, this government found in difficult times the money to build the broadcasting centre for the CBC in Toronto and we found the money to fund Newsworld. Those were major innovations for the CBC and for Canadians.

I think this indicates our commitment to public broadcasting in Canada. Gerard Veilleux is the first to recognize, as the former secretary of the Treasury Board, that the CBC or any other government agency cannot function in isolation. We are all in this together, and we all must control expenditures so as to strengthen the economy in the longer haul.

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives started the CBC and it looks like they are going to end it.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Harvard:** We have all seen the rise of western alienation, but still CBC operations in Calgary and Saskatoon will have to be—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has the floor. I would ask members to give him the courtesy to allow him to ask his question.

**Mr. Harvard:** CBC operations in Calgary and Saskatoon will have to sacrifice programs throughout the west. They will be lost as a result of these cuts today. Western Canadians will lose yet another means of expressing to other Canadians their feelings and their concerns.

If the Prime Minister will not allow his own Tory MPs from western Canada to express the concerns of western Canadians, why will he not let the CBC do it?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I may remind the hon. member that across Canada, in both western and eastern Canada, all Canadian communities will continue to be served by a CBC television station.

The CBC's budget problems are largely linked to advertising. I may remind the hon. member that about 30 per cent of the CBC's budget consists of advertising revenue, and I would also like to remind him that the corporation had budgeted $395 million in revenues this year, and it now has to revise this downwards to $300 million. This is not due to the impact of the economic situation but also to the fact that Canadians have more and more television services, and that the competition and specialized services will tend to fragment TV audiences, as they are indeed doing today.

In the Montreal area, the English network has lost 20 per cent of its audience in the past 2 years, and the French network has lost 17 per cent, because there are more television programs and more TV networks, and because more interests are involved in the television sector in Canada, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Communications.

How could the minister possibly say that there are more and more television shows in Cape Breton? CBC is the only network operating out of Cape Breton. How would he know, anyway? He is never in the country.

• (1440)

I remind him that the station in Sydney is closing. Why is this government trying to create two levels of Canadians? Will he accept the fact that people in Cape Breton and in the other regions of this country do not want to be second level Canadians?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that in the region of Sydney, like in other regions of Canada, there are more televison channels than in 1984. The residents of Sydney have more opportunities to watch television because there are more television services, including specialized services that did not even exist before. The fact that the same number of viewers have more televison channels to choose from translates into a loss of advertising revenue for the CBC. In the region of Sydney as elsewhere, the CBC will continue to offer services as it does to all Canadians.

[*English*]

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, the CBC in Sydney will be lucky to be left with a mobile unit. The problem is that this is not about services to the people. The government is systematically cutting back the revenues of the CBC until it reduces its operations and programming to such a level that the government feels it can be privatized.

Why does the government not admit that this is not about people, that the government is not concerned about the interests and the welfare of Canadians, that all it wants to do is get rid of the CBC?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend says that the government is systematically cutting back on revenues to the CBC. He has it exactly wrong.

The government has been systematically increasing its contribution to the CBC every year since it has been here. The Government of Canada now contributes in a lump sum a cash amount in excess of $1 billion a year to the CBC.

As the minister has pointed out, CBC's anticipated commercial revenues have encountered a shortfall, as has the private sector station in Sydney, as has CJOH, CFTO and all other stations across Canada. It is part and parcel of the difficult economic times that we are going through.

The actions of the Government of Canada are not designed to minimize the CBC. They are designed to strengthen the economy so that as the economy strengthens we can continue to do more for the CBC and the CBC can continue to play its important role in contributing to national unity and strengthening the fibre of the nation.

* * *

## GUN CONTROL

**Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice.

As early as the spring of 1989, this government promised Canadians stronger gun control laws. Then came the winter of 1989 and Marc Lepine made gun control a woman's issue. Since then the women of Canada have seen nothing from this government but the spectacle of a self-described 'feminist' sidelining her own bill.

On this first eve of the Montreal massacre, the women of Canada want action on gun control. They want action now. Where is that promised action?

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member was aware of the package that I deposited in the House of Commons in June of this year, she would be aware that the gun control initiative consisted of three parts: Bill C-80, legislative changes proposed to the Criminal Code of Canada, and proposed use of the regulatory power. That included some existing regulatory power and some use of regulatory power that would come into being with Bill C-80. Third, the proposal to create a national advisory council on firearms to provide me with a plan to implement the training provisions, which have been in the Criminal Code of Canada since 1978 and have never been proclaimed, and to provide me with advice on criteria by which we might implement some of the advice that students at École Polytechnique gave me and was reconfirmed by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to outlaw military and paramilitary firearms. That does not require new legislative authority,

but what it does require is very careful consideration of what criteria we would use to designate military and paramilitary firearms.

The legislation and the proposed regulatory changes are now in front of a special committee. I am sure the member is aware that if we had confined ourselves purely to dealing with second reading in a legislative committee, the scope of the regulations would not be appropriate for that committee to consider. In this contentious area my proposed legislative and regulatory changes are now in a public forum.

I announced yesterday the make-up of the National Advisory Council on Firearms, under the chairmanship of the Hon. Jacques Flynn, which will address itself to the question of the training provisions, which I think are very important, to assure all Canadians that those who purchase firearms in this country have satisfied a requirement of competence and safe handling of those firearms.

**Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, last April when the minister was appointed she said: "I hope people will be able to identify a difference that was made by a woman justice minister." There does not appear to be any difference.

My supplementary question is for the same minister. Is she comfortable knowing that because of government inaction, a 30-round clip, similar to the clip used by Marc Lepine, is advertised in catalogues across this country, and is available at neighbourhood hardware store catalogues, right next to kids' sleighs and camping gear. Is the minister comfortable with that?

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, I propose to limit the size of clips and magazines which are available for semi-automatic firearms. That is one of the proposed regulatory changes which I will be empowered to make by virtue of the provisions of Bill C-80. She also knows it is very contentious.

The question of 30-shot clips is not so much one of contention as the level of threshold that we have suggested in the proposed regulatory changes. I expect to be able to bring into effect provisions limiting the availability of those large high-powered magazines for semi-automatic firearms.

The short answer to her question is no, I am not satisfied with that. That is why it is part of my proposal for change. I also believe in the democratic process. I also believe in a process—

* * *

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

The province of Newfoundland and Labrador is being devastated by the largest per capita cuts in jobs and programming by the CBC anywhere in Canada.

Seventy of 315 positions are being permanently eliminated. Two out of three TV production facilities, one in Corner Brook and one in Goose Bay, are being permanently closed. All local programming is being cancelled and cut of some $5.6 million in Newfoundland and Labrador alone.

In recent weeks the Prime Minister has expressed serious concern about the state of national unity. Does he realize that when you tear Air Canada, when you tear VIA Rail, when you tear the post office and now, the CBC, out of the regions of this country, you destroy the unity and the glue that has traditionally kept us together. Is he concerned about that? Will he address it now?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to address it.

The fact that Air Canada has been privatized and is now found in the hands of Canadians, including many of its employees, and its unionized employees, was a gesture that was widely encouraged, not only by the employees of Air Canada but by most Canadians.

The fact that we have had to act to reduce a subsidy to VIA Rail that was approaching $700 million a year, to try to restore a degree of balance to that, is not something I hope that will offend my hon. friend.

From time to time, there are periods of retrenchment and this happens to be one of them. In the 15 years that preceded 1984, program spending in Ottawa increased at an average rate of 14.1 per cent every year, irrespective of declines in productivity and irrespective of declines in trade. That is 14 per cent a year in program spending every year for 15 years.

Under this government we have reduced program spending increases to below the rate of inflation, 3.6 per cent, which is one of the reasons why we are in the process of being able to restore a degree of sanity because the 14 per cent a year annual program increase would have really resulted in disaster for Canada.

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte):** Mr. Speaker, the legacy of this Prime Minister will not be that he presided over the disintegration of VIA Rail, or the disintegration of the Post Office or the disintegration of the CBC, but that he presided over the disintegration of a country because he did not understand the importance of national institutions.

• (1450)

Earlier today the Prime Minister talked about the privatization of the post office. I want to ask the Prime Minister, is it not the real objective of this government, that sees the country as a Monopoly board, to privatize the CBC?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, again I apologize to my hon. friend but the question was really addressed specifically to me in regard to previous actions by other departments. Whether I have any regrets about the actions we have taken, for example with regard to the post office, the answer is no. The post office, after 15 years of losses, is now functioning in the black.

**Mr. Tobin:** It does not exist in the regions any more.

**Mr. Mulroney:** My hon. friend says it does not exist in the regions. Of course it exists in the regions.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Sudbury.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Diane Marleau (Sudbury):** Mr. Speaker, we are more than one million francophones outside Quebec. Radio-Canada is the only French national network, I repeat, the only French national network outside Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Why cut-backs in the Radio-Canada French network? Why reduce regional services? Why abandon francophones outside Quebec?

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, again I can say that Radio-Canada does not plan to cut off televison services to francophones. As it has always done, it will continue to make sure that, through its services, francophones will enjoy everything it can offer in terms of cultural and informative programs.

**Mrs. Diane Marleau (Sudbury):** Mr. Speaker, it does not make sense to shut down the Toronto TV station and reduce services to francophones outside Quebec without notice and without consultations! How heartless, Mr. Speaker!

I direct my question to the Prime Minister. Why destroy French Canada in the regions?

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** First, Mr. Speaker, the government is dealing with this matter today rather than in April or at the end of March because this serves as a three-month notice. That is why we brought the matter up today. The hon. member should not say there has been no prior notification, quite the contrary.

Second, the hon. member will have a severe cultural shock in three months because she will come to realize that there will still be French services for francophones outside Quebec.

* * *

[*English*]

## WORLD UNIVERSITY SERVICES OF CANADA

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs relative to the World University Services of Canada. If WUSC is forced into bankruptcy, the government will likely have to assume significant extra costs in order to hire experts from other NGOs or the private sector to take over the administration of WUSC's Canadian government funded development projects, overseas volunteer payments and student payments.

Can the minister indicate what those extra costs to the government will be, and how those costs compare with the cost of the government measures to help WUSC restructure its operation on to a sound financial footing?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member would understand, that is a question which requires some detail in

response. I will take it as notice and try to get that detailed information.

He would also know that a principle is at issue here, which is whether or not the Government of Canada should accept responsibility for the financial standing of companies or of non-governmental organizations with which it has relations. We naturally try to ensure that those companies or non-governmental organizations are in a sound financial position.

Occasionally, very unfortunate events arise, as was the case with WUSCanada. We are trying to deal with that in a sensitive and comprehensive way, and in a way that looks after people who, in Canada or abroad, are relying upon WUSCanada.

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** Mr. Speaker, WUSCanada is not looking for a bailout, just for restructuring money.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Hovdebo:** Just for restructuring time, not money. WUSC just needs time to get its structure in order.

Does the government realize how badly it will appear in the eyes of the developing nations when, just after CIDA has been ordered to hand over nearly $2 million to the government's Persian Gulf fund, it is seen to stand idly by while WUSC is forced into bankruptcy?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, no fair-minded person, including the hon. member when he has an opportunity to acquaint himself with all the facts, would accuse me or the government of standing idly by.

We have tried to help WUSC. My colleague, the minister responsible for international development, announced some of the steps that we were taking the other day. Unfortunately they have failed.

With regard to the question of the crisis in the gulf, the hon. member must surely know that among the people who are suffering most seriously from this continuing state of uncertainty, with its impact upon increased oil prices, are precisely the poor of the world.

One of the ways in which we could help them most dramatically would be to bring a peaceful end to the crisis in the gulf, which is what Canada is trying to do.

**Mr. Karpoff:** Declare war.

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** The hon. member says, "declare war." I do not think that is the position of his party. It certainly is not the position of ours.

Our view is to support the United Nations, and we would appreciate the support of the New Democratic Party for the United Nations in practice as well as in theory.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

**Mrs. Carole Jacques (Mercier):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General of Canada who, last Monday, signed and approved the transfer of Maxime Gariépy, so that he may serve his time in a Canadian penal institution. This is my second question, Mr. Speaker, for we know already the reply to the first, thanks to Mr. Jean-Luc Mongrain: Maxime Gariépy will be 18 years old next January 22nd. It is therefore imperative for Maxime to be transferred to Canada before this fateful date. Could the Solicitor General confirm first the exact date of this transfer and, second, that it will occur before next January 22nd?

[*English*]

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada):** I want to thank the member for the interest she has shown in this case.

The Solicitor General has shown personal interest in it, and yesterday signed the approval of the application to have Mr. Gariepy transferred to Canada.

That application is now going through the various levels of government and authorities in the United States. We hope he will be transferred as soon as possible.

* * *

## AIR CANADA

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax):** Mr. Speaker, Air Canada has cut and will cut 150 jobs in Halifax by next spring.

Customer care is history, and Atlantic Canadians get it in the neck again. Will the Minister of Transport undertake today to use his considerable influence with Air

Canada's board to revoke its decision to close Air Canada's reservation centre in Halifax.

**Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend will know that Air Canada is now a public corporation. The shares are widely held.

I think the last thing in the world the shareholders of Air Canada want is the government telling it which reservation counters to keep open and which ones to close.

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for the shareholders of Air Canada, but I can tell you that the people of Atlantic Canada would like a government minister to speak for them just once in a while.

One hundred and fifty jobs are gone from Halifax. There has been a ruinous increase in landing costs. Our trains are gone. The ferries are going. Our planes are next, and we will not have CBC to tell us about it.

• (1500)

Air Canada and Air Nova have a 60 per cent market share in the Atlantic. The government's privatization policy and deregulation policy are strangling a profitable endeavour.

When will this minister move to normalize this industry and protect our vital transportation links in the Atlantic?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend will know that under deregulation the number of flights in Atlantic Canada has increased some 20 per cent over the last five years.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Lewis:** My hon. friend asked what we could do to help Atlantic Canada in terms of transport. My hon. friend will know that we have approved the increases in the holding room capacity at Halifax airport and just last week I announced a new taxi-way for Moncton and the first gate at the Moncton airport.

We are doing what we can with limited funds where we belong and that is in the infrastructure, not flying the airplanes.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

## FIGHT AGAINST DRUGS

**Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. A few days ago, the police force of the Montreal Urban Community announced that is 1991 they would step up their effort against drug trafficking and drug abuse with the slogan "Zero-Tolerance".

Is the minister planning to do the same, since it has been clearly established that following the arrival of "crack" on the market and the establishment of many shooting galleries, violent crime has increased by 40 per cent in my riding and everywhere else in Canada?

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, the Canadian strategy is to attack both supply and demand. The government has increased its control and seizure capabilities at the borders. We have updated our information collecting methods and reinforced our contacts with the various police forces throughout Canada. Thanks to the new Proceeds of Crime Act, the various police forces will have better tools to fight against organized crime and money laundering operations.

* * *

[*English*]

## PRIVILEGE

### CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION BRIEFING

**Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in my capacity as both member of Parliament for York West and chair of the parliamentary Liberal caucus on a question of privilege. I believe that my rights as a member of Parliament and those rights enjoyed by my colleagues in the Liberal caucus have been seriously breached because of the comportment of the CBC *vis-à-vis* the national government caucus.

Upon my return from the usual Wednesday caucus meeting today, at 12.30 p.m. I returned to find a message from Mr. Pierre Blaine of the CBC, offering a full briefing to my parliamentary caucus colleagues in the Liberal Party. The message as very clear and concise and was basically that the briefing would not be available before 2.30 p.m. today—2.30 being the time of the press conference by the CBC—with a preference that the

CBC would do a full briefing for the Liberal caucus next week.

I find that absolutely offensive, in light of the fact that the government caucus, at their regular caucus meeting this morning, received a full briefing from the CBC, in terms of the cut-backs that have savaged the CBC.

**Some hon. members:** Shame.

**Mr. Marchi:** I wish to say to Your Honour that all members of Parliament, irrespective of where they sit in this illustrious Chamber, are equals and that the CBC, as a Crown corporation, should not be allowed to discriminate between supporters of the government and supporters of the Official Opposition. The CBC, as a Crown corporation, belongs to 26 million shareholders who happen to be Canadian citizens and it is responsible to them through this parliamentary Chamber.

Not only have we been discriminated against, but the information that I have received from the CBC, as the chair of the parliamentary Liberal caucus, has been completely mischievous and misleading in terms of any sense of equality. I find this treatment of our caucus, and perhaps of the New Democratic caucus, absolutely unacceptable and irresponsible.

It would be my respectful submission that in order to stop this from being a precedent, that you, Sir, kindly look into this situation, because it is absolutely intolerable. We will not accept this on the face of it.

The CBC does not belong in the government's back pocket. The CBC belongs to Canadians and we have every right to be informed on an equal basis about the affairs of the nation, which includes the affairs of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, on the same point, I believe if you will review the Question Period proceedings you will be aware of the fact that the Minister of Communications, in answering a question from this side about the cuts that are going to be made, started to read from a statement on his desk about what the president of the CBC was about to say at a press conference that had not yet occurred.

I think if you review the tapes of Question Period, Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that Marcel Masse had a copy—

**Some hon. members:** Order.

**Ms. Copps:** —of the statement that was about to be made. That also is a clear breach of the arm's length relationship that should be existing between the CBC and the government.

If you review the "blues", Mr. Speaker, you will see that the Minister of Communications stated in the House that there were comments about to be made by the president of the CBC.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, in light of the revelation by the Minister of Communications that he had forewarned knowledge about communiqués coming from the CBC, clearly the arm's length relationship has been breached by this Minister of Communications. He is directing the CBC and he is further directing the CBC—

**Mr. Speaker:** I have the point of privilege raised by the hon. member. The hon. minister may want to respond.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I find all this very strange, especially the comments by the last member to speak.

First of all, I do not have any statement or press release from the CBC, none whatsoever.

Second, the hon. member should expect the Minister of Communications, who is responsible for the CBC in the House, to have, at the very least, some information on the developments over the last five years and on the projections, which are available to the member if she would care to look at the documents regularly delivered to members.

I am quite surprised, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry for the hon. member's credibility, but I did not use any press release that the President of the CBC might have been about to publish. We already knew at 2 p.m., and even a few hours before, that he was going to hold a press conference at 2.30 p.m. It was in the papers. If the hon. member had read the papers, she would have known.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I would never dare say, like the hon. member on the other side, that the party in power has more information. I would never dare, Mr. Speaker.

I do say to her that the President of the CBC, as I already said in the House, would be willing to meet with individual members or groups of members regardless of their political affiliation.

[*English*]

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, on the same question, I would like to rise to explain the deep concern that we in the New Democratic Party also have with regard to this particular issue.

As my colleague from York West has indicated, the government had previously met with the directors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. It was provided with the intricate details earlier this morning, well before the press conference, while both opposition parties—the Liberal opposition party and the New Democratic opposition party—have not been allowed that same privilege.

• (1510)

This has placed the opposition parties at a distinct disadvantage to the government in terms of finding out the details of the very serious situation with regard to the CBC cuts. It has in large measure inhibited our capacity to represent the situation, as well as to represent our constituents fairly and effectively.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond is rising on a point of order and I will deal with that in just a moment.

**Mr. Dingwall:** It has to do with the same matter raised by my colleague from Hamilton East.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think from a procedural point of view we should be fairly careful here. The hon. member for York West has risen on a question of privilege. The hon. member for Hamilton East has spoken on a question of privilege. The hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap has spoken on a question of privilege and I would like to deal with that first. The hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond has a point of order and I, of course, will hear it, but I think I have to deal with the question of privilege first.

I have listened carefully to the hon. member for York West and I will consider the matter. By saying I will consider it, I am not saying that it is necessarily a question of privilege, but I will look at the practice very carefully and perhaps I can report back to the House for the assistance of all members.



The hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond on a point of order.

* * *

## POINT OF ORDER

### COMMENTS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I think all of us listened very carefully to the words of the Minister of Communications today and, as alluded to by my colleague from Hamilton East, reference was made to a particular document that he certainly had in his possession which obviously other members of Parliament did not have in their possession.

I wish to remind the Chair of the provisions of Beauchesne's, particularly paragraph 327 which states:

> A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other state paper not before the House, unless he be prepared to lay it upon the Table.

I would hope that just out of courtesy to all members of Parliament, since we all saw—and I am sure the television cameras would reaffirm what I am saying—the minister read from a document which ought to be tabled so members on all sides of the House would then have a full opportunity to examine it.

I hope the minister would comply with Beauchesne's, paragraph 327.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I can show you all the documents. Not one of these documents belongs to the CBC. This document here is the budget of Telefilm Canada about which no question was raised. The hon. member could have learned that in 1984 Telefilm Canada had a budget of $51 million and that, thanks to the interest this government has taken in Canada's cultural endeavours, the 1990 budget now amounts to $150 million. I have this document and I can table it. It can be found in all official papers, particularly those of Telefilm Canada.

Second, this is written at the bottom of the document: "CBC building in Toronto. Total cost of building: $385 million". It goes to show that Canadians and the government are interested in the future of the CBC and that to

that extent the contribution of our government—your government, I mean—to the future of the CBC in that building has been $65.5 million, Mr. Speaker.

I can also refer to another document here which has to do with the over-all resources of the CBC and which can be found in all budget documents tabled here in the House. For instance the hon. member would learn—

**Mr. Speaker:** I think the remarks of the minister are very interesting, but we do have a very specific question.

[*English*]

I would ask the hon. minister if he read from a document, as has been suggested by the hon. member. If his response is no, then that is the end of the issue.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### BROADCASTING ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Tuesday, December 4, consideration of the motion of Mr. Masse that Bill C-40, an act respecting broadcasting and to amend certain acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunication, be read the third time and passed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** It being 3.15 o'clock p.m., pursuant to order made Monday, December 3, 1990, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the motion at the third reading stage of Bill C-40, an act respecting broadcasting and to amend certain acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunication.

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:

*(Division No. 340)*

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Attewell | Beatty |
| Bernier | Bertrand |
| Bird | Bjornson |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blenkarn |
| Bourgault | Boyer |
| Browes | Campbell (Vancouver Centre) |
| Cardiff | Casey |
| Chadwick | Charest |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Cole |
| Collins | Cooper |
| Corbeil | Côté |
| Couture | Danis |
| Darling | DeBlois |
| de Cotret | Della Noce |
| Desjardins | Dobbie |
| Domm | Dorin |
| Duplessis | Edwards |
| Epp | Fee |
| Feltham | Ferland |
| Fontaine | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gibeau |
| Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Greene |
| Guilbault | Gustafson |
| Halliday | Harvey (Chicoutimi) |
| Hawkes | Hicks |
| Hockin | Holtmann |
| Horner | Hudon |
| Jacques | James |
| Jelinek | Joncas |
| Jourdenais | Kempling |
| Koury | Layton |
| Lewis | Lopez |
| MacDonald (Rosedale) | MacDougall (Timiskaming) |
| MacKay | Malone |
| Marin | Martin (Lincoln) |
| Masse | McDermid |
| Monteith | Moore |
| Nicholson | Oberle |
| O'Kurley | Porter |
| Reid | Reimer |
| Ricard | Richardson |
| Robitaille | Roy-Arcelin |
| Saint-Julien | Scott (Victoria—Haliburton) |
| Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) | Shields |
| Soetens | Sparrow |
| Tardif | Tétreault |
| Thorkelson | Tremblay (Québec-Est) |
| Valcourt | Van de Walle |
| Vankoughnet | Venne |
| Vézina | Vien |
| Vincent | Weiner |
| Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia) | |
| Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) | Winegard |
| Worthy—108 | |

NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Dingwall | Grey (Beaver River) |
| Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast) | Lapierre |
| Murphy—5 | |

• (1540)

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Dingwall:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wish to clarify for the House that members of my party did not vote—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Dingwall:** —because they wish to register their total disgust with the Minister of Communications and the Prime Minister, not only for the content of Bill C–40 but because of the massive cutbacks to CBC; totally disgusting.

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious that this government holds Parliament in complete contempt. What it has done—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is this a point of order?

**Mr. Murphy:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member is not allowed to comment on the vote but, if there is another point of order, I would like to hear it.

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, I guess the question on which in the New Democratic Party have to ask you to rule on: What is the purpose of parliamentary debate if the government—

**Some hon. members:** Order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I would like to hear the point of order of the hon. member for Churchill.

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, the point of order I would like a chance to address is this: The purpose of Parliament is quite clear. We are here to vote on legislation.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**An hon. member:** Why didn't you?

*Point of Order*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I would like to hear this point of order, please.

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, the whole purpose for debate and for voting is being denied in any practical sense—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Murphy:** —if a government deliberately announces its decisions, which are effective cuts to CBC throughout this country, after all possibility of debate is ended.

**Mr. Langdon:** That's right. Absolutely.

**Mr. Murphy:** This party and the Liberal Party went to great lengths on Monday and Tuesday nights in order to debate the Broadcasting Act, only to find out that after all possibility of debate is ended, the axe falls the following morning.

It affected community after community which members of Parliament represent. They were not given a chance to speak on the legislation after the government made the announcements.

Our whole purpose as a Parliament is being destroyed by the deliberate actions of this government. It is not acceptable. It is certainly more than a point of order. It is a point on the whole question of what Parliament is here for, and why it is important that government respect Parliament.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I would like to say that the member may have a grievance but that is debate. The hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier.

* * *

## POINT OF ORDER

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B)

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a very serious point of order. On November 23, 1990 the House was given Supplementary Estimates (B). The rules of this House allow for committees to immediately upon receipt of those supplementary estimates begin study of those estimates.

We had a total of $1,841,442,306 of budgetary estimates to be voted. The vote is to be taken next Monday, December 10, as stated in our standing orders, that being the last day of this supply period.

The standing orders also say that the estimates must be reported to the House, or at least to have been deemed reported five days prior to that, which is today.

My point of order is simple. No committee has met on those estimates. Over $1,800 million has not been looked at by this House. There has been no examination of those estimates because basically the chairpersons of those committees did not call meetings.

Mr. Speaker, I think that you would recognize that this is most important. The purpose at hand is to look at expenditures. That is what this House does best. That is what ought to be done in Parliament. That is what we do with the estimates.

I will quote Beauchesne.

I am quoting from Beauchesne's Fifth Edition: "The purpose of the estimates is to present to Parliament the budgetary and non-budgetary expenditure proposals of the government for the current fiscal year."

Humbly but forcefully, Mr. Speaker, I submit that Parliament does not operate smoothly when the estimates are not seriously examined by the committees. Since no committee sat to study these estimates, I make the following suggestion, Mr. Speaker. There are three possible solutions. First, that the vote not be taken Monday on the last allotted day, but that that day be deferred to Thursday, December 13.

**Mr. Ricard:** Send it to the Senate.

**Mr. Gauthier:** If you want to speak, stand up!

**An hon. member:** He would not know what to say.

[*English*]

**Mr. Gauthier:** The second solution would be for this House to recognize that since the process has not been the best, we should not today take it as the last day for the estimates to be deemed to have been returned to the House. Therefore, we would wait until Monday at three o'clock. That would be acceptable to us if the committees were to meet today, tomorrow and Friday. We would have no objection to that.

The third possibility would be that by consent, this House would recognize the importance of this process and would not at this time have Monday next, the last day in this period—and I have a motion to that effect which I have given to the government and to the NDP.

By the way, the NDP agrees with me that this order should be adopted by this House. That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 81, (1) the last allotted day for the business of supply for the present supply period shall be Thursday, December 13, 1990. (2) Supplementary Estimates (B) 1990–91 shall be deemed to have been reported from the several standing committees at 6 p.m. on Wednesday, December 12, 1990. (3) All of the provisions of the said standing order shall apply *mutatis mutandis*.

• (1550 )

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to consider seriously this problem. If you do not see yourself in a position to find a solution now, may I suggest you do what you do best, which is protect minorities, protect the opposition in its right to look at these estimates by ordering the committees to sit today. If you do not want to do that, Mr. Speaker, then I would put it to you that you should at least ask the House if there would be a disposition to accept my motion to resolve this problem today.

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, the House leader of the Liberal Party certainly gave a creative description of the estimates' procedure and what is involved.

The procedure for spending estimates predates both his and my entry into Parliament some 18 years ago. It was brought in by a Liberal government. It provides for fixed supply periods, for estimates to be tabled and to be deemed referred to committees, and then to be reported back on specific days when the supply period ends. This supply period currently ends December 10 and that is very clear in the Standing Orders.

The procedure provides, interestingly enough, in each supply period for the opposition to have allotted days, or opposition days, when they can raise and debate in the House the expenditures in these estimates. They have the opportunity to argue about the estimates, to claim that we are spending too much or too little—it is usually too little we are spending, they always want us to spend

more and more—they have the opportunity to do that. Not once, on any of the opposition days, have they chosen to take that opportunity. They have chosen to debate every other subject under the sun except expenditures. Then the accusation is made that committees would not meet.

I made a very quick survey of those within earshot. The Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology intended to meet but did not have a quorum because no opposition members showed up. At the defence committee, the opposition members agreed they would not meet because they were all attending the Future of Russia conference. Those are the only two committees I was able to very quickly discuss.

I reject absolutely the accusation that no committees have met. I reject absolutely the contention members have not had an opportunity to discuss the estimates. On any one of the supply or allotted days they could have discussed the estimates.

I wait with bated breath to hear one single suggestion from any opposition member of any significant cuts to government spending because all day long today I heard, "We want more money for the CBC, we want more money for VIA Rail, we want more money spent on the post office. We want more money spent on everything." To hear the opposition complain that they do not have an opportunity to examine expenditures and cutbacks is an absurdity.

The Standing Orders are very clear. The hon. House leader of the opposition is always after me to "stick to the rules". Well, let's "stick to the rules."

**Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if for once the government wouldn't give Parliament some credit and give us an opportunity to look at these estimates.

The government House leader says that it is not true to say, "no committees have been meeting." That is true. It is also true to say that the consumer and corporate affairs committee has not been meeting and has not had an opportunity to consider estimates because they do not have a chairperson who can call them to meet.

We do at least have one committee which cannot meet. We have another committee, the defence committee, which has not been able to look at these estimates to date.

I do not want to take too much time but there are large numbers of dollars involved. It is appropriate for Parliament and for committees to consider the estimates. It is appropriate for us to have enough time to give serious consideration to those estimates. All that the motion of the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier is suggesting is that we extend by about three days the opportunity for committees to give proper and due consideration to the estimates. Surely this is a reasonable proposition, one which would help the process along and for once show some respect on the part of the government to Parliament and Parliament's processes, rather than trying to ram these things through without proper consideration.

I wish to support the resolution of the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier and ask the government, for once, to do something reasonable and give us an opportunity to consider these estimates. Three more days is surely not of great inconvenience to anyone in this process.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, I think the facts should also be put on the record. The minister got carried away in his arguments and his facts were completely wrong. There have been no opposition days or supply days since the estimates were tabled on November 23, 1990. I made that point in my remarks. Therefore, his argument that we could have debated these things in the House is completely wrong and absolutely beside the point.

Mr. Speaker, I can give you a list of committees; aboriginal affairs, agriculture, communications and culture, multiculturalism and citizenship, the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the Standing Committee on Energy, Mines and Resources, and so on. All these committees were given estimates to study. None of them have met. I think that is absolutely uncalled for and I resent the government House leader's arguments. They are completely wrong and misleading.

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, just a very brief point. The government House leader suggested that the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs somehow has an opposition agreement not to discuss the estimates. That is not entirely correct. It is important that we have an opportunity. The committee is meeting this afternoon. It has a witness on another

subject, but it would be important, and I do intend to raise with the committee even at this eleventh hour, the importance of having witnesses appear on the estimates themselves. But until now, we have had no opportunity to consider the supplementary estimates.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, there is a particular case that I want to bring to your attention in relation to the supplementary estimates. The Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations cannot meet. It does not have a chairman.

I wrote a letter, along with three other colleagues in the Liberal caucus, the hon. member for Burin—St. George's being one of them, and two other members, asking the clerk of that committee to cause this committee to meet. We wanted to study, among other things, issues involving Canada Post as well as the estimates.

I received a letter from the clerk of the committee, which I am willing to lay on the table of the House, which says that our committee cannot meet. The clerk is unable to make it meet as we do not have a chairman and the government will not appoint one. So in that particular case, we cannot study the estimates. There is nothing we can do about it because the government will not and has not appointed the chairman.

I am willing to table this letter in the House of Commons to prove the point. In at least that particular situation, the case is even stronger why the estimates cannot be deemed to have been reported because the committee could not have sat no matter what it had decided to do. That has been caused by an action, or rather an inaction, of the government across the way.

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few comments to this debate with regard to the lack of committee meetings that has pervaded this place.

When I was first given the critic's responsibility for communications, arts and culture, which was just before the session began, I was quite anxious to have an opportunity to take part in the committee meetings that would be taking place.

Since that time, there has not been a single committee meeting, to discuss estimates, to discuss concentration of the media, to discuss the budgetary cutbacks to the CBC, to discuss nothing. I looked at the options that I had as a member in order to force the committee to meet and I ran up against exactly the same roadblock as the hon. member just pointed out.

The fact is that the communications, arts and culture committee has no chairperson. The former chairperson does not want to play chairperson any longer. We have no chairman. Therefore there is no procedural way that we can put in a legitimate request for this committee to meet to address the very important needs that we need to address.

• (1600)

This is an abdication of the democratic responsibility of the House and it is a shameful misuse of the privileges of the House by the government. It has to stop, and it has to stop now.

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the members' arguments with great interest.

There are a few points that I think are essential to put on the record. First, the issue has been discussed at House leaders' meetings and there were some discussions about specific concerns, one of which was the committee on defence. At that point, I talked to the chairman of the committee and asked him about what was going on in the committee and their intention to look at the Estimates or the opportunity to meet. It was he who advised me at that time that there had been an agreement among all parties not to have the committee sit, I think last week or a part of this week—I have forgotten the exact dates—so that they could attend this conference on the future of Russia.

I also know that several other committees, including the aboriginal affairs committee which the House leader for the official opposition has mentioned, have been meeting. In fact, just the other day it recommended a study on the issue that arose on the Oka situation this summer.

Mr. Speaker, my point is this. First—

**Ms. Blondin:** That's not the estimates. You stole them before we could study them.

**Mr. Cooper:** Oh, I see. It is really interesting, Mr. Speaker, to listen to the opposition who are very quick to play both sides of the fence.

In fact what has been happening is that a number of the committees have been meeting, but the members of the committee have preferred to look into issues rather than study the estimates. As you know, Mr. Speaker, that is a habit the House been tending to fall into for some time now.

It is very clear. Committees are masters of their own destinies. They have had an opportunity in most cases to study those estimates, with a few exceptions. In those few exceptions, we have advocated—and I renew the offer again today, if we can by unanimous consent—has to proceed with the report of the Striking Committee of the House of Commons and in fact we can have all of those committees up and running very quickly and allow them to do what has to be done.

In fact, what we are seeing instead is that the opposition continues to try to score political points, while at the same time taking full advantage of committee meetings to pursue other issues which they consider to be of importance.

**Mr. Gauthier:** I just want to wrap up. Having heard what the government has to say, I believe that we should put some facts. There were 108 votes in these estimates—and these figures come from the Table, by the way, so they must have some element of truth—referred to 17 committees. None have met on these 108 votes and none were called to discuss the estimates.

Mr. Speaker, I plead with you to use your authority and to order, today, those committees to meet.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I have listened to hon. members and I think that I should say something about this at this time.

The hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier may well have a grievance. Committees are masters of their own agenda. It may well be that the committees have not reported the estimates, but the House will have an opportunity to consider the Supplementary Estimates B when they are before the House on December 10, next.

If the hon. member would like to propose the motion, we will ask for unanimous consent.

The motion reads as follows:

*Point of Order*

1. That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 81(1), the last allotted day for the business of supply for the present supply period shall be Thursday, December 13, 1990;

2. That Supplementary Estimates (B) 1990–1991 shall be deemed to have been reported from the several standing committees at 6 p.m. on Wednesday, December 12, 1990; and

3. That all other provisions of the said standing order shall apply *mutatis mutandis*.

Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** No, there is not unanimous consent.

I will listen to a point of order from the hon. opposition Whip.

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I would just supplement what my colleague for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell has said.

**Mr. Cooper:** We've dealt with the point of order.

**Mr. Dingwall:** I understand that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader is very nervous, very touchy, and very sensitive when it comes to matters of this nature, particularly when the preponderance of evidence is so clear and which will dispute any thesis that he wishes to put before the House.

It is very clear here, Mr. Speaker, that on November 26, 1990, four members of our caucus did, in fact, write a letter to Mr. Fournier, Clerk of the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I quite agree with the parliamentary secretary that committees are the masters of their own destinies, but there is a restriction on that. It has to be done in accordance with the provisions of the Standing Orders. This is the response that came back. It states:

> Standing Order 106(3) is quite explicit and it provides that the meeting being requested is to be convened by "the Chairman of that committee". As you are aware, Mr. Garth Turner, M.P., resigned as Chairman of the Committee on September 18, 1990 and a new Chairman has not been elected.
>
> In accordance with Standing Order 106(3), it would appear that only the Chairman of a committee may convene a meeting pursuant to the said Standing Order—

Yes, Mr. Speaker, committees are masters of their own destinies, in accordance with the standing orders. But now you have a clear example, which we wish to table for all members to see, that this committee is being precluded from considering matters which it believes to be important because the government Whip and the Parlia-

mentary Secretary to the Government House Leader refuse to appoint a chairman for that committee.

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order.

The Environment Committee as well has not been meeting and has not had an opportunity to consider supplementary estimates simply because, at the initiation of the chair of that committee, those meetings have been cancelled. That committee has not held a regular meeting since the supplementary estimates were tabled. It has held meetings only to consider future business of the committee. There was no meeting on Tuesday. There is no meeting scheduled for tomorrow. Therefore, there is no opportunity for the committee to consider the supplementary estimates.

This is especially serious, Mr. Speaker, given that the Committee on the Environment sought, week after week last spring, to meet with the new Minister of the Environment and the previous Minister of the Environment. In fact, our first meeting with the new Minister of the Environment was last week. Because of the inability of the committee to have those previous meetings, this committee did not even table a report to Parliament on the Main Estimates. Therefore, it is doubly crucial that it have a look at the supplementary estimates and how the priorities of the Department of the Environment are being revised, in light of changing government spending priorities and particularly in anticipation of the green plan being tabled next week.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I think we should get on with the Routine Proceedings. Tabling of documents.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 31 petitions.

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

* * *

### POINT OF ORDER

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B)

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the earlier point of order. I only want another 30 seconds of the time of the Speaker.

I referred to a document earlier on which I said I would be glad to table. I have now received the document and I want to share only one sentence of it with the House. I do not intend to beleaguer the point, I assure you, Mr. Speaker.

The document which I have received, from the clerk of the committee in question, states that our committee cannot meet, and I quote from the letter, "until a Chairman has been duly elected". It states further that "the only person authorized to convene a committee for the election of a chairman is the Chief Government Whip". In other words, it is only the government Whip who can allow us to study the Estimates because only he can cause the appointment of the chairman.

I have that letter, Mr. Speaker. I will now table it, if the House agrees so that the whole House can see that—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is there agreement to have it tabled?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

* * *

• (1610 )

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

BILL C-81—REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

**Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis):** Mr. Speaker, it is my duty and pleasure to present a report from the legislative committee on Bill C-81, an act to implement the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods, with amendments. I have the honour to chair that committee, having been appointed by the Speaker.

I would like to thank my colleagues of all parties for their co-operation. What looked to be a very long process was rapidly terminated.

Therefore, it is my pleasure to table the report and to thank the Speaker for his confidence.

HEALTH AND WELFARE, SOCIAL AFFAIRS, SENIORS AND STATUS OF WOMEN—SECOND REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. John E. Cole (York—Simcoe):** Mr. Speaker, I too have the honour of presenting a report today from a committee.

On behalf of the chairman, the hon. member for Medicine Hat, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare, Social Affairs, Seniors and Status of Women. This report, entitled *Amateur Sport: Future Challenges*, has been agreed to unanimously by the Subcommittee on Fitness and Amateur Sport and also by the Standing Committee.

It has been an honour to chair this committee and it certainly has been a pleasure.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a response to this report.

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

**Mr. Attewell:** Mr. Chairman, I am not sure if this procedure is correct, but I see the vice-chairman of the finance committee here and I wonder if he might like to give a report on the extensive meetings we have been holding in the last week or so.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** There is not unanimous consent.

* * *

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, Thursday will be the anniversary of the tragedy of the murder of 14 young ladies in Quebec. On Thursday morning a number of members from all sides of the House are going to be in Montreal for that particular occasion. As a result of that, we would ask that there be consent given for the following motion:

> That on Thursday, December 6, 1990, that at three o'clock p.m., the House will revert to Statements by Ministers, with the usual responses.

This will simply allow members to attend the events in Montreal and yet to come back to the House at three o'clock that afternoon for the ministerial statement rather than the usual time, so that we can pay our respects in the House as well.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Hon. members have heard the terms of the motion. Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Agreed and so ordered.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

## PETITIONS

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have five petitions to present in opposition to the goods and services tax.

The petitioners are from across Canada and in particular from here in Ontario. They too find that the proposed goods and services tax with regard to magazines, books, and newspapers to be totally unacceptable.

The petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to withdraw the goods and services tax immediately.

CANADA POST

**Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I rise under Standing Order 36 to present petitions from 537 residents of the community of Port Alberni in British Columbia to add to hundreds of names previously submitted criticizing the government's destructive mismanagement of Canada Post Corporation and its tendency to ignore Canada Post Corporation's 1981 mandate to improve customer service and labour relations.

In the Comox—Alberni riding, Canada Post shut down rural post offices, closed down sorting facilities, privatized parcel and counter services, and the result has been a decline in employee morale and customer services.

Specifically, my constituents request that Canada Post Corporation be instructed to keep existing outlets, operate longer hours, expand revenue generating services, stop privatizing and start increasing services to raise revenues.

FOOD AND DRUGS

**Mrs. Pauline Browes (Scarborough Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present this petition today that is signed by residents who live in Scarborough, Ajax, Etobicoke, Oakville, Mississauga, Toronto, Whitby, Whitevale, Pickering and London.

The petitioners are most concerned about the packaging of food and the labelling on the packaging as a result of the death in Scarborough of a young 15 year old. The mother of the 15 year old lady who passed away has instituted petitions across the country to try to get some changes made to the regulations relating to packaging so that other young people will not have the same result of this severe allergy reaction that Robyn Allen had a few months ago.

The petitioners are calling upon Parliament to enact legislation amending the food and drug regulations in order to require manufacturers to list specific food ingredients and additives used in pre-packaged foods.

Additionally to this is to require restaurateurs and food retailers to provide to customers the list of all ingredients that are used in the prepared foods.

[*Translation*]

PARLIAMENT HILL

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to table a petition from residents of Senneterre and Belcourt, in which your petitioners humbly pray and call upon the Government of Canada to scrap the so-called Hill project which would spend $68 million on an underground parking garage and shopping mall under the Parliament Buildings, and to acknowledge the need for preserving the environment and historical character of the buildings and the Parliament Hill site in Ottawa.

Your petitioners also state that members should continue to park as they do now, behind the Parliament Buildings and outside, like factory workers, and that the Government of Canada has more important priorities than building an underground parking garage and shopping mall on Parliament Hill.

**Mr. Prud'homme:** What a harangue!

[*English*]

FOOD AND DRUGS

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition on behalf of citizens of the greater Toronto area who spend their lives with life threatening allergies and whose health and possibility of normal living would be improved if packaging legislation listed the ingredients in those packages.

The petitioners humbly pray that Parliament will enact legislation that would give them that protection.

* * *

## STARRED QUESTIONS

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Starred Questions Nos. 336 and 364.

Due to the length of these questions, I ask that they be printed in *Hansard* as if read.

[*Text*]

A FLOOD CONTROL STUDY INVOLVING THE TOWN OF MALARTIC

*Question No. 336—**Mr. Saint-Julien:**

1. Have Transport Canada, CN and Environment Canada conducted a flood control study involving the town of Malartic (Malartic River) and, if so, what was the cost of this study?

2. Have any flood control programs been funded and, if so, which ones?

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** I am informed as follows:

1. Transport Canada, CN and Environment Canada have not conducted a flood control study concerning the town of Malartic (Rivière Malartic).

2. Transport Canada, CN and Environment Canada have not funded any flood control programs involving the town of Malartic (Rivière Malartic).

WORK DONE BY THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

*Question No. 364—**Mr. MacWilliam:**

Is any work done by the Department of Communications for the Department of National Defence and, if so (a) what is its nature (b) in particular, is any work done for the Communications Security Establishment and, if so (i) what is its nature (ii) out of which departmental or agency budget is it paid for (c) in particular, is any work done for the Canadian Armed Forces Supplementary Radio System and, if so (i) what is its nature (ii) out of which departmental or agency budget is it paid for (d) do any representatives of the Department of Communications serve as members of the Communications Research Technical Group (CRTG) or successor bodies to the CRTG and, if so, what is (i) the name of the body (ii) the specific purpose of the DOC representative on such a body?

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** In January 1969, it was agreed between the Postmaster General and the Minister of National Defence that the newly-created Department of Communications would carry out defence-oriented projects. Research and development activities have been carried out on behalf of the Department of National Defence since that time.

a) The nature of the work is defence-oriented communications research and development, with emphasis on communications which do not rely on satellites.

b) All of the work done by the Department of Communications for the Communications Security Establishment is negotiated with and sponsored by the Chief of Research and Development at the Department of National Defence, through the Defence Research Establishment—Ottawa.

c) All of the work done by the Department of Communications for the Canadian Armed Forces Supplementary Radio System is negotiated with and sponsored by the Chief of Research and Development at the Department of National Defence, through the Defence Research Establishment—Ottawa.

d) The Department of Communications has no involvement with the Communications Research Technical Group or any successor bodies.



[*English*]

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, I ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Ms. Copps:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have two questions on the Order Paper, questions Nos. 379 and 380 that were tabled on October 15.

They result from a lay-off of several hundreds of people across this country from various companies that have received government bailouts, including Varity Corp. and Tridon. The list goes on.

• (1620 )

All I have asked for is a simple listing of all four profit corporations that have received government funds, under what programs have they received these funds and for what purposes.

The government is muzzling this issue because it is hiding the true fiscal facts from the Canadian taxpayers. I want an answer to these questions. Canadian taxpayers deserve to know why the millions of dollars that they use to prop up companies like Varity Corporation and Tridon are now being used to subsidize companies' hasty exit from Canada as they go to the United States.

I need this information to do my job as industry critic. I resent the fact that the ministry of industry and the government is preventing me from doing my work by keeping these figures secret. I would hope that at the earliest opportunity my Order Paper questions will be responded to.

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. member is getting so upset. Her rather simple question requires us going through 16 departments to pursue this information. As a result of that, the questions are being looked at at the moment. The answers are being prepared, but it does take a fair amount of time to go through 16 departments.

* * *

## MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr.

Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers P–33 standing in the name of the hon. member for Northumberland.

CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all documents related to the report prepared by the Canadian International Development Agency in August 1990 for Treasury Board regarding CIDA's decentralization program.

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, the documents requested cannot be released because they contain cabinet confidences as defined under section 69 of the Access to Information Act.

I therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw her motion.

**An hon. member:** Transfer for debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Transferred for debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I have a letter of notice under Standing Order 52 from the hon. member for Okanagan–Shuswap that arrived before notice from the hon. member for Mount Royal. I will listen to the on. member for Okanagan—Shuswap first and then I will recognize the hon. member for Mount Royal.

* * *

## MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S. O. 52

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, as you know, earlier today I served notice by way of written letter that I intended to rise under the provisions of Standing Order 52 to seek the adjournment of the House for the purposes of debating the imminent closure of the CBC broadcasting facilities in a number of Canadian municipalities.

Although the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation reports to Parliament through the Ministry of Communications, in fact, Mr. Speaker, as you know, it operates at arm's length from the government.

The only appropriate way for parliamentarians to direct the CBC in its use of public funds is, of course, through parliamentary debate, not through direct government intervention. While some parliamentarians, I submit, had an opportunity to debate this issue directly with the president of the CBC this morning, they did so in a private meeting with the government caucus earlier today, that same privilege and courtesy was not extended to the members of the opposition. The president did not seek the opportunity in the morning to speak to the concerns of parliamentarians on the opposition side of the House. Nor has the right of Canadians to open public debate on this issue of national importance been fulfilled.

In summarizing, and for that reason, Sir, I ask that the House provide an opportunity for this most urgent debate to occur. For that reason, I beseech you, Sir, with the request that this house do adjourn for that purpose.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the new critic in the NDP Party took my suggestion to heart and wrote a few moments before I did. He pleaded very well for the consideration of the House to adjourn and address a very serious and urgent national issue, the stricken condition of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I believe that with respect to the parliamentary channel which will be affected by these decisions, Radio Canada International, which will be affected by this decision, as well as the people from coast to coast, it is up to this House to debate this very serious issue and I hope you will favourably consider this request.

SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I have listened to both hon. members and have had an opportunity to consider this. I do not feel that I can allow an emergency debate at this time.

---

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

## FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Monday, November 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Loiselle that Bill C–91, an act to amend the Financial Administration Act and other acts in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

**Hon. Roger C. Simmons (Burin—St. George's):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about this bill that seeks to amend the Financial Administration Act.

The bill, because of its fairly wide sweeping nature, gives us the opportunity to make a few points about this government's performance and, Lord knows, there is much that can be said about the performance of this government, and not very much of it complimentary.

My friend from Calgary Southeast nods his approval to every word I say. Or, is he just so glad that he is still on the backbench at this particular time and not on the frontbench where he would have to bear direct responsibility for it? He is not completely absolved of course because he is still at least nominally a supporter of the government, and I stress "nominally" because I know his commitment to his constituents and to Canada, a commitment which I suggest prevents him from being a very enthusiastic supporter of some of the things this government is doing at this particular time.

As I said, Bill C-91 seeks to amend the Financial Administration Act in several ways. It allows me the opportunity to pick up where I left off a few days ago when we were discussing another related matter. I was explaining to you, Mr. Speaker, rather concisely, as is my usual form, and to my good friend from Gander—Grand Falls and others who were in the Chamber, as he is always in the Chamber, why it was that I chose to characterize our beloved Prime Minister as a wrecking ball. I was saying that in a somewhat warped sense it was some kind of a compliment. My friend from St. John's East will know exactly what I am talking about here.

A wrecking ball is not something that is flayed without direction. That is a loose cannon. A loose cannon on a deck can do a lot of damage because it has nobody orchestrating its movements but the weather, the wind, and itself. It can go in any direction at any time, depending on the whim of the wind, the slant on the deck, and the direction of it. The result is that it can do untold damage to any above deck structure. A loose cannon is not to be confused with a wrecking ball.

A wrecking ball, contrary to the image that it conjures up, is a very precise instrument. In the right hands and with the right pre-planning it can damage, yes, but damage in a predetermined way. The controllers of that wrecking ball know exactly what it is they want done. By appropriate orchestration and pre-planning, they can see that that ball does only the damage intended and no other damage. That is the basic difference between a loose cannon, I submit, and a wrecking ball.

• (1630)

Why, then, do I not just go all hog and call the Prime Minister a loose cannon? That would be wrong. He is no loose cannon. He is not just rolling around out of control. He knows exactly what he is up to. He is a wrecking ball, yes. He is doing damage, yes, but it is prescribed and predetermined damage. It is the damage that says, as it did recently when the government decided to reduce expenditures by $350 million, to rural Canada: "We are going to take away from you $12 million in agricultural funding". It is the damage that says to fisheries: "We are going to take away $11 million". It is the damage that says to the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency: "We are going to take away $640,000". So it goes. It is that kind of pre-planned wrecking ball damage.

If we talk about fisheries—and I am delighted to see my friend, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, in the House—and about finding another $11 million, the question is: How do we find another $11 million without cutting into essential programs?

I will use an analogy that will be understood by most members of this House. Certainly it will be understood in parts of this country where they still use the soup bone to get a last bit of nourishment from the bit of beef they had the day before for dinner. I say to my friend from Gander—Grand Falls that this is the kind of analogy with which he and his people would identify with. They, like my people in Burin—St. George's, often resort to the soup bone. This is not because they are all poverty stricken, although many of them are hurting, but because they are resourceful. They do not believe in throwing away anything. The analogy I am reaching for is that however good the soup bone is and the bit of meat that might be left on it and the pot of soup it might make, you cannot have a steak dinner on a soup bone.

In the same context, you cannot find in the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, money that is no longer there. You cannot have the luxury of cutting from fisheries and oceans money that is so desperately needed. Indeed, at this particular time there ought to be a

fairly massive shift of funding into fisheries and oceans and other departments.

Let me address the expenditure cuts of last week amounting to $350 million in the context that the Prime Minister brought them forward. In fairness to him, he said that these cutbacks were being implemented in relation to the expenditures we were incurring in the Persian Gulf.

He will find no argument from this member. I believe he will find no argument from any member of this Chamber that we must pay our way if we incur certain expenses in the Persian Gulf or wherever. We must have a financial plan to ensure that we are not out spending like a drunken sailor but that we are spending in a way that we know we can pay the bills when they become due. I have no argument whatsoever with the marvellous concept that if we are to incur expenditures in the Persian Gulf or wherever, we ought to be there with a plan as to how we are to pay the bills.

I also say to the Prime Minister and others who are saddled with the need to find ways to pay the bills in the Persian Gulf, that these are commitments that every Canadian would proudly stand behind. There is a need to ensure that our interests in the Persian Gulf are adequately protected. However there is a but.

I understand that the government has to find ways to meet the financial obligations in the Persian Gulf, and with that I have no argument. I have great difficulty with the way it is being done. I believe it is unconscionable that at a time when fisheries is hurting it cuts even more deeply into the soup bone I mentioned earlier. At a time when agriculture is on its knees, the government is wanting to take another $12 million. At a time when the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency is already strapped for funds, it is reaching out once more to take money from it. At a time when we need infrastructure and expenditures in transport in Atlantic Canada, it is reaching in and taking out $31 million. At a time when the government has already cut the guts out of its commitment to unemployment insurance, it is now going to the Department of Employment and Immigration and reaching in for another $25 million.

I have no difficulty with the idea that there is a need to meet our commitments in the gulf. I have much difficulty with the way it is being done. If the government wants a way to find that $500 million, it is fairly simple. It can renege on that cowardly and secret commitment it made to the Americans. The former member for York–Peel, Mr. Sinclair Stevens, mentioned it a few days ago in the press. He publicly confirmed what we have been saying for four or five years, that there had to be a cooked deal on interest rates. There is no other explanation why our interest rates are 5 percentage points higher. I say to my friend from St. John's East that there is no explanation for that. I have always understood the idea that they ought to be maybe marginally higher.

**Mr. Reid:** You told us that we can't manage the economy, and we stabilized the interest rate.

**Mr. Simmons:** I missed the brunt of what my friend from St. John's East was saying. I invite him one more time.

**Mr. Reid:** You never understood me.

**Mr. Simmons:** I understand him all too well. I just do not agree with him. There is the difference. I even admire the way he defends his stands, however wrongly arrived at.

**Mr. Richardson:** That's the Christmas season.

**Mr. Simmons:** As I was saying, the member has no worries about his intellectual stature. It is well up there. I have no difficulty with that at all. The physical height was not of his doing, but what he has done with what he had is marvellous and I congratulate him.

Let us get back to the subject at hand. I have something to say to the hon. member for St. John's East and to others. My good friend from Burlington is chafing at the bit to respond to what I have to say, but would he hear first what I have to say. There is no earthly reason he can give this House as to why our interest rates ought to be 5 percentage points higher than they are in the States.

I can buy the idea that maybe they ought to be marginally higher, a point or point and a half, to attract some investment over the border. However, they ought not to be 5 per cent. There had to be some convoluted reason why they were, and Sinc Stevens gave us that convoluted reason the other day when he said publicly that there was a deal back there, something that many of us have felt for a long time. Otherwise, in the absence of

an undertaking to artificially keep those rates high, there is no market reason why they would be as high. There had to be tampering, and that is what Sinc Stevens told us the other day. I understand that his former colleagues now want to disown him on that, but that is between him and them. I am not here to make the brief for him. What I am saying is that unwittingly or otherwise he let the cat out of the bag the other day. We now know. We now have confirmed what a lot of us suspected for a long time.

I come to the point as it relates to today's debate. If the government wants to find $500 million or whatever amount to finance its gulf operation, I have a suggestion for it. Cut interest rates by 1 per cent, and it will find not $500 million but $1.7 billion, because that is what will be generated. As my hon. friend from Glengarry—Prescott—Russell well knows, what will be generated by 1 percentage point cut in the interest rate will be $1.7 billion.

• (1640)

Let me say it differently. Our commitment in terms of deficit reduction will go down. Our required commitment will go down by $1.7 billion just by cutting our interest rates 1 per cent. If the government wants a sure way, a quick way and a painless way of paying the bills in the gulf, I give that one to my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, without charge.

**Mr. Boudria:** Carried. Let's do it now.

**Mr. Simmons:** My friend from Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, being a charitable man, jumps to the conclusion that the government will take it because it is sensible. I say to him that had it been of the inclination long ago to take things that are sensible, we would be in a lot less trouble in this country than we are.

The reason for which we are in the financial mess we are in is that this government paid lip service right back in the fall of 1984 when the minister brought down his first budget after the September election. It is worth reading. I went back the other night and read it again. I got a kick out of Grimm's Fairy Tales when I was younger, but this one really turns you on. If you want to read a modern day myth, you should hear what the Minister of Finance actually said with a straight face. He said to all of Canada back in late 1984 what he was going to do to bring down the deficit, how it was going to be a new world, how it was going to be marvellous out there, and everything was going to be hunky-dory.

We are in 1990 and we know what hunky-dory is. Hunky-dory is an unemployment rate of 18 per cent in Newfoundland, higher than it has been in years. The unemployment rate is skyrocketing all over the country. People are being pummelled in terms of their own unemployment insurance. People are being pummelled in terms of their jobs in the fishery. The government allowed overfishing to get completely out of hand before it even began to pay lip service.

I stood in this House in December 1988, soon after the November election that year, and I raised the question of foreign overfishing. My hon. friend from St. John's West, the Minister for International Trade and the then Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, the now Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, laughed me out of the place. They literally laughed me out of the Chamber because I would suggest that there was a problem. More to the point, they tried to laugh me out of the place because I suggested that the solution was to start getting tough with the European Community about the overfishing by Spain and Portugal in particular.

That year, 1988, was the fourth year of scandalous, criminal overfishing. The Portuguese and the Spanish as part of the European Community were allowed in 1985 to take 23,200 tonnes. In that year, they took 172,000 tonnes. The next year they took 12 times their quota, and so it went on. Four years after, I was the first person in four years to raise it in this House. Not one person raised it publicly in 1985, 1986, 1987 or 1988; it was not raised publicly. I raised it here for the first time in December 1988, and I was told I did not know what I was talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask you to go back and read the words of the member for St. John's West and the minister of fisheries as he then was. Then read the press release put out last week by the present Minister of Fisheries and Oceans from New Brunswick and the Minister for International Trade. Do you know what they said? Almost word for word, they said what I was saying in December 1988 about the nature of the problem over there and what needs to be done about it. They were saying what my hon. friend from Gander—Grand Falls has been saying and what my hon. friend from Bona-vista—Trinity—Conception has been saying. We three, not to ignore the others from Newfoundland and Atlantic Canada, sit literally on the ocean; our ridings sit facing the ocean. What happens out there very seriously im-

pacts the ability of our people to earn a livelihood because their livelihood is the ocean. If the Portuguese, the Spanish and the French take it, our people cannot have the same fish the next day. You cannot catch it twice.

If a government of whatever political stripe stands idly by, or aids and abets the process by silence for four years, then our people suffer and our plants close, not because the resource is not there but because somebody else is getting their claws on it before our people do, aided and abetted by a government that ought to be protecting our interests.

Mr. Speaker, I see from your signal that I am getting close to the end of my allotted time. I know that before you became a very able Acting Speaker, you were a very able football player and I suspect that some of the signals I am getting now are about football. I do not know much about football, but I think the general message is I should sit down fairly soon. I will try to do that within a minute. My friend from St. John's is much more direct. He wants more.

I am sure he will recognize the truth of what I said about the overfishing and the fact that, as they say in French, *Mieux vaut tard que jamais*, better late than never. Even if my friend from St. John's West and the Minister of Fisheries have come lately to the job, lately to the need, lately to the realization that something has to be done about the overfishing, I say to them, better late than never. A lot of damage has been done, a lot of jobs have been lost, but at least by getting in now, five years late, they are not going to be 10 years late, and for that we can be thankful.

This Financial Administration Act needs amendment. All the amendments in the world are absolutely useless, absolutely beside the point, if we do not have in government somebody who administers that act competently. That right now is the crux of the problem. It is why our people are suffering. It is why the government is going in all the wrong directions to fund our overseas commitment in the Persian Gulf.

If it would instead get a sensible interest rate policy, fire John Crow and get someone there who understands how people are hurting, who understands that government is not first a business. It is an enterprise which ought to look after the needs of people. If government were a business alone, we would not need a government. We would just have one of the big multinational corporations run the whole thing for us. We need government, but by that, we need a government worthy of the name. That is our problem right now.

**Mr. Bill Kempling (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Burin—St. George's in the course of his comments made the remark that someone had said to him that he did not know what he was talking about. I have to concur with whoever that was.

In the course of his remarks he said that Mr. Stevens had made some comment about interest rates. He should read the newspapers again. There was no comment made about interest rates at all. Mr. Stevens apparently was reflecting on a conversation he had with the former Secretary of Commerce of the United States, Mr. Baldrige. They were talking about the level of the dollar, not the level of interest rates.

They were not talking about interest rates at all and that was confirmed by the Minister for International Trade of the day who is now in the Senate, the Minister of Finance, the chief negotiator for the government, the deputy negotiator for the government and several others who were involved in it. There was no mention of interest rates whatever, no mention of the dollar whatever.

**Mr. Simmons:** I thank my friend from Burlington. As usual he is half right. Let me deal with the first half first and then I will come to the matter about the interest rate versus the dollar. On the first half he said that I had said that I was told that I did not know what I was talking about. The answer to his question as to who told me was in my earlier speech. The member for St. John's West and the then Minister of Fisheries said I did not know what I was talking about when I talked about the damage overfishing was doing.

If he wants to stand in front of 100,000 fishermen in Atlantic Canada and tell them there is no overfishing, then he had better try harder and shout louder because the message is going to be difficult getting through when people sit in their homes in Seal Cove—I know he does not want to hear this, but I am going to tell him anyway—people sit in their homes in Seal Cove. They

see their stocks being raped by fishermen from France, Spain and Portugal. Yes, I knew what I was talking about. Whether the member for Burlington agrees that I knew does not bother me. Let me thank him and say that he is absolutely right on the second. I made an error. I was inadvertently saying interest rates. Of course, what Mr. Stevens had to say was about the dollar. I thank him very much for correcting the record on that.

• (1650)

I believe he will agree that if you follow the argument through that I was making, it applies equally to the dollar as it does to interest rates because the two matters are related.

The argument basically was that there had been a convoluted undertaking by the Government of Canada to a foreign power to give that government a say, leverage, in our internal affairs. The level of our dollar is wiping out the exports in Newfoundland on fish, pulp and paper, and mining. It is wiping them out because of the level of the dollar.

Now we know what we have suspected for a long time, that our jobs in Newfoundland and elsewhere in Atlantic Canada—wherever there are resource industries with exports flowing from them—are being sacrificed because according to Mr. Stevens, and confirmed by the minister as the member for Burnaby has reminded us, there was a deal to artificially peg the level of the dollar up around 85 cents to 90 cents—85 at the moment but the objective was close to 90.

**Mr. Boudria:** By increasing interest rates.

**Mr. Simmons:** In the process, they sacrificed thousands of jobs. Of course, as my friend for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell reminds me, and the member for Burlington will well know, the matter of how the dollar got to be up close to 90 is not exactly unrelated to interest rates and their level, and vice-versa.

I thank the member very much for correcting me. It goes to show that once in awhile one can make a mistake in this House. There is somebody alert here, like the member for Burlington to put me on the right track. I thank him for that. In the process, I thank him for allowing me to make the point that the high dollar is also killing jobs in Newfoundland the rest of Canada.

**Mr. Kempling:** You don't know what you are talking about.

**Mr. Bill Attewell (Markham—Whitchurch—Stouffville):** Mr. Speaker, near the end of the member's speech, he mentioned the word "competence", I believe it was. I am honestly surprised that anyone who was in a Liberal government with any knowledge of the spending habits of that party could even talk about restraint.

Let me just give you a couple of figures, Mr. Speaker. In the five years prior to us assuming power in 1984, the average level of spending by the Liberal government, excluding interest rates, if I recall correctly, was over 14 per cent. It doubles in about five years at that rate of expenses. The previous five years to that was a little over 10 per cent as I recall. The previous five years to that, again under the Liberal government was over 17 per cent a year.

In six years, our average annual increase has been a marvellous 3.5 per cent, under the rate of inflation. We never hear them mention that type of thing because they are too embarrassed about their 15-year record—and they should be—when spending got totally out of control by that previous government.

We have turned from an operating deficit to an operating surplus, a turnaround of about $25 billion. They have the nerve to question the competence of the track record of this government. I wish he would look back on his own and maybe we could chat a bit about that when I see him in the gym tomorrow morning.

**Mr. Simmons:** I say to my friend for Markham—Whitchurch—Stouffville all of that was fair play except the last sentence. The last sentence is getting dangerously into my personal life when he talks about our being in the gym at seven o'clock in the morning trying to keep in shape. He is very good company. We do not always agree, as I am sure you have just seen, but he is very good company.

I thank the hon. member also for bringing to the debate—and this is the beauty of this period, this 10-minute question and answer—it puts another flavour on the debate. He has brought the debate to another side of the issue.

He talks about not having the courage—whatever word he used—to put forward the argument. No. He knows the process very well. My job is not to stand here and praise the government for any good things it might do. It is not what I am sent here for at all. I am sent here to keep the government accountable. I fully expect that if the government does some good things I can depend

on the competence of the gentleman from Markham to make sure that it is known. Listen to our title—Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. We are here to poke holes in what that crowd does, and it is an easy job because there are so many places to poke the holes. We are not here as acolytes for the fellow from Baie Comeau.

Do not ever be under the impression that I am going to be out singing the praises of this government. If it does something that is particularly laudable, I will get up and swallow my pride and congratulate them. But I do not find it laudable that it went off and cooked the Canadian dollar up around 85 cents to satisfy the Americans on the free trade issue. I do not find it laudable that high interest rates are artificially pegged. My people in Burin—St. George's and elsewhere are hurting because they are paying a much higher mortgage than they ought to be.

The gentleman from Markham and I are not really at odds to the degree that he might suggest. He happens to be in a party where he has to be an acolyte. He has to say all the good things about that crowd and shut up about the rest. That is his problem, not mine.

In my case, I happen to be part of the Official Opposition whose job it is to point out that the cutbacks this government has inflicted over the past six years are hurting the poor, are robbing people of their jobs. If he thinks I am going to stand here and ignore what it is doing to my people, I will not. He might shout, but he might keep his cool as well because the effect will be the same on me.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I have a very short question. First of all, I want to congratulate my colleague for his excellent remarks. I am sure I speak on behalf of most members of this House who probably inadvertently forgot to mention that when they rose to ask a question of my colleague.

Does he not find that the argument of the government that it needed the supplementary estimates in order to pay for the gulf war just a little shallow when, in fact, far more money will be spent to administer the GST than will ever be used in any effort that is presently contemplated in the Persian Gulf? Does he not agree with me that the funds that will be used to collect the GST, just that surplus portion of $365 million, could be far better used to assist either the fishermen in his riding or the unemployed people in Hawkesbury and elsewhere in Glengarry—Prescott—Russell?

**Mr. Simmons:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Glengarry—Prescott—Russell because he hits the nail right on the head, as he usually does. Of course, it is a very shallow argument. When he mentions the GST, he reminds me, because he has made the first argument so well, I need not repeat it. Let me give him a parallel argument which reinforces the very point that he makes rhetorically in his question.

I heard the other day that the government wants to pay all the people out there the tax credit before Christmas. But it cannot do it unless the big, bad Liberal senators stop filibustering and pass the bill. The government cannot pay or draw money until the bill is passed.

Now, what kind of double-talk is that when the same government that cannot pay tax credits to people who are wondering whether they will have a Christmas or not, sitting on the edge of their chairs waiting to know if they will get the tax return in time for Christmas, and are being held to ransom, being blackmailed by this government, the same government that cannot find the money to pay the tax credit, is actually spending equivalent amounts of money renting four floors in the hotel over here to administer the GST? It had to pay money down for that, did it not? It is spending millions on TV. What Canadian, even those waiting for the cheques out there, has not seen those foolish ads on TV? Do you think they get them for nothing? They cost money. How come? I ask you, Mr. Speaker—and I am just about through—how come the government that cannot find money to pay the tax credit before the bill goes through can find globs of money to rent four floors of a hotel to administer the GST, and for all the other foolish reasons, the hot line and so on. What hypocrisy! What shallowness!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions and comments are now terminated. Debate. The hon. member for Essex—Windsor. I have to recognize the NDP. The last five speakers have been from the Liberal Party so I will recognize the hon. member for Essex—Windsor.

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Mr. Speaker, I am spurred, I guess, by the comments of the previous speaker and by the question which the hon. member for Burlington put before this House with respect to the whole question of the value of our dollar and the relationship of that to the free trade agreement.

• (1700 )

This is, of course, something which is, one would have to concede, only tendentiously connected to the piece of legislation which is in front of us. But since it has come up in debate, I wanted to add just a few comments in respect of some of the exchanges which have been taking place.

We have not had a chance in the House actually to debate the rather extraordinary comments which a former Minister of Industry in this government made this past weekend with respect to a gentleman's agreement, as he put it, to see to it that the value of the Canadian dollar was raised quite significantly. There was some exchange which took place in Question Period and I happened to be in my constituency at that time. It has been only since my return that I have had a chance to see some of the comments of the Minister of Finance with respect to these comments of the former Minister of Industry of the Conservative government, Mr. Stevens.

Mr. Stevens suggested, on the basis of his discussions with Commerce Secretary Malcolm Baldrige, who was essentially in many respects Mr. Stevens' counterpart in the U.S. administration. He suggested in 1985, according to Mr. Stevens, that it was going to be essential that the dollar be raised in value if a free trade deal was going to take place.

This suggestion by the former Minister of Industry in the Conservative government was met by the Minister of Finance with statements of complete dismissal. On Monday, he put it in the following terms. He said:

> —that the statement was absurd speculation, but it is simply also not true.

He went on from that to say:

> I would remind my hon. friend that Mr. Stevens was basing his speculative comments on a conversation that he had with a man who was not involved in the negotiations and a conversation that was held some two years before the final negotiations were completed.

That might seem to put an end to this whole issue very clearly and to any speculation that might exist on this side of the House. In tracing this issue through the past five years—since the time that the supposed conversation took place between Mr. Stevens and the U.S. Commerce Secretary—we found that in fact this was not the only occasion on which this question of the value of the Canadian dollar was raised in prominent terms in the context of discussion of the Canadian trade deal, not by Canadians, not by the opposition attempting to suggest that something underhanded was taking place, but instead by senior Americans who were in fact, unlike the reference in Mr. Wilson's statement, deeply involved in the negotiations with respect to free trade. These questions were raised, not just by such people, but they were raised after negotiations had already started with the United States with respect to a free trade deal.

Unfortunately, many of us would have to put a lack of strong faith into the recollections, five years after the fact, of a former minister of industry of this government who, after all, did have to resign in rather unfortunate circumstances. Despite our scepticism about that minister, the fact of the matter is that in the aftermath of that 1985 period there continued to be right up to 1987, the year in which the free trade negotiations were concluded, continuing comments on the part of key American officials with respect to this issue.

I want to note some of these for Canadians who are perhaps perplexed at the very quick way in which the serious suggestions of the former minister of industry were dismissed by the Minister of Finance. I will first quote from the person who was the negotiator from the United States, Peter Murphy, who wrote a memo in April of 1986. This was considerably after the discussions with Mr. Baldrige. He directed this memo to the members of the Canadian task force senior staff, that is, the people who were in charge of negotiating with the Canadian delegation with respect to free trade.

The memo came from Ambassador Murphy and the subject was Canadian negotiations. It stated: "Now that we have squeaked by in the Senate, the hard part starts. We have to prepare for the negotiations." He went on to review a number of key points which would be important to consider in the course of the negotiations. He noted only six points, so this was one of quite a small number of important points that he made. One of the important

issues to consider was "the direction and situation of exchange rates over the last 10 years, and efforts, if any, to change it, both in Canada and the United States." That might be seen simply as a small point and simply a review of what past exchange rates had been.

It is interesting that at the same time, virtually, in fact about a month later, James Baker, the United States Treasury Secretary at that point, had this to say. We all know that he is now the Foreign Secretary, but at that point he was the Treasury Secretary. The following appeared in a story by Alan Toulin, who now works for *The Financial Post*: "Yesterday Baker told a Senate committee that entry of Canada and Italy into the G–5 could swing the spotlight on to the economic policies of both countries and require them to meet policy goals set by the G–5."

• (1710)

Again, it was a relatively innocuous comment, one might think, until further on in the story one gets the following comment: "'Re–evaluating the Canadian dollar could also figure in the free trade negotiations slated to begin today,' U.S. Senator Daniel Evans said yesterday in a CBC interview."

One might think that this, again, is a relatively insignificant act, but what is fascinating is that these kinds of comments continue throughout 1986. In a story from September 10, 1986 written by Jonathan Ferguson who reported on U.S. Secretary Malcolm Baldrige speaking before a committee of the House of Representatives in Washington. This is precisely the same person who the former minister of industry in this Conservative government said in 1985 had told him that it was essential to get the Canadian dollar higher. A year later, September 10, 1986, after the free trade negotiations had started, he is saying precisely the same thing and I quote from this story by Jonathan Ferguson: "U.S. Commerce Secretary Malcolm Baldrige told a committee of the House of Representatives in Washington yesterday that an increase in the value of the Canadian dollar would help ease the record U.S. trade deficit."

Well, again, one might say this is just an idle comment by somebody who was not deeply involved in these issues.

Then there is a front page story from *The Ottawa Citizen* of November 21, 1986 in which Peter Murphy, who was the chief United States negotiator in these free trade negotiations, speaks out. This story, written by Wendy Warburton, starts as follows: "'The U.S. Congress would likely want changes in Canada's exchange rate, the value of the Canadian dollar compared to the U.S. dollar, before it would pass a free trade agreement,' American trade negotiator Peter Murphy said Thursday."

He went on to say that this was being looked at by Treasury Secretary James Baker. That is a direct quote. "Secretary Baker is dealing with that, but what you cannot do is separate that in the mind–set of the Congress who will vote for a deal, that is for a free trade deal, or vote against it". Here we have Mr. Murphy talking in these terms.

We followed up on some of these comments by these various people who have been noted here. There are, for instance, Malcolm Baldrige's comments from the testimony which he presented to the House of Representatives which has been quoted here from September. It is quite clear. He is talking about the United States dollar and he said: "The U.S. dollar remains strong against the currencies of countries accounting for over half of our total trade, including our largest trading partner, Canada". He went on to say: "We are seeking discussions with a number of countries on the exchange rate issue. Progress there would be beneficial".

James Baker, in his testimony to the committee on finance in the United States Senate said: "There is not a lot we can do about those countries that tie their currencies to ours", and he goes on to talk about other countries, "but I think the fact there has been a depreciation of the dollar, that is the U.S. dollar, will help our trading relationship with those countries by putting more pressure on their markets and less on ours".

Finally, I would stress that despite the fact that Mr. Reisman, the Canadian negotiator in 1987, said: "We will not discuss the dollar in any way, shape or form", January 17, 1987, he did this in the aftermath of the comments by Mr. Murphy, the U.S. negotiator, in which he made it quite clear that the value of the Canadian dollar was quite important in consideration of the U.S. trade deal.

I have to conclude with two observations. The first observation is that Mr. Reisman walked out of the negotiations at a very late stage. It was never entirely clear and he never entirely indicated why he had walked out of those negotiations. I wonder if it was because something which he had said would not be on the table suddenly became crucial in the latter stages of that negotiation. I wonder if that is the case.

Finally, I think we have to conclude that Mr. Wilson's comments that this is not something to consider seriously, what Mr. Sinclair Stevens suggested last Sunday, because it took place well before the trade negotiations started and because it was based on conversations with someone who was not even in those negotiations, that that denial in fact itself holds no water. We can see from these comments that I have quoted to the House today that after that time, in fact after the negotiations had started with the United States, senior figures on the United States side, who were in charge of those negotiations, such as Peter Murphy and James Baker, did in fact talk directly and in terms of joining the question of the value of our dollar with whether or not the free trade deal would be accepted. Given the fact that they spoke in those terms, is there in fact any reason to reject the suggestions which Mr. Stevens made this past Sunday?

• (1720 )

I think there may not be a clear smoking gun here, but there certainly is a great deal of evidence from the period when negotiations were taking place, from people who were part of those negotiations that in fact the United States saw the value of our dollar as a key component with respect to the free trade deal.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret the hon. member's time has expired. Questions or comments.

**Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the contribution that the member from Windsor has made to this debate.

There is no question in my mind that the exchange rates between Canada and the United States were a key component throughout the trade discussions between Canada and the United States. I wonder how a so-called free trade agreement can possibly exist, unless there are arrangements made to stabilize the relationships between currencies.

As I recall from the discussions we had in British Columbia around the softwood lumber problem and the threat of American trade retaliation against our softwood lumber, the currency was the major issue.

Even though the Americans used the excuse of the stumpage rates in a number of Canadian provinces, American senators and congressmen whom I met when the Gibbons committee travelled to Vancouver indicated to us that, when they saw Canadian lumber coming into places like Little Rock, Arkansas and selling at a price, because of the value of the Canadian dollar, far below what Arkansas lumber fetched in the Little Rock market, their sawmills shut down.

Their lumber workers were out of work, and they, as U.S. congressmen and senators, were going to take any action necessary, legal or otherwise, in order to reverse the situation.

The specific problem that they identified was the decline in Canadian currency relative to the American currency. That precipitated a retaliation by the American softwood lumber industry against Canada.

I cannot see how it is possible that free trade discussions took place between Canada and the U.S. without some currency pegging arrangements being made, whether it was an insistence by the Americans that the government in Canada raised interest rates in order to keep the value of our dollar propped, or whether some other arrangements were made behind the curtain between the Conservative government's negotiators and the American negotiators.

I just cannot understand a free trade arrangement existing without some currency pegging arrangements existing at the same time. I would appreciate if the member would respond to that.

**Mr. Langdon:** Mr. Speaker, I think that the member is quite right in pointing to the fact that the exchange rate was the common issue which American politicians, in discussing trade issues with Canada throughout that whole period, emphasized in their discussions.

We certainly found that to be the case. For example, when a delegation of American congressmen came here to talk about grain issues, it was the low value of the Canadian dollar at that stage which was of particular concern to them.

Precisely the same thing is true with respect to the objections under the auto pact which were put forward from Michigan. The various congressmen and senators from the state of Michigan who were concerned about Canadian exports under the auto pact into the United States emphasized the low value of the Canadian dollar.

I think that one has that set of evidence to look at. One has the set of evidence that I have talked about today. One has as well the fact that ever since the trade deal has come into effect, a gap has grown between interest rates in this country and in the United States, which is something which we have never seen historically in this country at that kind of level.

We are talking about a percentage point difference of from four to five percentage points which, given the fact that inflation rates are very similar between the two countries, means that the only conceivable consequence of that huge gap in interest rates would be to raise the value of the Canadian dollar.

We have not seen a reduction in the Canadian inflation rate relative to the American inflation rate. What we have seen is what all these people were suggesting was necessary for the free trade deal and that is a marked increase in the value of the Canadian dollar from the level of about 73 cents, which it was in 1985, to the level of approximately 86 cents, which it presently is.

Of course, that is damaging in the extreme to all of our exporters no matter which part of the country they are in; British Columbia, Ontario, Quebec, or Atlantic Canada. It is an incredibly damaging blow to our potential as a country to provide jobs and incomes.

The facts, therefore, speak for themselves. It is those facts that we have to look at in judging whether or not Mr. Stevens' comments this past weekend should be taken seriously or not. Do the facts conform with what Mr. Stevens suggested? Unfortunately, for the government, and unfortunately for its suggestions that this is not the case, the facts indeed do conform exactly with what one would expect to have taken place if Mr. Stevens had indeed been telling the truth.

I have to say that the statement of this past week demonstrates yet again the irresponsibility of this government which has led to the damage which this economy is now suffering, the first made in Canada recession which Canada has ever experienced.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions and comments are now terminated. Debate.

**Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls):** Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I understand that I am the last speaker on this particular bill before the House which is the Financial Administration Act.

I have just a couple of points concerning provisions in the bill that are, quite frankly, bad legislation for the people of Canada. One of them deals with collection agencies. One deals with saltfish, and the other one could deal with air traffic control centres in Vancouver and in eastern Canada.

The first one concerns collection agencies. Clause 5 of the bill enables the Government of Canada to hire collection agencies in any department, in any Crown corporation, in any agency of the federal government to collect moneys that are owed the Government of Canada. Collection agencies.

The Minister of Justice is sitting here. The minister knows the procedure today whereby a department of government collects it money.

• (1730 )

First, a person is given a reasonable opportunity to make the payment. If that fails and if the person defaults on his or her payments, then perhaps through a third party attachment the wages are attached. Or, the person who is due money by that agency or that department has it taken off a bit at a time.

That is the standard procedure used by the Government of Canada and its departments. In legislation passed by this Chamber we have clauses in certain bills that terminate moneys owed to the Government of Canada over certain periods of time. In other words, there are two ways in which something can be forgiven. One is, in certain legislation, if it imposes undue hardship on the person involved. Second, in some legislation there is a time limit. In other words, in some legislation it is set out that moneys cannot be collected beyond three years from the date at which the individual was notified that he or she owed money to the department.

Now that is the jurisprudence we have in Canada today. That is reasonable law. What is the Minister of Justice and the Government of Canada doing by putting forward this proposed legislation and saying throughout the legislation that collection agencies are now to be used by the Government of Canada, not only in the restricted sense that we have today to collect the student loans that are overdue but in every agency of the

Government of Canada and in every department? Now, circumventing the system, we have the imposition of collection agencies. Shame on the Minister of Justice for permitting this to pass through cabinet.

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** I don't chew my cabbage twice.

**Mr. Baker:** I hope that is on the record. The Minister of Justice has just made a statement; she says she does not chew her cabbage twice. I hope that she chews it at least once. This entire bill is enough to give anybody indigestion.

The second portion of the bill which is really objectionable is a new imposition on Crown corporations listed in schedule 3 of part X of the Financial Administration Act. There are three schedules, Mr. Speaker, as you know.

The first schedule includes government departments. The second schedule includes Crown corporations that are part of government departments, and the third schedule is wholly owned Crown corporations, owned by the Government of Canada. This bill imposes upon those Crown corporations an obligation to collect money and have a reasonable expectation that the corporation will pay dividends.

In other words, the whole intent of the legislation is that the Crown corporation becomes, through another part of the bill and using user fees in some cases, a money maker. That is the philosophy of the Government of Canada. CBC is not included in schedule 3 of the Financial Administration Act because it is considered to be a cultural institution which remains autonomous from section 3.

What will happen if we take the established Crown corporations of today to deal with the natural resources of Canada? I use as an example the Canadian Saltfish Corporation. Last week half of the people employed by that Crown corporation received their lay-off notices. The function of that Crown corporation was to provide marketing, to be the sole buyer and marketer of what we call saltfish, which is a fish that is cut open and then there is salt put on it. It is dried with salt on it.

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** Is that a recipe?

**Mr. Baker:** Back in my day, we used to dry them on what we called flakes, but now it is automatic drying machines.

The Canadian Saltfish Corporation fulfilled that vital function. Now it is in trouble because it owes a lot of money to the Government of Canada. That is a relatively new phenomenon. What caused it? The Government of Canada caused it. The Government of Canada, to my way of thinking, in my estimation, caused the crisis in the fishing industry in Canada.

**An hon. member:** How did it do that?

**Mr. Baker:** The member asks how the government caused the problem. Today I received an update on the numbers of licences issued to foreign interests in Canadian waters so far this year. It comes to 135 factory ship licences issued to Cuba, Japan, U.S.S.R., Bulgaria, Norway, Poland, and the U.S.A. That is an increase over last year. That is an increase over the year before last.

Who caused the crisis in the fishery in eastern Canada? If we have a larger fleet from a foreign nation fishing inside our 200-mile zone, licensed by the Government of Canada, a larger offshore fleet than we have in Canada, then we know that something is wrong. I am not talking about outside the 200-mile zone that the hon. member spoke about a few moments ago. I was going to mention to him about the Namibia connection, a recent phenomenon in Canada. Namibia, a country in the southern portion of Africa, declared about three weeks ago that it was going to tell every foreign nation to get out of its waters. It did it. Imagine, the Government of Namibia. I checked and I found that there were about 100 factory ships from Europe in its zone in Namibia. Namibia threatened them. They left about two and one-half weeks ago, and they steamed right up through the Atlantic Ocean. Where did they go, some of them? They went right up, off the east coast of Canada, and they started to fish just outside the 200-mile zone in the shallow water.

Our search planes and survey planes for the last two weeks have been flying over these ships. They take photographs. They have very sophisticated machinery aboard to observe what these vessels are doing. They discovered that some of the ships that were chased from Namibia were out off the east coast of Canada, and they were catching a type of flatfish. They will destroy that particular species. I am not talking about the disaster that is happening outside, because even countries in

Africa that do not have our expertise in the fishery and do not have advanced fishing technology in place, are kicking out those foreign nations. Those foreign boats do not have very many places to go now, so one of the places they pick on is our Canadian east coast.

• (1740)

I am not talking about outside 200 miles, because we do not have jurisdiction, but we have jurisdiction for these licences granted to Cuba, Japan, the U.S.S.R., Bulgaria, Norway, Poland, and the U.S.A. We have jurisdiction tomorrow when a Japanese vessel comes in to port in Halifax, Nova Scotia, and gets from fisheries and oceans tomorrow afternoon a licence to fish what we commonly call turbot inside our 200-mile zone in areas called 2-G and 2-H off the Labrador coast.

What does that have to do with the bill? That has everything to do with the bill, because the Canadian Saltfish Corporation is paying for the follies of the Government of Canada. It is in a position where it owes money. It is being disbanded. Why else would the Government of Canada issue half or 50 per cent lay-off notices to all its staff in eastern Canada? It is an outrage.

Another portion of the bill authorizes the collection of user fees from the federal government. Imagine one government department charging another government department for use of its services. That is what it says in this bill. Another portion of the bill gives authority to charge provincial governments user fees for their services.

In the last intervention I said that I would mention in conclusion the authority given, as the government had announced prior to this bill, to government departments to collect revenues and to use those revenues as expenditures in their own departments. That is what it does in section 12 of the act. It allows a department to do it. It says that a department may be authorized to do it.

We are faced today in Canada with the probable closure of air traffic control services in western Canada, in British Columbia, and in the far east of our great country. We are facing that because the Government of Canada and the Auditor General, I believe, determined that the work being done in those control centres could be done in a control centre in downtown Montreal.

That is one side of the picture, but that department of the Government of Canada collects revenues that far exceed their expenditures. What happens to those revenues? They go into what we call the Consolidated Revenue Fund. They do not go into the Department of Transport to keep these operations going. If we examine the figures of air traffic control stations in British Columbia and in eastern Canada, in Newfoundland or New Brunswick, we would discover an interesting fact. The system is that a foreign aircraft carrier which comes within a national airspace pays a fee for the air traffic control services it gets. It is about $85 per initial contact. That is the way it is worded. Then it pays another fee, about $50 I believe—it used to be $40—for what we used to call radio services. That is when you speak to somebody about weather conditions and the like.

The average fee is $100 per initial contact for these trans-Pacific and trans-oceanic flights. There are about 500 a day on average, west coast, and east coast. That would cost approximately $50,000 a day. Air traffic control generates about $15 million to $20 million a year in eastern and western Canada. That money goes into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. They make more than they spend. They are not only making their salaries, they are making double their salaries. But that does not show up in the department. That is not what this means. What this means is that where the government so wishes, a government department may be encouraged to charge fees which will then become a part of a pot of money within that department that can be spent as they see fit.

The legislation, Mr. Speaker, is incomplete. The legislation should say that each government department which generates revenue will receive that revenue and will be responsible for that revenue.

In conclusion, let me say that this is a very bad piece of legislation. It is a terrible piece of legislation. It will increase charges on the general public, on provincial governments, and it will lead the Government of Canada down some very poor paths as far as collecting money is concerned from a lot of poor people in this country.

**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 and referred to a legislative committee.

* * *

## FISHERIES ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Monday, November 28, consideration of Bill C-74, an act to amend the Fisheries Act and to amend the Criminal Code in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING—MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** There are three report stage motions on today's Notice Paper in amendment to Bill C-74, an act to amend the Fisheries Act and to amend the Criminal Code in consequence thereof.

There is an error for which the Chair and the Table apologize. Four motions were received prior to six o'clock p.m. last night. The motion omitted is in the name of the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley. Copies of this motion are available at the Table. It becomes Motion No. 4.

Motion No. 1 standing in the name of the hon. member for Gander—Grand Falls causes the Chair some concern because it seeks to introduce into the bill the licensing of fishing vessels, a subject which goes beyond the scope of Bill C-74, as agreed to at second reading. By doing so the hon. member is reaching into the Fisheries Act to amend Section 7, in contravention of Citation 773, paragraph (8) (a) and (b) of Beauchesne's fifth edition, which reads as follows:

> (a) An amendment may not amend a statute which is not before the committee.
>
> (b) An amendment may not amend sections from the original Act unless they are specifically being amended in a clause of the bill before the committee.

For this reason, it is with regret that I must rule the amendment out of order.

Motion No. 2, standing in the name of the hon. member for Cardigan is in order. It will be debated and voted on separately.

• (1750 )

Motion No. 3, standing in the name of the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley, deals with the tabling of the annual report by the minister on administration and enforcement of the provisions relating to fish habitat. While this motion is similar to an amendment that was moved, debated and defeated in committee, as a result of representations, I have decided to give the member the benefit of the doubt and allow the motion to go forward for debate in the House. It will be debated and voted on separately.

Motion No. 4 deals with a matter dealt with in committee. It is my understanding that, as a result of consultations and representations, this motion may now be more acceptable to the House. Motion No. 4 will be proposed to the House for a separate debate and vote.

I shall put Motion No. 2 to the House.

MEASURE TO AMEND

**Mr. Lawrence MacAulay (Cardigan)** moved:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-74 be amended in Clause 6

(a) by striking out lines 10 and 11 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"remove it within forty-eight hours after the com-";

(b) by striking out lines 15 to 17 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"along a beach or within a fishery for such a period exceeding forty-eight hours after the commencement of a close time as the fishery officer considers neces-".

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to speak to this motion that I have put forward.

What my amendment will do is restore the 48-hour time period for the removal of fishing gear, especially lobster traps, from the water. When I was reading the bill, this clause eliminating the 48-hour grace period was one that stuck in my mind.

When I went home to Prince Edward Island and spoke to the lobster fishermen in my riding, I asked them how this would affect them and received the same reply over and over. "It just won't work", they said. What happens when the weather is bad? What happens if the fisheries

officer will not let their gear stay in the water past the closing time of the season?

I told the fishermen that I was not sure what would happen but I would bring their concerns to the committee hearings and to the House of Commons. On two separate occasions I raised the issue in committee and both times my questions and the questions of my fishermen were not answered.

When we heard the assistant deputy minister, Mr. Haché, before the committee, I asked him if it would follow that at the end of the lobster season the traps, buoys and all would have to be out of the water; if the season ends on Saturday, everything must be removed by Saturday, which the ADM responded, that is correct. Later on, I asked Mr. Haché again, if we have a stormy day on Saturday, unless the fisheries officer desires, the traps would have to come out on Friday. I can see where this would create a problem in the lobster fishery where we come from. We have always had a couple of days, 48 hours, to remove the traps from the water. Again, the ADM responded by saying, "This is correct, Mr. Chairman. There has always been an additional day or two, depending on the weather, for the fishermen to haul their gear at the end of the season".

The government has gone on and on about how this amendment to the bill will allow more flexibility in the removal of gear. Indeed, I must have heard the word hundreds of times from the government in committee. However, fishermen in my riding see this as being anything but flexible. Fishermen say that it leaves them at the mercy of the fisheries officer who may or may not look kindly upon the fishermen. Fishermen are afraid of being put in the position that they can be harassed.

During the committee hearings we heard from witnesses who said that fisheries officers are also being harassed and I agree. There are fisheries officers who are being harassed by fishermen who deliberately break the law. However, there are instances where fishermen are also harassed by fisheries officers.

This clause which says that "a fisheries officer may permit" is just another way for our fishermen to be harassed. The problem is they may or may not permit them to leave their traps in the water for another 48 hours or if it is going to be stormy on the day the season closes, they could be forced to remove their traps possibly a day early.

It is my belief that the government's amendment to this section of the act is unnecessary. I asked the government officials if there were any problems under the old section, and they did not give me one example. They could not give me an example of any time this 48-hour grace period that our lobster fishermen had in order to have a reasonable amount of time at the end of the season to remove their traps caused difficulties.

Why was this done by the government? There is no answer. I think it could cause a problem for our fishermen. The fisheries officer might decide to give them the time, and he might not. Indeed, most fisheries officers that I deal with, or know, certainly would.

It puts the responsibility on the fishery officer, and the word "may" in the clause is very important: "They may, or they may not."

The official from the department could not point out a case. An old quote says: "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." I think this is the situation in this case. There is not a problem, so why do we here in this House create a problem for the lobster fishermen?

This government amendment is unnecessary and unwarranted. The fishermen in my riding say this will limit their flexibility in removing their gear. Of course, it certainly will complicate their flexibility.

My amendment will prevent harassment and provide greater flexibility by restoring the 48-hour time limit for the removal of fishing gear.

I urge the government members, some of whom truly understand how hard the fishermen work and how difficult it is on the sea to not place this extra burden on the fishermen and let's leave the 48-hour time period that we have had over the last number of years and treat our fishermen with respect.

**Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Mr. Speaker, I rise very briefly to let you and the House know that our party will be supporting the amendment being proposed by the member for Cardigan.

**Mr. Ross Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief.

I do have some empathy for my friend from Cardigan. As was discussed in the committee, the problem is that section 25 now deals not with fishing gear per se but with stakes, posts, buoys and other materials placed for fishing purposes. There is quite a difference.

The flexibility that he talks about, unfortunately, is not there. For that reason, I regret to say that, despite discussions and attempts, we cannot accept this amendment. The government will vote against it.

In the interests of dealing with report stage, I think you will find unanimous consent that we not see the clock at six o'clock, and agreement that we can be through this probably by 6.20 p.m. or 6.30 p.m., finish report stage and move on after that.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, our party is prepared to agree with that with the one proviso: that there be a time limit on this extension for the purposes of dealing with report stage only, that it not extend beyond 6.30 p.m. If by any chance, it would not be completed by then, we can further consult.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is that agreed?

**Mr. Gardiner:** We will agree to that.

**Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls):** Mr. Speaker, just for the record, the hon. member for Cardigan who brought in this amendment is absolutely correct.

Everything that the member said is absolutely correct. There is not one reason that the government can cite for not accepting his amendment. It is an outrage to make every fisherman a criminal if a season closes while he has gear in the water.

In other words, if the season closes at midnight and the announcement is made at 6 p.m., the fisherman is a criminal if the fisheries officer does not extend him the privilege of picking up his gear.

If it is bad weather, how bad? How big is his boat? Does he feel he can make it while another guy feels he cannot make it? Suppose Sunday is the next day. A lot of people respect Sunday and they will not go on the water. A lot of people. That is why the two-day notice was there in the first place in the act. It is outrageous, it is unbelievable. It really is an absolute outrage for the Government of Canada to place fishermen in Canada in the position that it is doing under this bill.

• (1800)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is the House ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Negatived on division.

Motion No. 2 negatived.

**Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley)** moved:

That Bill C-74 be amended by adding immediately after line 6 at page 5 the following new clause:

"11.(1) The said Act is amended by adding thereto, immediately after section 42 thereof, the following section:

"42.(1) The Minister shall, as soon as possible after the end of each fiscal year, prepare and cause to be laid before Parliament a report on the administration and enforcement of the provisions of this Act relating to fish habitat protection and pollution prevention for that year.

(2) The annual report shall include a statistical summary of convictions under section 40 for that year."

He said: Mr. Speaker, it certainly is a pleasure to have a chance to speak on Bill C-74 in the House today. I will be as brief as I can to make some of the points on my Motion No. 3, which you so graciously considered to present before the House, and, of course, I look forward to future debate and discussion on this bill when it returns to the House for third reading.

First, I would like to say how very interesting the witnesses we heard were when we were discussing this bill. We had witnesses from both coasts who gave us a firsthand account of their views about the fishing industry and, in particular, their concerns and comments on Bill C-74. That ranged from discussions about general offences, catch reporting, and what have you. A number of representations from the west coast in particular included concerns regarding habitat protection, which is the particular reference that I make in my amendment to the bill.

I am pleased to see that the government has seen fit to support this amendment. We did debate it in committee. There were some differences, but I am glad to see that on second thought the government can see the importance of my amendment. It will require the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to table in Parliament, annually, a report "on the administration and enforcement of the provisions of the act relating to fish habitat protection

and pollution prevention". It will also provide for a statistical summary of conviction under section 40 of the act.

It is very important that be included, because all of the witnesses who appeared before our committee agree—and it certainly has been a subject of public debate in British Columbia—about the need to ensure that the Fisheries Act and its rules and regulations are followed and complied with in the Pacific region and, of course, in the inland waters and on the east coast because there is concern that that in fact has not happened.

I asked questions of the witnesses based on the information and background material provided by the minister. In 1988, of some 959 fines in the Pacific region, 11 related to habitat protection and there was not a witness who thought that that adequately reflected the concerns that we have about protecting our salmon habitat on the west coast. By calling upon the minister to ensure that we have an annual report on this section, it is going to make it very clear for all members of the House and the general public to see exactly how we are dealing with that situation.

I am pleased with the government support. Tuesday, in the Environment Committee, the Minister of the Environment from British Columbia supported a full public hearing of the Alcan project which we have talked about in the House before. That is another example of the considerable debate around fish habitat and the need to ensure that we have the enforcement and compliance in the law by the fisheries officers carrying out the rules and regulations that we pass in this House.

This provision for an annual report is an important one, and I am glad to see that the House will be supporting it.

**Mr. Ross Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I have a small problem that I discussed with my colleague on which I would like your direction.

First, yes, the government does support this. I think it is an important step. It is not inconsistent with a number of other pieces of legislation, but I want it recognized that this information has to be gathered from a number of different departments, agencies, and provincial governments.

What I have discussed with my colleagues is probably an amendment to the amendment. I do not know quite how to proceed. It is a question of numbering. The new clause motion refers to 11(1). It should be 11.1. The proposed section reads 42(1). In fact, it should read 42.1(1). I think there is unanimous consent to make that change. It is purely a number change and I do not think there is any problem. I can certainly provide it to the Table if it is of any assistance.

Apart from that, we certainly support the motion of the hon member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley.

**Mr. Baker:** Mr. Speaker, it is just a matter of changing 11(1) to 11.1 and a matter of changing 42(1) to 42.1(1). It is quite clear and understood in the bill itself.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Agreed and so ordered.

**Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls):** Mr. Speaker, I would just put on the record that if you overfish and you catch fish that you are not licensed to catch, you will be convicted unless you do it on a foreign boat in Canadian waters.

Not only that, but what is happening off our coast is that, if a foreign nation catches more than it is legally allowed to catch, the observer comes in two weeks hence, reports it, and the ship is then moved either north, south, east or west. They do not have to throw away the incidental catch or the catch which is in excess of the buy catch. Shame! Shame on the Government of Canada.

The Canadian will come in and he will be arrested. But, if you have a good lawyer, Mr. Speaker, here is a great clause in the bill. "No person shall be convicted of an offence under the act if the person establishes that the person (a) exercised all due diligence to prevent the commission of an offence or (b) reasonably and honestly believed"—and the Minister of Justice should be overjoyed with this one—"in the existence of facts that if true would render the person's conduct innocent."

That is pretty clear, is it not? You get a big lawyer. You have to have the money to pay for your lawyer, like the Government of Canada thinks most people have. It will cost you a lot of dough. No problem getting over this act. But the poor fisherman who is brought in, who is supposed to be represented by members of Parliament, will get it right between the teeth with this legislation.

**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 as amended?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

**Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley)** moved:

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-74 be amended in Clause 24

(a) by striking out, in the English version, line 24 at page 18 and substituting the following therefor:

"control of fisheries or fish habitat or the";

(b) by striking out lines 33 to 48 at page 18 and substituting the following:

"(h) directing the person to submit to the Minister, on application by the Minister within three years after the date of the conviction, any information respecting the activities of the person that the court considers appropriate in the circumstances; and

(i) requiring the person to comply with any other conditions that the court considers appropriate for securing the person's good conduct and for preventing the person from repeating the offence or committing other offences under this Act."

• (1810 )

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise on Motion No. 4, this particular amendment to Bill C-74, and to comment about how soon we will be debating at third reading this legislation. The amendment is going to require a person convicted, if the court so orders, to pay for promoting the proper management and control of fisheries or fish habitat.

When the bill first came to committee it just talked about fish. We have included fish habitat in this amendment, and the government is supporting it. That is particularly important, given all the concerns we have in terms of protecting our creeks and rivers from logging operations, pulp mill pollution and others and of ensuring that more than just a balance among our resource industries happen and that we are successful in extracting our resources in a sustainable way which not only protects the environment but ensures that the resources will continue in perpetuity for all of us to benefit from.

An interesting aspect of this amendment is the fact that we are not only talking about paying for the damage, which I find very difficult to accept as a principle. It is like having people take over your house for the weekend and they wreck the place, and then when you come back on Sunday night they say: "That is okay. We will pay for it". That is not the way to go about inviting any of your friends or guests over, if they are still friends. Nor is it any way to allow the destruction of our fish habitat.

This amendment goes beyond asking people to fess up and to provide some dollars. Witnesses said to us in committee that it would be just a cost of doing business, that it was going to be another couple of hundred dollars and on we go; there was no change. This amendment will ensure that damages are paid from what the courts order. It will also ensure that there is emphasis on the fisheries officers being out there and that they have confidence that their department realizes the importance of the rules and regulations they are policing. As well it will ensure that anyone convicted of a crime will understand how important that is and that they will participate in helping to promote the protection and enhancement of our fish habitat.

It is a positive amendment. It is moving in the right direction, and I hope the House will support it.

**Mr. Ross Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, this amendment was accepted in committee. I think it is important to put on record that there were some minor legal changes, some wording changes which my friend opposite has reintroduced. The government supports this amendment and thinks it is a good step as well.

**Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls):** Mr. Speaker, I have just a brief comment. It is fine and dandy to talk about fish habitat. It is fine and dandy to talk about fines. It is fine and dandy to have such glorious words about protecting the fishing environment and the fishing habitat.

However, 135 gigantic, monstrous vessels from nine foreign nations are raking the grounds around the coast of Canada, while we sit in this Chamber and figure out what fines to put on Canadian fishermen who might be violating the fish habitat of Canada.

A lot of things have to change in this country, and that is one of them. Canadians vessels are not allowed to go into the waters or any one of those countries; not one of those countries. It is not allowed. There would be a war. We would be chased out. They are in our waters with all of this gigantic gear, all computerized, raking all of the grounds on the continental shelf, ignored by the Government of Canada. In fact, the numbers are going up every year. No wonder the fishing resource is destroyed together with the fishing habitat.

**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.

**Hon. Kim Campbell (for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans)** moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** When shall the bill be read the third time? At the next sitting of the House.

It being 6.17 p.m., this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1)

At 6.17 p.m. the House adjourned.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Thursday, December 6, 1990**

The House met at 11 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

**Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of State (Youth) and Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government responses to 26 petitions.

* * *

### CANADIAN NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

PRESENTATION OF 20TH REPORT

**Mr. Bob Hicks (Scarborough East):** Mr. Speaker, subject to Standing Order 34, I have the overwhelming pleasure and privilege to present to the House, in both official languages, the 20th report of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association.

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS—PRESENTATION OF TWENTY-FIRST REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the Twenty-First Report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, in both official languages. This report concerns the procedures and practices relating to the conduct of Private Members' Business.

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

* * *

[*English*]

### PETITIONS

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I have a number of petitions which I wish to lay on the table, pursuant to Standing Order 36.

The petitions are signed by residents of the province of Ontario from places such as Ottawa, Markham, Toronto, and other communities throughout the province.

All the petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to exercise prudent judgment and withdraw the goods and services tax, particularly as it applies to the tax on magazines, books and newspapers. These petitioners, like other Canadians, are appalled at the fact that the Government of Canada would move forward with the goods and services tax which they believe to be very negative in view of the state of the economy at the present time.

**Mr. Jack Whittaker (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present a petition under Standing Order 36 which has been certified by the Clerk of Petitions. This is another in a series of petitions that I have had the pleasure of presenting for members of the public from across Canada against the goods and services tax.

The petitioners have not given up hope that the government will come to its senses and withdraw this unfair tax and bring in a tax system that is fair to all Canadians.

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have additional petitions against the GST. These are from my home province of Saskatchewan. Others are from Ontario and Quebec. These petitions in addition to the thousands that I have already tabled in the House.

The petitioners are asking the government not to put the GST on magazines, books and newspapers.

I table these as the senators are trying to kill the GST with 16 and 18-hour marathon speeches. All the senators are doing is reflecting—

**Mr. Speaker:** I do have to remind the hon. member that he is to present his petition and not get into speeches.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, today I would like to table a petition along the lines of the many petitions that have been tabled with respect to the goods and services tax. Your petitioners strenuously object to taxing books. They maintain that the free distribution of printed matter constitutes the corner-stone of our democracy, culture and education. They claim that an educated and productive society will suffer as a result of this decision.

Therefore, your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to recall the fundamental principles underlying the exemption of printed matter and ensure that the legislation and regulations contain an exemption for books. Like myself, these people maintain that taxing books means imposing ignorance.

• (1110 )

[*English*]

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, I also have a petition signed by a number of Canadians against the goods and services tax.

These people in their petition have called for Parliament to reject the current proposal for a goods and services tax. They call for a reform of the taxation system so that there is an effective minimum tax on wealthy individuals and corporations.

The petitioners also ask that the House of Commons ensure that, if and when there is a broad public consensus on a sales tax measure, that that be used to replace the manufacturers' sales tax and that this reform not be used as an opportunity for the government to impose a massive tax grab. They believe that this would cause an undue burden on ordinary Canadians through a regressive consumption tax and they call upon Parliament to have real tax reform.

I should point out that this petition is signed by a number of people from various parts of Ontario. Unfortunately, after the CBC cuts announced yesterday many of them will not realize that their petition was presented in the House of Commons, since they no longer have any local news coverage.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to present a petition in the House signed by numerous Canadians from the Ottawa area who are opposed to the goods and services tax insofar as it applies to the printed word and to books. They recite that uninhibited dissemination of the printed word is a corner-stone of democracy, culture, and education in our society and will be negatively affected by the goods and services tax.

These petitioners must rejoice in the valiant efforts of Liberal senators to save the country from this iniquitous tax.

## FOOD AND DRUGS

**Mrs. Pauline Browes (Scarborough Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present this petition today that concerns a serious health issue as it relates to allergic reactions to foods.

The petitioners are joined by the Allergy Information Association. These petitioners are from Scarborough, Brampton, and Ajax.

For the protection of the citizens of Canada, they are calling on the Parliament of Canada to enact legislation amending the food and drugs regulations in order to require manufacturers to list specific food ingredients and additives used in pre-packaged food. As well, they require restauranteurs and food retailers to provide to customers a list of all ingredients and additives in prepared foods.

## GASOLINE ADDITIVES

**Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex):** Mr. Speaker, I am rising again to present petitions signed by over 600 residents of southwestern Ontario who are among the thousands of petitioners asking the government to ban MMT, an automotive fuel additive which was banned in the United States 12 years ago.

The U.S. subcommittee on health and the environment found that the manganese component of MMT is capable of serious neuro-toxic effects. Studies have

shown that manganese damages the human brain causing dementia and severe mental disorder.

Many of these petitions were signed at CJBK Radio, London, Ontario. These petitioners are asking the government to ban MMT and replace it with a non-hazardous octane enhancer such as ethanol.

LITERACY

**Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, I rise, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present two petitions today. The first is about literacy. The petitioners are from Ontario, as well as from my riding of Mission—Coquitlam.

Because 25 per cent of the Canadian adult population is illiterate, and in some regions illiteracy reaches and exceeds 40 per cent, the petitioners humbly pray that the government will consider undertaking a major national campaign against illiteracy and create community-based remedial and preventive illiteracy programs which respond to the needs of those individuals and groups involved.

BANKING

**Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition that I wish to present is with regard to bank service charges. This petition, too, is from my riding of Mission—Coquitlam.

The petitioners ask the government to present legislation that would regulate and control bank service charges and provide consumer protection to banking Canadians, in view of the fact that, in the past five years, bank service charges have been increasing at an average rate of 19 per cent per year, five times the rate of inflation.

* * *

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicted by an asterisk.)

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, Question No. 398 will be answered today.

[*Text*]

ELECTRONIC BAGGAGE SCANNERS

Question No. 398—**Mr. Worthy:**

Do any Canadian airports with a yearly passenger volume of less than 75,000 persons have electronic baggage scanners and, if so, which ones?

**Hon. Douglas Grinslade Lewis (Minister of Transport):** Yes; Stephenville, Yarmouth, Rouyn-Noranda, Val d'Or, Sarnia, Fort McMurray and Prince Rupert.

* * *

[*English*]

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 387 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House that Question No. 387 be deemed to have been made an Order for Return?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Text*]

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE OF CANADA

Question No. 387—**Mr. Nunziata:**

Since June 7, 1988, how many contracts, including amendments, has the Correctional Service of Canada awarded to former federal correctional employees and in each case (a) what was the date of the contract award (b) what was the purpose of the contract (c) what was the name of the individual and/or company awarded the contract (d) what was the amount of the contract (e) was the contract awarded with or without tender?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

**Mr. Cooper:** I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

### PETRO-CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-84, an Act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada, as reported without amendment from a legislative committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Speaker:** On the Order Paper there are 45 amendment motions at the report stage of Bill C-84, an Act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada. They are in the names of the hon. members for Edmonton East, Nickel Belt, Essex—Windsor, Scarborough—Rouge River, and Ottawa—Vanier.

[*English*]

There are a number of duplicate motions in the names of members of the New Democratic Party. As the House knows, duplicate questions cannot be proposed for debate.

After consultation, the Chair wishes to announce that it will select, where they are otherwise in order, the motions standing in the name of the hon. member for Essex—Windsor rather than the motions set down by the hon. members for Nickel Belt or Edmonton East. I think hon. members understand the reason behind this.

Motion Nos. 2A, 14A and 19, are in order and will be grouped for debate but they will be voted on separately. Motion Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 31 and 32 are not selected since they are identical to Motion Nos. 2A, 4A, 6A, 8A, 12A, 14A and 32A, respectively.

[*Translation*]

Motion Nos. 4A, 6A, 8A, 12A and 23 are in order and will all be debated and voted on separately.

[*English*]

Motion Nos. 9, 10 and 10A, standing in the names of the hon. member for Edmonton East, the hon. member for Nickel Belt and the hon. member for Essex—Windsor are identical. They are also beyond the scope of the bill and constitute an attempt to do indirectly what cannot be done directly. Hon. members are aware that this is not in accordance with parliamentary practice. Thus, it is not competent to introduce into the bill an oath of office which contains conditions foreign to the bill, since introducing these conditions would otherwise be out of order. I would refer hon. members to citation 773, paragraph (1) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, and I quote: "An amendment is out of order if it is irrelevant to the bill, [or[ beyond its scope—". The 21st edition of May's *Parliamentary Practice* makes the same point in almost the same words at page 491. These three motions will therefore not be selected for debate.

[*Translation*]

A motion quite similar to Motion No. 15 was debated and rejected by the legislative committee. After consideration I decided to let the House debate this motion. It will be debated and voted on separately.

Motion Nos. 16, 17 and 17A in the names of the hon. members for Edmonton East, Nickel Belt and Essex—Windsor go beyond the scope of the bill and therefore are out of order. As I pointed out before, this basic principle can be found in the fifth edition of *Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms* and in the 21st edition of Erskine May.

• (1120 )

[*English*]

Motion Nos. 18 and 24 attempt to introduce provisions of the Official Languages Act into the bill. These provisions are also beyond the scope of this bill, so I must regretfully rule them out of order.

Motion Nos. 20 and 32A are in order and will be debated together, but they will be voted on separately.

Motion Nos. 21, 22, 22A, 25, 26, 26A, 27, 28, 28A, 29, 30 and 30A also standing in the name of the hon. member for Edmonton East, the hon. member for Nickel Belt and the hon. member for Essex-Windsor are all variations of an amendment that was debated and negatived in the legislative committee. They will not be selected for that reason.

As the explanatory note to section 5 of Standing Order 76 points out, the report stage "is not meant to be a reconsideration of the committee stage of the bill".

I advise hon. members that a recapitulation of this ruling is available at the table.

I know the hon. member for Churchill wishes to comment, and I of course will hear him. It may be of assistance to the Chair.

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, it is always a difficult issue in getting up after a Speaker's ruling.

However, Sir, you in your wisdom have ruled a number of motions standing in the name of a number of our members, including the hon. member for Edmonton East, the hon. member for Nickel Belt and the hon. member for Essex–Windsor, out of order.

Some of these deal with environmental legislation. Others deal with an oath of office to be signed by members of the board of directors of the new Petro–Canada Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, you have also ruled out amendments which would have the effect of applying the provisions of the Official Languages Act in the bill. You have been quite correct in citing the citations and history in terms of the rulings that have been made in the past with regard to having new items brought in.

Normally, they have been ruled out of order. I would submit that that has not always been the case. I can point to Bill C–79 which was passed by this House last Friday.

At that time, in a report from committee, new amendments were introduced and, ironically, one of the new motions that was brought forward from the committee was on an oath to be sworn by the members of the Board of Internal Economy.

I refer to page 16060 of *Hansard*. At that time, I said:

> —the House will be aware that in committee review of the legislation a new clause was added to the bill, which is an unusual procedure. Normally, it would not be allowed in this manner.

The House was made aware at that time that a new clause was being added that went beyond the scope of the bill.

What we are asking and what the hon. members in the New Democratic Party have done with their amendments here is to have a similar oath put in place for a company.

I think we are talking about a ruling. If it was in order Friday to have a new clause requiring an oath for members of the board of directors of the House of Commons, if I may use that term with regard to the Board of Internal Economy, then certainly in terms of procedure it is just as in order today, four sitting days later, to have a similar oath put into a bill. Certainly in terms of procedure, it is in order today, less than four sitting days later, to have a similar oath put into a bill. We are not talking about private corporations versus public corporations, House of Commons, or outside the House of Commons. We are talking about procedure. If it is acceptable in one incident, it is certainly acceptable in this incident.

I would also point out that in terms of the Official Languages Act, this is a situation where the government is, by changing a corporation from public to private, basically saying that the Official Languages Act no longer applies. I am surprised that government members would allow the government to take that position. I do submit, Sir, that if we are going to allow new clauses in one bill, without the objection of the Chair, that should be the case for other bills as well.

If government members wish to defeat our amendments on the environment, on official languages, and on an oath for the board of directors, that is their privilege and right. But I do believe we should be allowed to make that presentation and to bring those amendments forward for debate and for a vote.

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank the hon. member for Churchill for the intervention and also for his courtesy to the Chair in letting me know earlier this morning that he would want to make the point which he has made. He also understands, and he has indicated this to me, that the point he is making is not likely to result in a change in the ruling which the Chair has just given.

I wonder if I could take the House again into confidence with respect to these amendments. We have as much as possible been trying to have a process whereby the amendments would be the subject of very extensive discussion in some cases, certainly between the member who is filing the amendment and the table officers.

When there is sufficient notice, that is a very practical and useful practice, and I thank all hon. members for having co–operated as much as they have. Unhappily in

this particular case there was very little notice for a lot of the amendments. I must tell the House that the table officers were working very late last night and also early this morning.

I anticipated there would perhaps be some discontent. I want to assure the hon. member for Churchill that earlier this morning I went over all these amendments and I could anticipate perhaps the hon. member's feelings. Without getting into it in great detail here because I do not want to set precedents where I am required after having given a ruling to then go into a great explanation about it, there are distinctions that can be drawn, and had to be drawn, between the quite accurate observations the hon. member for Churchill made with respect to Bill C–79 and the oath in that case and the oath in this particular bill.

If one examines the oath very carefully, it is not a simple oath. It is an oath with a very great deal of detail in it. It is those details which I felt clearly distinguished it from the oath in Bill C–79.

However, the hon. member has in a very concise way put forward his feelings on this matter. They have been heard. I hope that on other occasions there will be time for more discussion than there was in this case because there was obviously very little.

I thank the hon. member for his comments and also again his courtesy for giving the Chair notice that he wanted to make these points on the floor of the House.

The hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier seeks the floor.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to make a comment, without wishing in any way to reflect on the Chair's ruling with respect to the amendments. I realize the clerks had their work cut out for them, considering the limited amount of time they had to examine the amendments, which in turn was largely due to the fact that the government called the bill so soon after the committee report was tabled in the House of Commons. It is not against parliamentary procedure, but it sometimes makes things very hectic.

Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to see in your ruling that amendment No. 24, standing in my name, whose purpose is to add to the bill a provision that would commit Petro–Canada to serving Canadians in the official language of their choice—in the language of the customer—was ruled out of order. I am astonished, because we did the same thing with the bill to privatize Air Canada, and as you know, Air Canada is bound by the Official Languages Act and must comply with into provisions.

• (1130)

I am somewhat puzzled, now it seems we cannot do the same with Petro–Canada. Of course, I accept the Chair's ruling. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say and that Motion No. 23, which was ruled in order, is somewhat deficient in that the English and French versions do not read the same. I would therefore like to make the necessary corrections.

[*English*]

In English it says:

That Bill C–84 be amended by adding immediately line 44 at page 12 the following new clause:

"18. All undertakings and works constructed by Petro–Canada are, and each of them is declared to be, works or a work for the general advantage of Canada."

[*Translation*]

In French, Mr. Speaker, the same amendment reads as follows:

"18. Les ouvrages de Petro–Canada –

I think we should say: "Les ouvrages et les entreprises de Petro–Canada sont déclarés à l'avantage général du Canada".

Mr. Speaker, if this amendment, or should I say motion, is accepted, it will have the same effect as the one on official languages which you ruled out of order.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier indicated there may be a problem with the two versions—the English version and the French version. Perhaps this amendment could be discussed with the Table officers later this morning.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, because of the time factor there was a problem with communications. I notified the Clerk of this change yesterday, because I noticed there was something wrong. I think my letter did not reach him soon enough for the corrections to be incorporated in the amendments. I simply wish to inform the House that I wanted to get these corrections in before you handed

down your ruling. I think the Clerk will inform you that he has the letter.

**Mr. Speaker:** I want to thank the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier. Regarding the other point he raised, it is a very simple problem. His reasons for including the use of both official languages in the Petro-Canada Bill are good, and that is why I said it was regrettable that I could not accept this amendment. For the time being, perhaps the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier could have a discussion with the Clerk and the other officers.

[*English*]

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if my friend was on a point of order or not when he was discussing the motion that was, by your ruling, taken out of the amendments to the bill. However, a lot of information was left hanging by the hon. member when he compared Air Canada with Petro-Canada.

**An hon. member:** The Official Languages Act does apply.

**Mr. McDermid:** That is right, the Official Languages Act did apply to Air Canada because it is a national company and does come under the act. Petro-Canada, once privatized, comes under provincial jurisdiction, under provincial law.

**An hon. member:** Order, he does not know what he is talking about.

**Mr. McDermid:** This morning the hon. member left a lot of things hanging in his point of order that should be clarified. Perhaps the hon. member can tell me where, in the debate that will be taking place this morning, we might be able to explain that to the public. The hon. member left things things hanging, and I think that needs explanation.

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank the hon. minister for his intervention. I thought that I had made it clear that for procedural reasons there is a difference between a Crown corporation and what will become a privatized company. For that reason, procedurally I could not allow the amendment. I did say in my reasons "regrettably". There it is; it is a procedural thing. It is not for me to speculate on how the matter could be remedied. That is a matter for members and not a matter for the Chair to comment upon.

The appropriate thing to do now is to complete my ruling. I remind hon. members that there is a recapitulation at the table. I will now propose Motion Nos. 2A, 14A, and 19. to the House.

MEASURE TO ENACT

**Mr. Steven Langdon (Essex—Windsor)** moved:

Motion No. 2A

That Bill C-84 be amended in clause 9 by adding immediately after line 26 at page 3 the following:

"(a) provisions insuring that the positions of the Chairperson and directors of Petro-Canada shall not be held by non-residents;'

Motion No. 14A

That Bill Bill C-84 be amended in clause 9

(a) by striking out line 5 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"than one per cent of the votes that";

(b) by striking out line 17 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"more than one per cent of the total".

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River)** moved:

Motion No. 19

That Bill C-84 be amended in clause 9

(a) by adding immediately after line 49 at page 4 the following:

"(h) provisions prohibiting the direct or indirect ownership of voting shares of Petro-Canada by a foreign government or any agency thereof;"

(b) by striking out lines 15 and 16 at page 8.

**Mr. Langdon:** Mr. Speaker, we have a whole set of amendments in front of us today, which I suspect we will spend considerable time in this House debating, because they deal with some of the critical weaknesses in the present bill respecting the privatization of Petro-Canada.

We had hoped to be able to persuade the government to accept a number of other important suggestions not included in the set of amendments before us. For instance, we stressed that in these days of environmental concern it was extremely important that Petro-Canada reflect the concerns and aspirations of many Canadians with respect to environmental matters. We have raised this question in committee and actually had a fairly positive response from the chairman of Petro-Canada, Mr. Wilfred Hopper. However, it has not been possible to persuade the government that some of these environ-

mental considerations which we consider central to Petro-Canada's future should be permitted to be in front of us for debate.

Therefore we moved to a set of proposals which aimed to do a number of things. First, this company had been paid for by the people of Canada. In fact it had been paid for in significant part through a specific tax at the pumps which people paid, the Canadianization tax expressly and explicitly designed by the government of this country to establish a more Canadianized oil industry. We had hoped that this could be incorporated in the bill more effectively than is presently the case. The particular set of amendments in front of us at this stage is the set of amendments which attempts to do that in two ways.

• (1140)

First, with Motion No. 2A, we set out that the chairperson and members of the board of directors of Petro-Canada must be Canadian residents. I note that this is a very mild provision, because it does not even suggest that they must be Canadian citizens. It suggests instead that they must be Canadian residents. From our point of view, if the minister is prepared to put into the bill a limitation with respect to foreign ownership, a limitation which we think is not tight enough but nevertheless a limitation, it follows that there should also be as a principle, as a key point, that the directors and the chairperson of this important company, which will be Canadian by the minister's edict or by the government's edict, must also be Canadian residents. That is why we have moved that particular motion.

We have also moved Motion No. 14A, which would have the effect of changing the limit with respect to foreign ownership of Petro-Canada in the future from the 25 per cent the government is prepared to accept to 1 per cent of all shares.

Frankly, our concern in this case is that as the legislation presently stands it is possible for the bill to permit foreign firms to take effective control of Petro-Canada. With three foreign companies, for instance in a widely held share basis within this company, it would be possible for one such company to have 10 per cent; another, 10 per cent; and another, 5 per cent. Foreign companies would then control 25 per cent and would have effective control of Petro-Canada in a context in which the remaining 75 per cent of shares would be held widely by Canadians, with no concentration.

**Mr. McDermid:** That's not true.

**Mr. Langdon:** The minister says that it is not true, but it is absolutely true.

Therefore we feel there must be a reduction in the 25 per cent limit. We appreciate the fact that the minister has included in the bill the 25 per cent limit, but we say, if he is serious about keeping this company Canadian-controlled, that limit has to be reduced from 25 per cent to 1 per cent.

With respect to the other motion which has been grouped for debate in this particular category, Motion No. 19, it would prohibit foreign governments or their agencies from owning Petro-Canada shares. This becomes especially significant, given the sellout permitted by the government of de Havilland to foreign government controlled companies from Italy and France. For instance, Aérospatiale of France and Alitalia of Italy will be able to control the future of an important aircraft company in this country. We do not think that makes sense. We will therefore as a party support Motion No. 19.

However, the basic point to keep in front of us on this whole set of amendments is the following, Mr. Speaker. Petro-Canada was created from the resources of the people of Canada. There is no earthly reason why we as a House of Commons should pass legislation which permits the control of this company to slip into the hands of foreign firms. For this reason we hope very much that the majority in this House will see fit to adopt the various motions that are grouped together for debate in this particular category.

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak in favour of the amendment outlined by Motion No. 19.

This motion proposes that there be an explicit restriction on ownership of shares of the privatized Petro-Canada, or the semi-privatized Petro-Canada, as it goes through transition, a prohibition against ownership by a foreign government or an agency thereof.

The general purpose stated by the government in connection with this privatization is that common shares and ownership of Petro-Canada be placed in the hands of Canadians. In doing so, the government has also

permitted explicitly in the bill shares of Petro-Canada to be owned by non-Canadians, by non-residents.

The proposed limit is 25 per cent. There is also a limit of 10 per cent being held by any one individual. With reference to this specific motion, it means that a foreign government, or an agency thereof—a national oil company of another government—would be restricted to 10 per cent ownership of the privatized Petro-Canada. Why is that relevant? Why is that an issue for Canadians?

I want to point out that a few months ago a Crown corporation, Connaught Laboratories, was privatized and sold, and notwithstanding the close relationship that had existed between Connaught and the Government of Canada over the years and the great work that Connaught had done, it became necessary to accept a merger with a French corporation which was owned in part by the French government.

I found that to be a step backward for Canadians. If the thrust of what we are doing in terms of privatization includes a policy of Canadianization, and that policy was confirmed by the minister of energy when he appeared before the legislative committee on Bill C-84, then any procedure, any statute which provides or acquiesces in the ownership of shares by a foreign government runs completely contrary to that.

Let me place a hypothetical situation before the House. We might be looking at this type of problem here. I do not wish to cast aspersions on the Venezuelan state oil companies, but they may have an interest in marketing their petroleum products in Canada. They may deem it in their interest to acquire a 10 per cent interest in Petro-Canada. I suggest to the House that that ownership would influence Petro-Canada greatly in a marketing decision that would remove Canadian oil products from eastern Canada and replace them with Venezuelan oil products. That may be totally inconsistent with Canadian strategic energy planning. It may not be, it may be completely consistent. We do not know. What we do not want to have is a state oil company of another country influencing strategic energy decision-making here in Canada.

• (1150)

I suggest that the provisions of the bill, as they are constituted now, would permit or even invite this to happen. I would not be the first to stand and say that an interest in Petro-Canada is an automatically appealing investment for another state oil company, but you never know. Certainly in this world we never know. We do not know what is going to come up tomorrow.

We have placed millions and millions of dollars of taxpayers' money in Hiberia. Would it not be embarrassing to have another government that had a great interest in the energy sector pick up a piece of the Hibernia development? One is for sale. A few days after the passage by this House of the Hibernia legislation authorizing all of that money to be put into Hibernia, the other Canadian partner, the non-Petro-Canada partner, indicated publicly that it had a desire to sell.

Perhaps I do not have to comment strategically on why they waited until after the bill was passed in this House. The prospect of Hibernia being less than 50 per cent owned would have had an impact, I know, on the decision of all the members in this House. Let us hope that Hibernia is not the first test case for the absence of a prohibition on foreign government or foreign agency ownership of Petro-Canada shares.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have an opportunity to speak in the debate on the privatization of Petro-Canada, although not happy that we are having the debate in the first place. In my own view, the privatization of Petro-Canada is part of an over-all process by which the Conservative government is systematically dismantling the country.

I do not know that it actually realizes this. I like to think that it does not realize it. I like to think that it is a form of ideological naivety that is not malicious in its intent. However, I am sure that it is malicious in the boardrooms of some of the corporations which fund the Conservative Party, which give it direction and which take great delight in the fact that Petro-Canada and other Crown corporations have been and are to be privatized. Canada is to be left entirely open and vulnerable to the dictates of the marketplace, which is just an euphemism for being open and vulnerable to the dictates of the multinational corporations.

For many years Canadians were very concerned about the question of foreign ownership of various sectors in our country. They were concerned about foreign ownership in the energy sector, particularly in the oil and gas industry. One of the solutions that has long been

advocated for that problem, particularly by my party, was a measure of public ownership in the energy industry.

We had the opportunity to make that happen in the minority Parliament of 1972–74, when in conjunction with the fact that we held the balance of power in Parliament and the fact that the world was experiencing the first oil shock of 1973, the common sense of having Canadians own a measure of their own oil and gas industry, through the instrument of a Crown corporation, appeared obvious to everyone. I say everyone, but obviously it did not. It was opposed at the time by the Conservative Party. They are now living out the opposition which they expressed at that time by moving to privatize Petro–Canada, precisely at a time in the world of energy politics in a global situation is similar to the context in which Petro–Canada was created in the first place. That is to say, the oil crisis of 1973.

Once again we are very sensitive to our dependence on oil and to the fact that a country without the ability to control its own energy resources may well find itself in a very difficult situation.

It is for these reasons that we moved a series of amendments, one of them having to do with the limit on foreign ownership in the bill the minister has put forward. On the question of the provision in the privatization bill which limits foreign ownership to 25 per cent of all shares, we moved that that be reduced to 1 per cent.

This is our way of saying that we feel 25 per cent is far too high a limit with respect to the provision for foreign ownership of this privatized Petro–Canada. We would, of course, prefer that it not be privatized in the first place. What we are engaged in here is a sort of last ditch argument for real Canadian control over this privatized Petro–Canada.

Ministers on the government side have been known to say, and I understand the minister for privatization has said this in the past, that he would prefer 100 per cent Canadian ownership. But the fact of the matter is, if foreign ownership is set, this 25 per cent, once achieved, it will be very hard to go back on.

What we are talking about here is whether we actually have the will as a country to control our own resources, to control our own economic destiny. Surely energy is a very crucial part of our economy. I think it was Tommy Douglas who said any set of corporations or people who own all the energy resources of a particular country literally has its finger on the windpipe of that particular country.

That was the situation in which we found ourselves for years when all our energy resources were owned basically by the seven sisters of the multinational oil corporations. We are being sent all the way back to that period of time by this government and joyfully so, in its view. This is not something of which it seems to be particularly ashamed. It did not say it was doing this because it has to and it regrets it. It is all part of the kind of Canada that it wants.

I submit to the government, it is a Canada that Canadians do not want. There was no outcry. There was no public demand for the privatization of Petro–Canada, no particular reason to go ahead with this. In fact, I think one would find that there is overwhelming support for the notion of a publicly–owned oil and gas corporation.

One of the reasons I suspect support has declined somewhat, or at least the excitement about the notion of a publicly–owned oil and gas corporation has declined, is that Petro–Canada, since 1984, has been advised to act like any other oil company.

If Crown corporations are advised, in fact are required to act like any other business in that particular sector, sooner or later, of course, Canadians will not perceive any difference between the Crown corporation and its competitors. So at some point they will not be as upset as they might otherwise have been by the privatization of that particular Crown corporation.

As a strategy, I have to commend the government. It instructed the Crown corporation to act like any other company. Several years down the road Canadians will be at a point where they will not see any difference between that Crown corporation and other corporations in the same sector.

• (1200 )

The notion of privatization does not set off the same public reaction as it did, for instance, in 1979 when the Conservatives suggested that they would privatize Petro–Canada. That became a major issue and, I think, one of

the major reasons for the downfall of the Conservative government at that time.

Why? Because in 1979, Petro-Canada was very new. At that time, there was still the hope that what we had was a Crown corporation that would develop into something entirely different and superior to the kinds of oil and gas companies that we had known in the past.

I am thinking of the hope that Petro-Canada would become an oil and gas company which would, unlike other oil and gas companies, not gouge the consumer at the first opportunity, that it would become a company through which we could determine what the real cost of oil and gas should be and what a fair price might be.

In 1979 there was still the hope that Petro-Canada might become exemplary in its dealings with its employees, native peoples in the north, and the environment. I can remember making speeches myself in the House in the early 1980s in which we called upon the Liberal government of that time to do more to make Petro-Canada into that exemplary oil and gas corporation that the NDP had in mind in the early 1970s when we called for its creation.

That did not happen, and things got worse after 1984 when a government hostile to the very existence of Petro-Canada took over the government of the country. It proceeded to have Petro-Canada operate in such a way that now, frankly, it is able to privatize it without much public ado.

I think these are the reasons. The other reason, of course, is that the country is pre-occupied with the GST, the Senate, the Bloc quebecois, Meech Lake, and everything else. As my comrade from Edmonton East says, if the government is busy hitting you over the head with a sledge hammer, sometimes you do not notice the knife that is being slipped into your back. The knife that is being slipped into our back is the privatization of Petro-Canada. Unfortunately, that goes along quite nicely with what we experienced yesterday with the gutting of the CBC.

I can see my colleague from the Bloc quebecois shaking his head. If one wanted to destroy the country, these guys over here are doing a better job of it than anything that my colleague from the Bloc quebecois would like to do. They are doing it by gutting the CBC, privatizing Petro-Canada, devastating VIA Rail, eliminating all kinds of postal services particularly in rural Canada—you name it, Mr. Speaker, all the things that have bound the country together. Pretty soon it will not be a big deal for the Bloc quebecois or anybody to advocate the dismemberment of Canada, because there will not be anything left that resembles the kind of Canada that many of us wanted to protect.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret the hon. member's time has expired. Debate.

**Mr. Dave Worthy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs) and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I think it is interesting and I should comment as I start that there is a basic, fundamental philosophical difference between many of the members on the other side of the House and the government.

The whole world recognizes that, as country after country is working as hard as they can to become competitive on a global basis, we see these countries taking moves to privatize many of their industries. In so doing, they become more competitive.

From the other side of the House, we tend to hear that the government should, in fact, be getting into more industries, that we should be creating more Crown corporations, and that the government should, in fact, be playing a bigger role in running the country. Those are fundamentally opposite objectives and of course this government—and I believe this government with the support of the majority of Canadians— is attempting to become responsible economically. Part of this process will involve the proper privatization of many of the companies.

In so doing, obviously we have to get the best return possible for the taxpayers. Many people seem to forget that, in fact, the taxpayers out there fund everything the government spends or invests, or anything that the government loses money on. If the government makes money, the taxpayers benefit. So, it is critical that we get maximum return for our investment. In so doing, the minister and the government is seeing that the shares are going to be widely held and widely held by Canadians. There are not going to be more than 10 per cent of shares controlled by one group and no more than 25 per cent of the shares can be held by people who are not Canadian residents.

In that light, I would like to address the three amendments that we are looking at right now. The first is the amendment to try to control the numbers of directors or the composition of the board of directors of PetroCan. The motion would indicate that none of the directors could be non-resident. On the surface this may seem to be attractive but, I think, quite unnecessary.

I would like to emphasize, first, that the company will be Canadian-controlled and that Canadians who own those shares will be able to control who the directors are. I would like to point out, as an example, that Imperial Oil which does not have this restriction has all Canadian directors. It did not require a piece of legislation to ensure that that would happen. The other point, of course, is that the CBCA ensures that a majority of the directors will, in fact, be Canadians.

From a practical point of view, if we have a Canadian-controlled company and these shareholders want to have somebody who is very competent on their board of directors who happens not to be a Canadian resident, it would be quite improper for us to try to impose that restriction on that board of directors.

The second amendment would reduce foreign ownership in Petro-Canada from the limit we set at 25 per cent to 1 per cent. We have had expert witness after expert witness indicate that, if it is going to try to realize the maximum return for our taxpayers, the government should put the fewest number of restrictions possible on the privatization of Air Canada. In fact, we have had some witnesses recommend that we increase or remove the 25 per cent limit. Others have said that, with the 25 per cent limit, they do not feel that there will any undue restriction on the market. But, obviously, to reduce it to 1 per cent is precluding so many shareholders or potential shareholders that we should be trying to encourage to invest in Petro-Canada if, in fact, we are going to get the best return for the taxpayer and the government wants to get that best return.

As to the last amendment which has been proposed, the hon. member indicated his arguments were based on many hypothetical situations. I would first point out that it has not happened to any of the other oil companies in Canada, large or small, where we have seen any undue control by foreign agents.

• (1210)

There would be some very practical and I think quite logical repercussions if we did try to impose this. Most of the investors we would be affecting are in fact pension funds from Canadians. For instance, Canadian National Railway, as a pension fund, invests in many other international companies' shares and other countries' shares. If we were to start to impose restrictions on ours, obviously we would expect some retaliation from these other nations. It is not something that, as a government, we should be entering into.

Another point that I would like to make is that Petro-Canada itself deals internationally with many other countries. Although in most cases other countries are not interested in investing in Petro-Canada, the mere fact that we would be trying to impose these restrictions would lead to us being perceived as attacking those countries and their ability to invest. It would be seen as a very negative thing.

For these reasons, I would recommend that members of the House not support these motions.

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, we listened stoically to the parliamentary secretary's intervention in the last few minutes and his brilliant commercial on behalf of Exxon, Shell, and the major multinationals which dominate the field of petroleum the world over.

He was somehow attempting to tell us that there is no role for the public and for the public interest in the field of petroleum. The wise thing to do, according to the Conservative theology, is to withdraw from the public interest. In that sense, the Tories are quite consistent. They are doing it with VIA, Air Canada, the CBC, and now effectively so with this bill and through this bill with Petro-Canada. We are told to leave it to the seven sisters, or the five now. Leave it to the private sector. They will take care of Canada's energetic future.

We also hear the parliamentary secretary suddenly defending the taxpayers' interest by way of this bill. That is rather amusing since he belongs to a party and a government that has doubled the national debt between 1984 and 1989, from some $165 billion to some $380 billion.

All of a sudden, it is the bottom line that counts after six years of mismanagement. This is the message that comes these days from the Tory government benches,

including the dinosaur from Brampton who is otherwise known as the so-called Minister of State for Privatization and Regulatory Affairs. He is dismantling Canada and here he produces a bill which is the classic product of a dinosaur who never learns and who is about to die because the citizens of Brampton will only give him another couple of years. Then he is gone down the drain as all dinosaurs should go and deserve to go.

We hear now this fantastic concern for the public debt. At the end of 1990, all of sudden we have to cut in the interest of the public. What a shame! What a distortion if one looks at the performance of this government, from the time it was elected until very recently, in doubling that very same public debt. Canadians, however, will not be fooled.

In looking at this bill, in particular Motion Nos. 2A and 19, the parliamentary secretary of course feels that these go too far and that these are not measures that ought to be adopted. They sound perhaps too patriotic for this government. I do not blame him because he has to carry out orders on behalf of the dinosaurs over there. He is telling us to be careful, that we should not impose a Canadian presence on the board of Petro-Canada. This is something that you do not do. It is improper. It is not necessary because it is being done through other means, perhaps through an association of some sort, but not through the bill because it could backfire and be counter-productive.

It is really difficult to believe that the section we are examining now, section 9, goes on for six pages to identify provisions, mostly of a technical nature, without statements that relate to the environment, to sustainable development, and without a statement of mandate in general. Actually, it is a bill without a preamble which these days is quite unusual. This is an old fashioned type of bill in which it is not indicated overall in which direction you intend to go. That is usually what a preamble does in a bill. But this government does not trouble to indicate to the public the mandate or the general philosophy which the government intends to pursue. It probably would be too embarrassing to reveal to the public in a few lines what this bill is all about. That is perhaps the reason why we cannot find in the short introduction to the bill what it intends to produce.

We thought that the amendments put forward by the hon. member for Essex—Windsor and the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River, whom I congratulate for their initiative, would have fallen on sensitive and receptive ears, particularly the two motions put forward this morning. The reason being that there has to be in an organization, which was launched and funded over the years, which performed a valuable service to the Canadian public, and established a presence which is so popular, as witnessed by the efficient operation of the Petro-Canada stations across the country, a sense of substantial Canadian ownership which would be made a part of this legislative measure.

We never would have thought we would hear an intervention of the kind that the parliamentary secretary made a moment ago in defending the importance of the private sector. The private sector would not be in danger at all if Petro-Canada were to continue under the present mandate. It would not be in danger if the mandate of Petro-Canada were to be expanded, which is unthinkable in the dinosauric mentality of the Tories across the aisle here today and for the past few years. It is inconceivable for them to even think in terms of the fact that Canada needs a long-term energy plan and within that plan to devise a bill of a different content that would fit within the general plan.

We are perhaps the only nation in the industrialized northern hemisphere which does not have an energy plan, policy or sense of direction, let alone the vaguest idea as to what we should be doing to reduce our dependency on fossil fuels. The dinosaurs over there are not even trying to tackle that in their wildest mornings when they wake up with their foggy minds. In fact, they do not have minds. They are just creeping creatures, they have nothing in their brains except spinach, perhaps, at best. On the eve of 1991, we are debating this bill with its puny little sections which are really meaningless in terms of long term environmental and sustainable development and climate change. We are trying to tell this bunch of idiots that they are out of sync with the rest of the world. That's what they are because, Mr. Speaker, at every scientific conference that you attend throughout the world these days scientists are telling us: "Damn it, reduce your dependence on fossil fuels because there is a climate change danger at the door". And what does this government happily do? It just ignores it.

• (1220)

It is very hard to take seriously a bill like this. When the government comes here and the dinosaur has his chance to speak, if he wants to get up in his seat today, if he has the courage to defend this bill, we will listen to him. We will be glad to hear the drivel he has to offer.

The fact is that we are not even dealing with the fringes of the issue as to what Petro-Canada should be all about. Actually Petro-Canada is being gradually, systematically phased out and with it also Petro-Canada International.

I challenge the minister to get up in this House today and confirm or give us assurance that eventually Petro-Canada International will not be wiped out as a long-term consequence of this bill. I challenge the minister to get up in this House and give us this assurance. He will not, Mr. Speaker, because he cannot give it and he knows it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret the hon. member's time has expired. The hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley.

**Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to have an opportunity to speak at report stage to a couple of amendments to Bill C-84, the legislation introduced, as a previous speaker said, by the dinosaurs on the other side of this House, these right-wing zealots, these extremists across the way, who are doing their best to remake and destroy this country as we have come to know it. The list has been repeated on a couple of occasions in the last few days. Yesterday the CBC. Before that, VIA Rail and Canada Post, particularly in rural areas. I think what this government is trying to do is remake this country so we will never recognize it again and for that all Canadians, all taxpayers, are going to pay.

We have to take a look at what I think are three very reasonable amendments to this legislation to privatize Petro-Canada, three very reasonable recommendations. The first one is an amendment saying that the chairperson and members of the board of directors of Petro-Canada must be Canadian residents. What is the big deal? Why be afraid of an amendment like that? We could even have put in that they had to be Canadian citizens. We thought members opposite might come part way and support an amendment like that. What are they doing? They are opposing that. What are they afraid of?

Second, under the amendments we are also suggesting that they change the limit of foreign ownership from 25 per cent being allowed by this government to 1 per cent, to make the message and the point that we think Canadians should own Petro-Canada. With that kind of arrangement I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein could come in here after the embargo and start buying up Petro-Canada. That is how illogical this legislation is.

As an individual he could come in after the embargo and buy up 10 per cent of Petro-Canada. Who over there is an agent for Saddam Hussein? That is what I would like to know, Mr. Speaker.

The third amendment being proposed by the Liberal Party also is an attempt to prevent Saddam Hussein from buying up Petro-Canada. This amendment will deny foreign governments and their agents buying up parts of Petro-Canada. It is important for the government to hear this message so that we do not allow our oil company to fall into the hands of Saddam Hussein, Exxon, and that ilk. That is what the Tories across the way are really trying to do. They are the front shock troops for Saddam Hussein and the huge multinational oil corporations which are going to come in and buy up PetroCan.

What they are going to do is tell all Canadians who are patriotic to Canada, who are patriotic to their oil companies, to have one of these in their wallets, Mr. Speaker—Petro-Can credit cards.

**An hon. member:** Not here.

**Mr. Gardiner:** These guys are going to issue one to Saddam Hussein, and he is not going to have a credit limit on his credit card so he can come in and buy up our oil reserves. It is shocking what this government is doing. It should listen to some good sense and vote for these three amendments. Let's keep Petro-Canada a Canadian oil company. Let us be sure that Canadian taxpayers recognize and play a role in the energy development in our country.

**Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt):** Surely, Mr. Speaker, you know that I would not miss an opportunity to have a few words on this issue. As a matter of fact, Sir, you will remember this well. It is like the wheel going full circle because we were here. We saw it all. We saw the

creation of Petro-Canada in 1972. There was a minority government. Lo and behold we ended up with an energy crisis in 1973.

We had the big sisters in the oil industry telling us one day that we had enough reserves for the next 3,000 years. The next day we only had reserves for 10 years. And then the National Energy Board could not provide Canadians with the facts. It had no information about the reserves, and no other information about the way the oil industry operated in this country.

As the price for our support of a Liberal government, we forced upon them the establishment of a national energy company called Petro-Canada. We all remember that well. Liberals were not interested in establishing energy policy in this country. They were not interested in Canada having a window on the energy industry of this country. It was the New Democratic Party. We gave our support to that minority Liberal government and one of the prices was the establishment of Petro-Canada.

The government says that Petro-Canada should be privatized because it serves no public policy role. Can you believe that? In a resource that is so vital to the success of Canadian industry and to Canadians as a whole, this government says there is no public policy. This is a government of ideologues. We saw where the last government of ideologues—Margaret Thatcher's government—ended up.

**Mr. McDermid:** Are you speaking of ideologues?

**Mr. Rodriguez:** That is right. The minister has pointed the finger at the NDP, but I want to tell you to look at what your government is doing. All it wants is some corporate agenda. All it wants to do is to run Canada as if if were running the Iron Ore Company of Canada. The last one out will put the lights out. That is not the way it is going to be.

If the minister thinks we are wrong, I wish his government would call an election tomorrow and see where it will end up. It will end up in the ash can of history and never again for the next 100 years will a Conservative government be elected in this country. Ever.

**Mr. Langdon:** Ten seats. They'd get 10 seats.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Not even 10 seats.

**Mr. Langdon:** I am generous.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** It is embarked on a corporate agenda. It does not care about people. All that matters is some sort of idea that it is an accounting book and that there is a philosophy that you can have competition. Not only competition within Canada, but it is now talking about global competition. If ever Petro-Canada could play a public policy role, it is now.

Second, the government says: "Oh, we have to do this because we need the cash".

**Mr. McDermid:** No, the government never said that.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Well, you said that. You said you need the cash. There is a thinking out there among Canadians that we sold off Air Canada, that we have sold off de Havilland, that we have sold off Canadair, and that we have sold off a whole host of Crown corporations. Do you know what Canadians think? Canadians really think that when these are sold a cheque is written by the purchaser, it is handed to the government and goes into the Treasury.

• (1230)

I want to say to Canadians who are watching that not one plug nickel has been collected from any of the Crown corporations this government has privatized. It has all gone back to the companies.

**Mr. McDermid:** That's not true.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Your minister says that it is not true. Show me the cheque. Where is it? Get it out of your pocket and show it to us. You did not put it in the Consolidated Revenue Fund. You put it into the consolidated revenue fund of the purchasers of de Havilland; you put into Boeing. That is who has it.

France has a very dynamic role in the financial institutions of France. The government itself owns the bank. In Italy, the government owns the airline industry which employs thousands upon thousands of workers. They are doing the research and development in airplane design and manufacturing. It is the same in France. They do it.

We have the spectacle or the possibility of de Havilland actually being nationalized by foreign countries. France and Italy might end up buying de Havilland. Do you want to tell me that these people are not ideologically bent? They are so ideologically bent that if they stood behind a corkscrew at noon they would not throw a

shadow. They are motivated strictly by the board room and some cockamamie concept that you can run Canada as you run a corporation.

We have seen how they run a corporation. Let us look at how they run the CBC? Yesterday, CBC just simply announced lay-offs of people immediately. That is the way that the Incos and Falconbridges of this world run their companies in relationship to their workers. That is not the way a government should be run. It is run by these ideologues from the Stone Age.

The government has also said that it will reduce the deficit. Petro-Canada has been quite a profitable company. Now, after it has written down the value of Petro-Canada, it wants to sell it off.

Here is an example of a government that gives billions to private oil companies to develop Hibernia; $5 billion, $3 billion of which we will never see. Now it is handing money out to private corporations. This is a corporate welfare state. This government is handing out to corporate welfare bums a whole pile of money. The government is pretty tough on old age pensioners who have overpayments on their Old Age Supplement. It collects every dollar back and dime back. By the same token, it has all these corporate types lining up at the trough and it simply shells out the money.

In the case of Hibernia, not one litre of that oil will be refined in Canada. We have a refinery at Come-by-Chance. A previous government handed out to a corporate welfare character a whole pile of money to build that refinery at Come-by-Chance.

**Mr. Langdon:** It was the Liberals.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Yes, it was the Liberals. I am talking about that other gang. What is the difference between them? Here we have quite a spectacle.

We remember when Petro-Canada bought Petrofina. We never did get the true story of that. When the Tories were in opposition they were demanding under access to information certain rules. When they became the government, the Auditor General demanded the information, and these guys were as forthcoming as a clam on giving the public the information.

Here we have the spectacle of Petro-Canada being used to pay top buck for a company that maybe was not worth that at the time. We have this gang now selling it off. This government is selling off the family jewels, all of those investments that the Canadian public has made. The Canadian public invested in building up Petro-Canada. It must have put in about $6.5 billion toward developing Petro-Canada and the government, having written down its value, will sell it off. It is an investment which the people of Canada have made in a national oil company with a role to play in the public interest.

The fact of the matter is the government says it needs the cash. This government knows that it does not receive one penny from all those companies that it has nationalized. It has misled Canadians to think that somehow or other by selling all this off the government is accruing billions of dollars which it can apply to the deficit.

The other question is whether it will reduce the deficit. Look at what it has nationalized so far. This company has made money for the people of Canada. What it wants to do is sell off something that is finally starting to return money to the people of Canada. I think it is a disgrace. It is too bad we cannot put this government out of its misery. I appeal to Tory backbenchers to get up on their hind legs and do to the present Prime Minister what the Tories at Westminster did to Margaret Thatcher.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret the hon. member's time has expired.

**Mr. Langdon:** Mr. Speaker, we do not have a quorum.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I will ask the Clerk Assistant to count the members present.

*And the count having been taken:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Call in the members.

*And the bells having rung:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** There being a quorum, not including the occupant of the chair, debate shall accordingly continue.

**Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Calgary Southwest):** Mr. Speaker, I have sat and listened to the members of the two opposition parties this morning. It is quite interesting what they are explaining with regard to the amendments they have put forth to Bill C-84. They talked about, in total, a national petroleum company that is government regulated, government involvement and government controlled.

I would just like to draw to the attention of my colleagues that I come from the province of Alberta. One of the most devastating things that happened to us was the National Energy Program which was passed through this House, with the co-operation of the NDP. It devastated our province in the latter part of 1980 and

1981. I am not sure if too many people here today understand what happened when the PGRT was applied, which was a 16 per cent tax at the well head. There was absolutely no permissibility to have that reduced from one's income tax. We were double taxed to the point where there was between $60 million and $65 million taken out of our province over a period of four or five years. What we are describing today in regard to Bill C-84 is exactly the old National Energy Program. One of the reasons that I ran as a member of Parliament and came down here was to dismantle that program.

• (1240)

They talk about foreign ownership. They believe that the board of directors should be only Canadian residents. This should not be a prerequisite. We want the very best people, with the smartest brains, to be the directors. If one looks at the major oil and gas companies, the majority of the directors in our country are Canadian residents. However, if one goes back far enough to the time of Leduc, some of our friends from south of the border who came up from Tulsa, used their resources and helped bring onstream some of the major developments in the country.

I welcome foreign participation; there is no problem. We have limited ownership to the 25 per cent, and no one person can own more than 10 per cent. If we restrict the shares with too many items, we are not even going to be able to sell them in the marketplace, which is the reason for the bill.

The bill is to untie the strings of Petro-Canada and allow it to operate as a totally independent company that can go to the marketplace for equity. It has involvement in Hibernia, where there is a large commitment. It has involvement in the Beaufort, in Syncrude, and the OSLO project, which is still under review.

No matter where you go, it takes money to make money. This government has a major goal, and it happens to be deficit debt reduction.

**An hon. member:** Oh.

**Mrs. Sparrow:** Absolutely. No matter what you people say—and you are all socialists over there, absolutely every one of you—Petro-Canada is going to be operating as a private, independent company that can prove itself. It has an excellent board of directors today, with no problem whatsoever. It runs a very good company. Its findings have been excellent, but its main problem is its inability to access capital to fulfil its future objectives, future objectives that will bring onstream supplies of oil and gas for this country, supplies that we will need, supplies that even Ontario will need.

I could not help but hear my colleague from the New Democratic Party absolutely berating us for allowing Petro-Canada to be privatized. What did his premier do, in his province? He allowed British Gas to come in and take Consumers Gas, which is exactly the right way to do it. He agreed to Investment Canada's recommendation that foreign capital was going to help the province of Ontario.

What we need to do is agree that in order to help all Canadians, if you want to sell a barrel of oil or an mcf. of gas, you have to replace it. And, if you are going to replace it, you need capital to do the exploration, the development, and the production. That is exactly what we are going to give to Petro-Canada to allow it to be the best player.

**Mr. Ron Fisher (Saskatoon—Dundurn):** Mr. Speaker, what we have here is more smoke and mirrors. I think they set fire to all Petro-Canada reserves in the country, because I cannot see through this smoke, I will tell you.

We have had the member for Cariboo—Chilcotin telling us that this is a strictly ideological move on the part of the government. Then we had a member telling us that the only reason the government is doing this is to reduce the debt. I really am at a loss to know which it is. I suspect the truth is that it is neither.

What is really happening here, as with so many other things this government has done, is that it has taken anything in which the government has any kind of an interest and which is profitable and done the very best it could to transfer it from the general Canadian population into the hands of those who definitely do not need it. They already have more money than they could possibly figure out what to do with. I make that assumption purely on the basis that people other than people

like myself are going to be buying those shares. Whether it is to be 25 per cent foreign owned or 75 per cent Canadian owned is rather irrelevant. The fact of the matter is that what it is doing is taking profitable Canadian-owned, publicly-owned institutions and giving them away to their rich friends so that their rich friends can become even more rich than they already are.

We have in this country at the present time the first made-in-Canada depression, recession I suppose is the word that they would use across the floor. I suggest that what we have in this country right now also is the first instance in world history where the scorched-earth policy has been applied to a nation's own population.

I can understand the Russians during the Second World War scorching the earth so that their enemies would not to have a food supply at a time when they were retreating. When I look at what has been happening to this country since this government was elected a mere six years ago, and how much devastation it has caused to the identity, to the entity, to that geographical, to that philosophical, to the description which the world knows as Canada, it is obvious that what we have is a scorched-earth policy. After it is through, after it has left office, there will be no possibility of anyone ever being able to identify anything as being Canadian again.

The free trade deal was certainly an example of the scorched-earth policy being put into effect. When we look at what happened to Bill C-21, when we look at the privatization of the airplane manufacturing companies, which we have already had reference to, it is obvious what is happening. Anything that has any kind of a Canadian identity is being destroyed for reasons other than debt reduction or that it is good for Canada.

That is something we keep hearing all the time. The government is doing these things because they are good for Canada. I guess the government must have a different vision of what Canada is than certainly I or the members of my party have. I have a hard time relating to a Canada that no longer has a sharing, caring unemployment insurance scheme. I have trouble with a Canada that no longer has a VIA Rail. I have trouble with a Canada that no longer has an identifiable publicly-owned airline such Air Canada. I have trouble with a Canada where with one of the major funding institutions in the country, the government has done the very best it can to diminish the well-being of Canadians. I am referring to the medicare system and also the federal funding of post-secondary education.

What we have is a scorched-earth policy. What we are debating right now, the privatization of Petro-Canada, is nothing more or nothing less than that.

Mr. Speaker, when the history of this nation is written, I assure you that the name of the minister of privatization on December 6, 1990 will not appear in the history books for good reason. If I was doing what that minister is doing, I would not want it to appear there. I am sure there are very few historians who would even give what he is doing a passing glance. Yet we have the confession of the government that this is being done for ideological reasons.

Hopefully, this is some kind of an aberration in the history of this country, that we should have something as disastrous as this happening to a nation. I suggest, as one of the previous speakers said, this is probably going to be the last Progressive Conservative government, hopefully with any connotation of Conservative, in this country for the next 100 years.

Getting closer to the amendments themselves, the idea is to reduce foreign ownership to zero, 1 per cent actually. Margaret Thatcher in her conservative wisdom set the number in many instances at zero. So it really is not that outrageous for us to suggest that the foreign ownership level be reduced from 25 per cent to 1 per cent.

• (1250)

Let us talk about the country with which we have a free trade agreement, the good old U.S.A. The Americans are becoming tremendously concerned about the level of foreign ownership of their economy. The level of foreign ownership of the United States economy is somewhere between 4 per cent and 5 per cent.

Manufacturing in Canada has 50 per cent foreign ownership. In the resource industries we have a foreign ownership level of 70 per cent to 80 per cent. In the oil industry we have foreign ownership levels of somewhere around 45 per cent, and that is up from a level of 37 per cent when these scorched earthers assumed power in 1984.

We had a confession from the hon. member for Cariboo—Chilcotin that this is an ideological battle, and I think it is nothing more than that. I think we owe a

great deal of thanks to that member for having identified it as such.

**Mr. Jack Whittaker (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today without some of the exuberance shown by other members on both sides of the House when speaking to this particular bill. I rise with the feeling of some depression, and I bring that depression with me, having just come back from a number of days in British Columbia. People in that province—and I have also seen this in Alberta, Newfoundland and other places in the country that I have been over the last little while—have a depressed feeling. It is not a depression in economic terms, although certainly the government has pushed us in that direction, it is an emotional depression where people are asking what is happening to our country.

During the last election, we were promised certain things. The government of the day talked about leading us into the economic future. But the feeling, which is reflected fairly accurately in the recent polls which show the government at an all-time low of 14 per cent, is here for a good reason.

People to whom I have spoken, life-time members until recently of the Conservative Party, have said they could not, and never would again, support the party into which they were essentially born and with which they have lived and fought for all these years, are now fighting with the party. I use the analogy of a family that has lost everything in a fire. They have worked their complete lives building up their assets and all of a sudden they see a total loss.

These people point out to me the problems with VIA Rail. They tell me our country is no longer the vision of the Conservative John A. Macdonald, of keeping this country together from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific coast. They see the breaking down of that under the government with the gutting of the VIA Rail lines and the privatization of Air Canada.

Yesterday, some of the worst fears of the people of Canada came about with the total devastation of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation by this government. That corporation was built over a period of time and has become what people from every region of Canada look upon as part of what keeps us together. It gives us the opportunity in cross-Canada programs for the east coast to talk to the west coast to talk to northern Canadians.

We have seen over the past six years a whittling away by this government of that particular method of communication. But what do we have today? Once again, we are back to what is depressing the people that I speak to; Air Canada, VIA Rail, Canada Post, and now Petro-Canada.

People have looked on Petro-Canada as our opportunity to keep the foreign oil companies who seem to control us somewhat honest. It was pointed out in an earlier speech by one of the members of my party that what has happened over the last period of time is a program by this government to ensure that Petro-Canada is more and more like every other corporation, instead of that leader which people in Canada have looked for.

Over the past month or so, I have had hundreds of letters from people in my riding and from various other parts of Canada, copies of letters to the Prime Minister, and copies of letters to the minister of privatization, asking me to stand up and fight for Canada, to fight against the privatization of Petro-Canada, the last vestige of control we have as far as retailing or refining of oil is concerned.

It is interesting to look at history and see what happened, what the people in our history have said. Some of our recent history, I think, is worth looking at. The minister of privatization who has been so vocal in his heckling and what not this morning, said in this House on December 11, 1979, at page 2255 of *Hansard*:

> —only eligible Canadians—eligible Canadians—should be permitted to own shares in Petro-Canada and only eligible Canadians—Canadians, I repeat—should be entitled to buy shares in the after-market. I have stated many times that the shares must go to and remain in Canadian hands.

That is the same minister who now brings forward a plan to turn over 25 per cent of Petro-Canada to anybody who wants it, to foreign interests. The particular amendments we are looking at, and that our party is pushing for, are to ensure that if this government is bent on privatizing this corporation, that the privatization remain minimal and the control of that corporation remain in Canadian hands, as the minister of privatization himself argued for in 1979.

But, Mr. Speaker, he is not the only one. The present Conservative House leader from Calgary stated on June 20, 1978, "I was a founding member of the committee for

an independent Canada and I believe that far too much of our economy is owned by foreigners. I know why that is so. It is because the oil industry is owned primarily by foreigners".

What is the House leader doing? He is supporting a bill that will put that control back in the hands of the foreigners.

This bill cannot go forward without our amendments, but I would suggest on behalf of the people in my riding that this bill should not go forward at all, but should be withdrawn by this government for the sake of Canadian unity.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chamber until two o'clock this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

---

### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*English*]

### INTERPROVINCIAL TRADE

**Mr. Joe McGuire (Egmont):** Mr. Speaker, oyster dealers in P.E.I. have encountered a problem trying to sell their oysters in the Quebec market. This problem arises because there are two different levels of inspections which are in effect in that province and which could be put into effect in any province.

If these oysters had come from the U.S., rather than a Canadian province, they would not have been subject to provincial inspection at all. However, because of interprovincial trade barriers, oyster dealers are faced with meeting different standards in different provinces.

The oysters in question passed federal inspection in P.E.I. before they left, passed federal inspection in Quebec after they arrived, but were rejected and returned by provincial inspectors. Our oyster dealers and fishermen are being badly hurt.

We have signed a free trade agreement with the U.S. We are considering joining free trade discussions with the U.S. and Mexico. Yet, within our own country, we are faced with restrictive trade practices which in instances such as the one involving oysters can actually discriminate against products from another part of our own country.

We need to put our own house in order before we get involved in another free trade deal, especially one which has the potential to be even more disastrous than the one the government has already gotten us into.

* * *

### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina):** Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the murder of 14 women at the École polytechnique in Montreal. It is a day of mourning for all women and men of conscience for it reminds us all that misogyny, the blind hatred of women, can only end in tragedy.

This was not an isolated incident and the murderer was not acting at random. He and hundreds like him are the logical results of a society which too often degrades and dehumanizes women. In Ontario alone dozens of women have died over the last two years. Today we remember just a few of them by name: Annette Orrico, Valerie McKay, Sakina Pabani, Jane Cunningham, Heather Pelletier, Nancy Simansky, Gabriella Christian, and Monique Girard.

Today, we are reminded that mourning is not enough. We must all work for change.

* * *

[*Translation*]

### TRAGEDY AT L'ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE

**Mrs. Suzanne Duplessis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Science):** Mr. Speaker, this is a very sad day, a reminder of a frightening drama that took the lives of 14 young women and future engineers. All these students had a brilliant career ahead of them, but only a few seconds is all that a distraught individual needed to destroy everything. The wound is still there a year later, and we realize that never will Quebecers and Canadians forget this terrible incident.

In the name of the Minister of Science and personally I want to extend again my deepest sympathy to the parents who had to learn to live again after losing their daughter. To the directors of the École polytechnique and to all students I express my respect and admiration for managing to overcome such a trying experience.

I hope that everywhere in Canada and throughout the world we will never again witness such cruel and aberrant incidents.

* * *

## HIVER EN NORD FESTIVAL

**Mr. Jacques Vien (Laurentides):** A few days ago, Mr. Speaker, eastern Canada was blanketed under the winter's first snow fall. The people of my riding were rejoicing, for it marked the beginning of the new winter tourist season.

This winter Sainte-Agathe-des-Monts will celebrate the 50th anniversary of its festivities. This year's Hiver en Nord festival will be held from January 26 to February 24 next. This festival provides a number of activities for the whole family, regardless of age and personal preferences. This winter feast is organized by a group of very dynamic volunteers who will extend the warmest welcome to all visitors.

I invite all Canadians to come and celebrate Saint-Agathe's Hiver en Nord festival. The Laurentians are well known for spectacular scenery, unrivalled hospitality and proven enjoyment of Canadian winters in northern country.

* * *

[*English*]

## BALTIC STATES

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Liberal Party of Canada, I would like to welcome the President of Lithuania who is with us in Ottawa today. My leader and members of our caucus met with the President this morning and were presented with a document of the Joint Session of the Baltic Supreme Councils addressed to the parliaments of the world.

In this document the Supreme Councils, reaffirming their nations' will to restore the complete independence of the three Baltic States and adhering to the fundamental principles of the Helsinki Final Act, appeal to the parliaments of the world to fully employ their influence in helping to assure that the Soviet Union end all threats and begin interstate negotiations with the States on the recognition of their independence.



We on this side of the House would like to urge the Government of Canada, in keeping with the spirit of the all-party resolution unanimously passed by the House last March, that full consideration be given to this document, as a member of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, to endorse the inclusion of the Baltic States on the future agenda of the executive bodies of the CSCE.

Once again, we would like to welcome President Landsbergis and wish him a successful and fruitful visit in Canada.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Jean-Luc Joncas (Matapédia—Matane):** Mr. Speaker, the CBC wants to restructure its operations, and the government wants to cut spending. I have no objections, but if it means closing down all television stations in Eastern Quebec, that is unacceptable and intolerable. It means depriving the people of my riding of their sole means of communicating with the rest of the country.

I therefore want to ask the President of the CBC and the Minister of Communications to review this decision, and to consider the geographical circumstances, the catastrophic state of the economy and the increasingly alarming demographics of this part of the country as grounds for excempting the Gaspé from these vicious cutbacks.

The people of the Gaspé are not asking for miracles. They want the right to be informed. Mr. Speaker, at this stage, a cut in the Senate budget would have been a much wiser decision.

* * *

[*English*]

## NATIONAL HOCKEY LEAGUE

**Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas):** Mr. Speaker, I have some great news for hockey fans across Canada. We just learned a few minutes ago that the city of Ottawa has been awarded a National Hockey League franchise.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Kilger:** I would like to congratulate Terrace Investments and everyone who backed the franchise bid.

I also want to commend the people who backed the application for the city of Hamilton. We hope that Hamilton will be included in the next round of expansion in the national hockey league.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## NATIONAL UNITY

**Mr. Walter Van De Walle (St. Albert):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians want a united Canada. Working together we have been building a tolerant, democratic, peaceful, and prosperous country and we have made tremendous progress. Together Canadians must continue this task.

While some spread doom and gloom and promote disunity and discord, our Prime Minister has shown initiative and leadership with his creation of the Citizen's Forum and his invitation for all Canadians to be heard.

One group in Alberta speaking out loudly and clearly for Canadian unity is the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties. At its recent convention it resolved that to "support those leaders whose goals are to develop a constitution for all Canadians, for one nation, united by our land and spirit, respecting our country, our flag, our home, our Canada."

Canadians want a united Canada.

* * *

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, today marks a memorial of sorrow. One year ago, Canada witnessed the brutal massacre of 14 young women at the École polytechnique in Montreal, a most terrifying example of violence against women.

Sexual assault, emotional abuse, battering, and murder of women continue to escalate. Battering of women is now a major public health problem. Indeed, women of all ages are scared, and rightly so. There is no sanctuary from the fear.

Is it not within our mandate to legislate for a secure future for Canadian women and to pass strict gun control laws? Let us support the call for a royal commission on violence against women.

As we mourn today those precious lives lost one year ago, please remember our Canadian obligation to keep Canadian women and all Canadians safe from harm and free of fear.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## RIDING OF CHÂTEAUGUAY

**Mr. Ricardo Lopez (Châteauguay):** Mr. Speaker, the riding of Châteauguay was severely affected by the Amerindian crisis last summer and, unfortunately, it is not over yet.

I want to ask the government to provide special economic assistance that will help the riding recover from the aftermath of these events.

I also want to ask the government to clarify the status of Indian land claims and give investors and the people of Châteauguay the assurance that these claims will not block the area's economic development, which badly needs a boost.

* * *

## QUEBEC SOVEREIGNTY

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, today I rise in the House to pay tribute to a government that is helping us achieve sovereignty. The federal government is withdrawing from most areas that affect the lives of this country's citizens. It has cut postal services and railway transportation; it is making cutbacks at the CBC and privatizing Petro-Canada; it will shut off the Sarnia—Montreal pipe-line, cut back unemployment insurance and cut back regional development.

Mr. Speaker, in addition they cannot agree with the Government of Quebec on immigration. They cannot agree on occupational training, they cannot agree on regional development and they cannot agree on communications.

Mr. Speaker, initially, we said that sovereignty was desirable. Now, we realize it is necessary. And the evidence is mounting that the sooner it happens, the better.

• (1410)

[*English*]

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing):** Mr. Speaker, one year ago today 14 women lost their lives to one man's hate. Today we mourn, but we must also work for change. We must work to end the glorification of violence against women so that we can end the violence.

We will truly have made progress when we can no longer remember the murderer's name, but only the names of the women he killed. With that in mind, today we remember Geneviève Bergeron, Hélène Colgan, Nathalie Croteau, Barbara Daigeneault, Anne Marie Edward, Maud Haviernick, Barbara Maria Klucznik, Maryse Laganière, Maryse Leclair, Anne Marie Lemay, Sonia Pelletier, Michèle Richard, Annie St-Arneault, and Annie Turcotte.

In their memory, members of the House are asked to support the establishment by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of 14 science scholarships in the names of the 14 who died at the École polytechnique.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Gabrielle Bertrand (Brome—Missisquoi):** Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the tragic killings of 14 young women at the École polytechnique. I would like to say that eliminating violence against women is one of this government's priorities, a commitment reflected in the Lake Louise declaration signed last May by the Hon. Mary Collins and her provincial counterparts. The declaration reads as follows:

"We, the Ministers Responsible for the Status of Women in Canada, are committed to achieving full equality for women in all aspects of life. As Canadians, we value the inherent worth and dignity of every individual and we expect all persons to treat one another with respect. Since violence and its threat are depriving many women of their ability to achieve equality, we declare that:

1. Violence against women is a crime and punishable under the law.
2. Women are entitled to live in a safe environment.
3. Offenders must be held accountable for their behavior.
4. The elimination of violence against women requires a response including prevention, public education, services and enforcement of the law.
5. Every individual, community and government in Canada must do everything possible to help the women, children and families affected by violence; we must all work together to achieve a society free of violence."

* * *

[*English*]

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester):** Mr. Speaker, at a time when Canada begs for unity and leadership, once again Canadians have been dealt a mean blow by the Conservative government.

Cruel and harsh cuts to local CBC programming across Canada will eliminate whole stations. Local productions, such as Ottawa's *Metro*, are gone.

[*Translation*]

Francophones in the Toronto—Windsor corridor have lost their French station, in an area where local programming is important to their survival. Thanks to the Conservative government, from now on Francophones outside Quebec will have only one station which they will continue to share with West Quebec. CBOFT and its English-language counterpart, CBOT, will suffer cuts of over $4 million and lose 75 employees.

Is the government really trying to destroy the Canadian dialogue and promote the Americanization of our airways?

* * *

[*English*]

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Felix Holtmann (Portage—Interlake):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the president of the CBC announced how the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation will be restructured and be able to operate within its federal budget combined with reduced commercial revenue.

There continues to be in excess of $1 billion of taxpayers' money flowing into the CBC every year. It is obvious to most intellectuals that the communications technology today allows continued coverage from coast to coast. It is also important to recognize that the private TV networks and independent stations after 50 years are

providing considerable Canadian coverage by Canadians for Canadians, sometimes even better than the CBC.

I wish to announce to the House that I have instructed the clerk of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture to invite the management of CBC to appear before the committee Tuesday next at 9 a.m. I suspect there may be some opposition members who may wish to attend.

* * *

### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, today I rise in this House to mark the tragic anniversary of the murder of 14 women and to remind the House that violence against women happens everywhere, every day. The real tragedy of violence against women is that it is so commonplace. One woman in Canada is assaulted every six minutes.

Across the country, there are those who would like to deny the reality of violence against women. The Speaker of the legislature in Alberta refused to allow any remembrance of the event. He said it would not be an appropriate observation for the Legislative Assembly of Alberta. In Newfoundland, the male Status of Women Minister felt that the murders were an isolated incident which had nothing to do with women in Newfoundland. Today, an angry man called the Newfoundland Advisory Council on the Status of Women and told the woman who answered the phone that he wished there were more Marc Lepines. Violence affects every region of Canada.

Flags fly at half-mast in the Yukon today to mark the anniversary of the occurrence at the École polytechnique, and the tragic deaths of 106 Canadian women who have died of family violence in the last 12 months.

In memory of women victims of violence everywhere, I urge all Canadians to first mourn and then work for change.

* * *

[*Translation*]

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Fernand Jourdenais (La Prairie):** Mr. Speaker, recently I read the following article in one of our papers: "Savings as a result of GST—A commitment to Canadians! More than 100 companies have agreed to let you take advantage of their savings once the GST comes into force." And I believe that, Mr. Speaker!

This week, upon finishing a roll of paper, I found this bilingual coupon:

> Message re goods and services tax.
>
> On January 1, 1991, we expect the federal manufacturers' sales tax to be abolished and replaced by a 7 per cent tax on goods and services (GST).
>
> We take pleasure in announcing that Facelle Limited will reduce the price to distributors of all brand name consumer products on January 1, 1991, to fully reflect the fact that the manufacturers' sales tax now in effect has been abolished. Facelle products will then be subject to the new GST. The transition should have no inflationary effect on the price of Facelle products.

Mr. Speaker, my message to the senators is: Stop fooling around and pass the GST—step on it!

---

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. A year ago today, a tragic event made a lasting impact on the École polytechnique in Montreal and the entire country. In a matter of minutes, 14 women with a promising future lost their lives as a result of violence. Throughout the country we see a disturbing increase in violence against women. Considering these terrible and shocking facts, I want to ask the Prime Minister whether today he will announce the appointment of a royal commission on violence against women in this country.

[*English*]

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, I think all of us grieve and remember that event of a year ago today and we will, after Question Period, have an opportunity to express our concerns.

The suggestion that the Leader of the Opposition has made has been made to the government by a group of women's organizations in the last few days. I am looking forward to meeting with them and discussing it with them. I have also asked the special subcommittee dealing with violence against women to advise us as well on an appropriate mechanism, whether a royal commission or some other mechanism, that will enable us to move

forward as a government, as a society, to try to finally reduce and eliminate violence against women.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, all across this country, women's hopes are being blighted by their legitimate concern about their personal safety. I regret that the government has not seen fit to announce today the creation of a royal commission on violence against women, something my party strongly supports.

• (1420)

Will the Prime Minister at least make a commitment today that there will be no cuts in funding for those centres which provide vital support services for women? In fact, will he make a commitment today, not simply to maintain, but to substantially increase the funding for these centres that provide services that are so important, so vital, to the women of this country?

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member is aware that there are a variety of initiatives and programs through the federal government working on fighting against violence against women.

Among those, of course, is the family violence program. We have been reviewing that program and as the Prime Minister has indicated, we are looking forward to new and extensive initiatives over the coming months.

In addition, through my colleague the Secretary of State's women's programs, we will continue to fund the efforts of many women's organizations and women's groups throughout the country which are also involved as one of the partners in trying to deal with this very difficult issue. This is going to require the efforts of all levels of government, of men and women across society and of educators, teachers and families.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I also address my second supplementary question to the Prime Minister. I hope he will get up and agree with me that the rights and aspirations of women are more than just another entry on a government balance sheet.

If so, will he commit today to provide substantial funding for new programs that will help eliminate violence against the women of this country.

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, and I know that this view is shared by hon. colleagues on all sides of the House, we all want to work toward that end objective.

There have been some 700 projects funded through the family violence program over the last few years. I look forward, as I know my colleagues do, to extension enhancements of those initiatives and those programs so that the federal government can play its role along with other partners in society to eliminate this tragic incidence in our society. If there was one way to eliminate it, I am sure we would all be able to do it quickly. There is not one way. It is multifaceted. It will require effort and understanding of the reasons why, and efforts on prevention, education and support for those women who are victims of violence.

I hope my colleague will join with us in working toward that goal of eliminating violence against women in Canadian society.

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax):** Mr. Speaker, one year ago we mourned a massacre and called for a royal commission into violence against women. Thousands of voices now echo that call.

Will the Prime Minister, in whose sole purview this is, offer dignity and legitimacy to the millions of Canadian women who spend part of every single day in fear, and announce the commencement of this royal commission immediately.

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, as I addressed my hon. colleague's leader, this proposal has been made to us in the last few days. I am looking forward to meeting with those who are suggesting a royal commission to discuss with them what its goals and objectives might be.

We are also looking forward to the report from the committee upon which the hon. member sits as to its

suggestions on an appropriate mechanism which would ensure that we move forward with initiatives. We will also continue to address the root causes and find whatever might be the most appropriate way to deal with this terrible scourge in Canadian society.

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax):** Mr. Speaker, I know and I appreciate the comments of the hon. Minister responsible for the Status of Women, but I repeat, I asked and I want to know the views of the Prime Minister in this matter.

In these days with the threat of guns, the threatened closure of women's centres, ruinous cuts to women's research and development, and over-all, a recession that we all know clearly aggravates domestic violence, can we expect the announcement of a royal commission from the Prime Minister? If we cannot expect a royal commission, what does the Prime Minister believe? What is he prepared to announce today to give hope to Canadian women? Is he prepared to say that all of the women who have died—not just those in Montreal, but all of the women who have died—have not died in vain?

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. colleague recognizes, as we all recognize in this House, that we have to continue our work toward full equality for women in all aspects of society. That is a challenge for all of us. It requires legislative measures. It also requires some fundamental changes in many of the attitudes that we have entrenched within our system for so many years.

We will be addressing all of these issues, and I know I speak not only on behalf of myself but for all of my colleagues and the Prime Minister, that we will seek new measures and new ways to achieve that fundamental goal of equality for women enabling Canadian women to live without fear.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. With all due respect to the Minister responsible for the Status of Women, who I feel is trying very hard to work on behalf of women, I ask the Prime Minister a question today because I think Canadians would like to know what the Prime Minister's commitment is.

This is the one-year anniversary of the tragic killing of 14 women in Montreal. We all, men and women, grieve for those victims and for their families. We also grieve for the one in ten women who are beaten by their partners, for the one in four women who are assaulted, or for the women, one of whom is raped every 17 minutes in Canada, and for women who experience sexual harassment in the workplace and on campuses. One year after this massacre in Montreal, there is still not a woman in this House of Commons, not a woman in this country who can walk in the streets of a city in Canada and not feel fear.

This is not a social issue, this is a political issue. Will the Prime Minister acknowledge that we have to begin addressing the real problem of violence against women by addressing the issues of unemployment, poverty and programs affecting women in our society?

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, I know that when the Leader of the NDP talks about those frightening statistics, she shares with all of us the grief that is felt by not only the families of the women who were killed at École polytechnique but the families and friends of women who are victims of violence in this country. Part of understanding the issue is talking about it, admitting that it exists. It is important that all members in this House recognize the extent of this problem.

We do know that there are links between violence against women and other issues affecting women's economic and social status in this country. That is why this government will continue its effort to ensure that women are able not only to improve their economic status in this country by ensuring that we work toward full employment and a viable economy, but that we work on the other issues of concern to women as well, work to ensure language training for immigrant women, work on new programs dealing with family violence and work in a whole variety of ways so that women finally can achieve that full equality, not only in the House of Commons and legislatures across the country but throughout Canadian society.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the Prime Minister. In its last Budget, the government decided to cut funding for women's centres. Next March, many women's centres across Canada will again be affected, including 42 in

Quebec. The government must be aware of the fact that without women's centres, many battered women and victims of sexual assault will not know where to turn and have no one they can rely on. Will the Prime Minister change his policy and promise the women of Canada that these centres will receive permanent and adequate funding?

[*English*]

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, I, of course, am very much aware of the situation in five of the provinces with women's centres where federal funding helps to ensure their continued role, and where much of their role is to help support women who are victims of violence, or women trying to access various government services. That, indeed, is why the government continued its funding of government centres last year. Since that time my colleague, the Secretary of State, has had discussions with his provincial counterparts, the ministers responsible for the status of women. We have been in the discussions with them and are working toward a resolution of this matter which would ensure that women's centres continue to thrive and continue to provide support and services for women in all provinces and territories of the country.

• (1430)

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Prime Minister. I believe the women of Canada deserve to know from the Prime Minister where the government stands on behalf of women in this country. I appreciate the comments of the Minister responsible for the Status of Women.

There are many causes leading to violence against women in this society: structural, fundamental, political, social, and cultural. Will the Prime Minister commit today to the establishment of a royal commission on violence against women which will address all these issues, which will show his government's commitment to address these issues, and which will give a commitment to the women of Canada on this very sad anniversary?

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the hon. member that in my portfolio as the Minister responsible for the Status of Women I have responsibility within this government to speak on behalf of the interests of women. I am very pleased that I have the support of my colleagues on these issues that are so fundamentally important to women.

As my hon. colleague has raised once again the issue of a royal commission and as I have responded earlier, we are looking forward to discussions about this proposal both from the women's organizations that have put it forward and from colleagues in the House who are examining the issue of violence against women.

I am sure that we will have in place mechanisms to ensure that we move forward with not only developing a greater understanding of the causes of violence against women but also reaching the solutions which will ensure over a period of time that women will be able to look forward to a brighter society and that violence can be reduced and ultimately eradicated from Canadian society.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister responsible for the Status of Women. Since in 1988 the federal government announced it would invest $40 million over four years in local initiative projects against family violence, could the Minister explain to the House why, in Quebec, 40 centres had to close their doors because of lack of funding?

[*English*]

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleague knows, this government did continue its funding for women's centres in Quebec. It has, through the Family Violence Program, provided funding for some 700 projects across the country involving a variety of initiatives from prevention to education and to programs like the recently announced Canadian Teachers Federation curriculum program "Thumbs Down" to bring into our schools with our teachers the ability to educate our children more effectively on issues relating to violence in our society.

Those kinds of initiatives, along with initiatives from the Minister of State for Housing to provide capital funding for shelters for women who have been abused across the country, are evidence of this government's commitment.

I work along with my provincial colleagues responsible for the status of women in our intent to ensure that we work jointly to reduce the incidence of violence and to work toward full equality for women in Canadian society.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville):** Mr. Speaker, that is all very well, but it has no connection at all with the subject of my question.

Considering the remarkable ease with which the government cut $1.6 million in funding for women centres, and considering it was forced to reinstate that funding, if only for one year, will the Minister give the House the assurance today that this funding will again be available next year and the year after?

[*English*]

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad my hon. colleague has recognized that the funding of women's centres has continued during this year in Quebec, British Columbia, Nova Scotia, Yukon, the Territories, and Newfoundland.

As I indicated to her colleague earlier, the Secretary of State is having ongoing discussions with the ministers responsible for the status of women in each of those provinces to work toward appropriate sharing of responsibilities for the further continuation of financial support to those centres throughout Canada.

* * *

## GUN CONTROL

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

Strong, effective gun control legislation is an issue for women, but it is also an issue for the whole of society. As long as young women are killed by angry men with guns, this House must press for stricter gun control legislation.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. MacLellan:** The minister had an opportunity to honour the victims of the Montreal massacre in a very constructive way by bringing forward quickly strong, effective gun control legislation. Instead she sidetracked her own bill.

Why, when Bill C-80 was introduced in June, did she wait until November to bring the matter before the House, a time when it became obvious that this bill would not pass in this session?

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I have made it very clear in this House that I would have preferred to have the package before the same kind of special committee during the summer. I have been working very closely with my colleagues on the issue since the bill was tabled.

As I have said before, I am absolutely committed to the fundamental principles that are contained in our gun control measures. I intend to see these changes made into law.

As the hon. member will know, this is a contentious issue. If I can quote his colleague from his party who sits on the special committee, he has expressed the view that the government's proposals for gun control stink. He said that in rural Canada we do not understand some of the difficulties that are taking place and what urban Canada is asking for. He also said that Bill C-80 would deny rural Canadians a long-standing right to hunt, shoot at targets in a gun club or merely collect weapons. That is in fact a misconstruction of what is in Bill C-80.

I am very concerned about violence. I am also concerned about democracy and think it is important that those who are affected by the legislation understand what is in it. That is why I am very pleased to see it before the committee.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, we must fight acts of anti-feminism such as the massacre the way we fight racism. We can never ignore the social context in which these murders took place.

As the first woman Minister of Justice, will she please honour the thousands of females who die as victims of violence and bring forward, in the event that Bill C-80 dies on the Order Paper, new, stricter gun control legislation by March 15?

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I have already made it very clear that I am committed to bringing forward such legislation. I hope that I will have the support of the hon. member and his colleague from Kenora—Rainy River.

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the same minister. Of course the minister did have the support of the previous member and this member on behalf of this party, and she withdrew her gun control legislation.

[*Translation*]

My question is again directed to the Minister of Justice. Tory members are proud of the fact they managed to kill the proposed gun control legislation. Young women at the École polytechnique in Montreal are campaigning for much stricter legislation. Why didn't the minister listen to the women of Canada and the women of Montreal? Why did she prefer to listen to the Tory members?

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I did not withdraw my bill. It is still before the House, and I fully support the fundamental principles of the changes I proposed with respect to the control of firearms, and I intend to see to it that the necessary amendments are made to the Criminal Code.

• (1440)

[*English*]

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the same minister.

Would the minister agree with me that women are not the gun owners, the hunters, or even the collectors? Although some of them are, by and large they are not. When it comes to statistics about guns, women are the victims of these guns. That is the problem.

In the spirit we are taking this House on this day, a day when we are reflecting on the first anniversary of this terrible incident, would the minister and the government commit themselves to bringing back before the House good gun control legislation, strong gun control legislation, well before this same time next year, the time when we will have the second anniversary of this terrible massacre?

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I have already presented to this House what I believe is good gun control legislation. I am looking forward to the constructive comments of the hon. member and other colleagues in this House on this proposal, because it is in fact the first time that the proposals of the government have been in a public forum.

I do not for one moment want to downplay the significance of firearms as it reflects violence with respect to women, but I think it is also important to understand that there is a difference between urban and rural outlets on this particular issue.

I have recently named my National Advisory Council on Firearms. The vice-chair people happen to be a man who is as former chief of police of Regina and an Olympic gold medalist in shooting competition who happens to be a woman.

* * *

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Ms. Ethel Blondin (Western Arctic):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

Violence should have no place in the Canadian family or community, yet every week two women are violently murdered in Canada. One in ten women are abused, be it sexually, emotionally, or psychologically.

I want to ask my question of the Prime Minister, not the Minister of Justice, not the Minister responsible for the Status of Women, but the Prime Minister because he is a man.

**Some hon. members:** Order.

**Ms. Blondin:** Mr. Speaker, will the Prime Minister of Canada give his assurance to all the women of Canada that his government will not cut funding for those badly needed services which battered and abused women depend on?

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member, I think she knows that there is a number of federal government programs that work toward support of women who are abused: from my colleague, the Minister of State for Housing, support for transition houses; the Minister of National Health and Welfare, through the family violence program, provides a great deal of support to organizations; and the Secretary of State. Of course the provinces play a very major role in providing support through social services with transition houses and other resources to help women who are victims of abuse.

I can assure my colleague that my provincial ministers responsible for the status of women and I, at our meeting at Lake Louise, issued a declaration against violence on women. We are now in the process of developing a national strategy, a strategy that will take into account the need for prevention, for education, and for support to women and women's organizations to assist women who are victims of abuse.

I think all 10 provinces, the two territories, and the federal government have made that commitment. We will ensure that we follow through on it.

**Ms. Blondin:** Mr. Speaker, I really wish we had heard from the Prime Minister. The women of Canada would have liked to have heard from the Prime Minister.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. Blondin:** That would have expressed a real commitment from this government.

* * *

## JUSTICE

**Ms. Ethel Blondin (Western Arctic):** Mr. Speaker, all Canadians have come to know that in northern Canada there have been sentences frequently given for offences against women that have been too light. I ask the Minister of Justice, without prejudice and with fair-mindedness: Will she commit to a full review in the Northwest Territories of gender bias in the court system?

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to address that question because, as the hon. member may know, it has been raised a number of other times in this House.

There is a number of projects under way to address that problem, projects that have been initiated by the Canadian Judicial Centre, with support from the Government of Canada. In the spring of 1991 there will be a national conference on women and the justice system. One of the issues that it will address will be the question of women as they are treated in the courts. That will be an opportunity for us to bring together the results of a great deal of ongoing research.

One of the most important things about the conference is that members of the judiciary will be participating. It is important that these problems not simply be brought to the attention of the public, but that those who actually administer the law and sit in judgment understand and have their outlooks changed. I am deeply committed to that process and to encouraging it.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, the Canadian people find dramatic the cuts affecting the mandate of the CBC. It is so bad, hacking away like that at the CBC, that Jean Dufresne, of the *Journal de Montréal*, called it a political crime today. So, here is my question to the Prime Minister: Is he prepared to put at least a moratorium on the cuts at the CBC and to set up an inquiry on the new role announced for the CBC yesterday by its president, Mr. Veilleux.

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, neither the CBC nor the government were happy to make such a major decision, but we felt it had to be done for the various reasons given yesterday. We could also come up with quotes from other people who approve of the government's move and think it was wise and called for under the circumstances.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, the problem with the government is its vision and its sight, and it is not on Canada.

My question concerns the remarks made by the CBC president, who stated just a few hours ago that he had been in constant contact with the ministers and this government, that they were fully informed. Therefore, they knew the CBC had had cuts of up to 15 per cent in their budgets in real terms over the last five years.

Will the Prime Minister admit today that it is the cuts of his government that caused this dreadful shutdown at the CBC and such misery to so many people?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, it is clear that in the case of a corporation as important as the CBC, as for all the corporations that come under the Government of Canada in one way or another, major decisions affecting them are always made in consultation and in view of the overall objectives and means of the government.

This government has been making tremendous efforts since 1984 for the CBC as for all others sectors. It is clear, however, that the CBC, with nearly 30 percent of its budget coming from commercial income, especially in television, is affected by the whole market as are all other television networks.

The communications critic should take a look at the statement made yesterday by the president of the Canadian Broadcasters Association, who stated, and I quote in the language the statement was made, i.e. English:

[*English*]

"Everybody is hurting because the market is more and more fragmented. Inevitably, CBC was going to have to change", as we will.

* * *

## STATUS OF WOMEN

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister responsible for the Status of Women.

Today, the minister said that she has the support of her colleagues in advancing the cause of the status of women. Is it the minister who asked for cutbacks to womens' centres? Is it the minister who asked for cutbacks to womens' publications? Is it the minister who asked for cutbacks to the Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women? Is it the minister who asked her colleagues to cut back on these programs?

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. colleague is aware of the difficult financial situation which this government finds itself in and its desire to reduce the deficit. Along with that, all departments of government obviously have had to provide some contribution to that.

I have ensured that when we discuss any reductions which have to take place with all of my colleagues, they must not affect women adversely or differentially. As we proceed with our programs, we must ensure that our support for women throughout the government, both in our laws and in our programs, is full in all areas of the government's mandate.

I can assure the hon. member of the Prime Minister's commitment to that and to the commitment of all my colleagues.

• (1450 )

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, for the Prime Minister. The women and men of Canada would like to hear that commitment from the Prime Minister himself. He speaks on many issues of concern to Canadians in this House.

Will the Prime Minister today give his commitment to fight violence against women by committing permanent funding for women's centres, and a royal commission on violence against women which will speak for the women of Canada? Will he do it now?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I respond simply because they are such serious questions. I am dismayed to hear the leader of the New Democratic Party refuse to accept as authoritative the voice of a woman speaking for the Government of Canada.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Mulroney:** The distinguished minister responsible for the status of women has the complete support of all of her colleagues in the government. That is why this government was able to increase to three the number of women on the Supreme Court of Canada, to increase by 300 per cent the number of women serving as deputy ministers, to increase from two to 14, the number of women serving as ambassadors, to increase from 37 to—

**Ms. McLaughlin:** What has that to do with women?

**Mr. Mulroney:** My hon. friend says, "What has that to do with women?". —to increase from 37 to 81, the number of women serving in the federal judiciary, to increase, since 1984, the amounts contributed to the protection of women and children against violence and

sexual abuse. Clearly, there are deficiencies. We have a long way to go but we have made progress on a number of very important fronts, including the fact that this government contains the largest number of women ever to serve in a federal cabinet.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## AIR TRANSPORT

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. There are rumours that public servants at Transport Canada in Ottawa are about to shorten working hours at the control tower at the Val-D'Or airport, which opens at 6.30 a.m. Does the minister intend to change the schedule of air traffic controllers at Val D'Or for the next twelve months just to save a few pennies, while every morning service quality and safety are diminished?

**Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, there are no plans to change business hours at Val d'Or Airport.

* * *

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Yesterday, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation announced the sudden shutdown of three regional stations in Quebec, including one in the riding where he was born. The mayor of Matane said the federal government was antagonizing an entire region. My question is this: How can the Prime Minister justify abandoning his birthplace, his former riding? How can the Prime Minister justify abandoning eastern Quebec?

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to make it clear to the hon. member that the decisions he just described were made independently by the CBC, without partisan interference from the Prime Minister.

Second, I would like to quote from a newspaper article, a public, not a secret document, for the benefit of the hon. member from Hamilton. In *Le Soleil*, a newspaper that covers these regions—and I hope the hon. member is listening—an article on the editorial page explains that although the decision made by the CBC was painful, it was very similar, at least as far as the French network was concerned, to what was recommended by the Caplan-Sauvageau Commission in 1986. Caplan—Sauvageau wanted to restrict the role of stations at Matane, Rimouski and Sept-Îles to news coverage only and recommended concentrating French language services in Montreal, Quebec City, Moncton and Ottawa. The conclusions of this commission or this task force were reached after wide-ranging consultations and published three years ago, and the hon. member must have had time to read them.

**Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard):** Mr. Speaker, my second question is again directed to the Prime Minister. It is really too bad he doesn't care about his region.

The CBC was the only network broadcasting local and regional programming in the Gaspé and on the North Shore. You want to quote people? So can I! The Mayor of Rimouski says their link with the rest of the country has been cut off. You want some more? Let me quote the Conservative Member for Matane, a member of your own caucus, who says that closing stations throughout an area that is already disadvantaged is unacceptable.

My question is this: Is the hon. member wrong? Is the mayor wrong? Are 500,000 viewers wrong? Could an entire region be wrong? Is the whole region out to lunch or is this government out to lunch?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, any budgetary cutback is painful for the people or the individual affected. I have no doubt that the hon. member for Matane, like the hon. member from Calgary or Windsor, knew what he was talking about and did so with a great deal of sincerity. The fact is that the general public realizes we have an enormous fiscal problem, a legacy whose antecedents my hon. friend knows full well.

The CBC acted independently, which, and I refer to the facts mentioned by my hon. friend, is quite clear since the cutbacks were made in a region I know very well and which I represent. This is conclusive evidence that there was no political interference by the government and that Mr. Veilleux and his colleagues made their decisions in the national interest.

[*English*]

**Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls):** Mr. Speaker, 1,100 dedicated, professional people have now found their jobs abruptly terminated. One might say exterminated, so vicious was the manner in which these lay-offs took place.

Is the Minister of Labour aware that employees were told to leave the premises immediately, that some crews who wanted to finish a little bit of editing, to finish their programs, free of charge, were told, "Don't touch a button. Get out".

Will the Minister of Labour investigate this callous and inhumane treatment on the part of the CBC?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, the CBC is very much aware of any legal implications there might be as result of decisions made by the corporation. I am convinced that these decisions were made after a thorough analysis. If for some reason, a member of Parliament or anyone affected by these cutbacks believes that the CBC erred in its handling of labour relations, there are all kinds of mechanisms for filing complaints, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

**Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls):** Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland suffered far more than its fair share of this government's cuts. Two of the 11 stations being cut are in Newfoundland, 22.5 per cent of all CBC employees in Newfoundland were laid off.

Will the Minister of Communications tell me how the government can accept the claims of the president and the chairman of the CBC that "The mandate of the corporation can still be served", when in the same sweep they have cancelled regional programs like *Land and Sea* which won the Wilderness Award, which has 53 per cent of the viewing audience? Why axe these programs? Why not axe the chairman and the president of the CBC? That would be money well saved.

• (1500)

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, the decisions made regarding the CBC were based on a number of principles. One of these was that there should be at least one regional bureau in each province where there were some. The lead writer of the *Globe and Mail* understood the intent of the decision when he wrote, and I quote:

[*English*]

> —the CBC will be no less a national network than it is today. Regional news bureaus will still be in place across the country—

This is true from Vancouver to St. John's.

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, in a meeting earlier today with the New Democratic Party caucus, the president of the CBC confirmed that the government has been kept fully apprised of the actions of the CBC every step of the way. He said that the political will was lacking to do anything about it. The government has obviously approved and encouraged these cuts, just like it took the broad-axe to VIA Rail.

In the Prime Minister's rush to dismantle and privatize yet another symbol of Canadian identity, has he considered that the resulting ten regional closures may, in fact, be a violation of the CRTC regulations, an abandonment of CBC's requirement for the provision of regional services in Canada?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention, as I said yesterday, that the President of the CBC would have gladly met the members, collectively or individually, and I think that the NDP member's statement confirms that.

Second, I agree with the President of the CBC who said that the corporation and the government consulted each other about their respective objectives and responsibilities.

Third, I would caution against taking for granted what the member just said when he quoted the President of the CBC.

* * *

[*English*]

## PRESENCE IN GALLERY

**Mr. Speaker:** I wish to draw to members' attention the presence in the gallery of Mr. Vytautas Landsbergis, President of the Republic of Lithuania.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Pursuant to order made on Wednesday, December 5, 1990, the House will now revert to Statements by Ministers.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### TRAGEDY AT ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE

COMMEMORATION OF FIRST ANNIVERSARY

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of sadness that I rise today on behalf of the Government of Canada to remind the House that one year ago today, 14 young women were murdered at École polytechnique in Montreal.

As we recall that tragedy, we remember those young women: Geneviève Bergeron, Nathalie Croteau, Anne Marie Edward, Maryse Laganière, Anne Marie Lemay, Michèle Richard, Annie Turcotte, Hélène Colgan, Barbara Daigneault, Maud Haviernick, Maryse Leclair, Sonia Pelletier, Annie St-Arneault, and Barbara Kluczniк Widajewicz.

That brutal act has left deep scars on the memories of Canadians. Nowhere is the pain and the loss felt more deeply than by the families and the loved ones of the women who were murdered.

[*Translation*]

Today, we offer our most heartfelt sympathy to the families and friends who lost a dear one in this tragedy.

I attended this morning with the members for Bourassa, Halifax and New-Westminster a ceremony at the Notre-Dame-de-Montréal Cathedral where, along with hundreds of men and women, we deplored this tragedy again.

[*English*]

Today is a day for commemoration and reflection on our loss. But it is also a time to consider how the spirit that enlivened those women has not been lost. Our initial shock at this senseless violence, our anger, and our anguish must now turn to a commitment to action.

I believe, as I know do all members of this House, that violence is unacceptable in our society. For any person to resort to such violence, wherever it may take place, is deplorable. As legislators and as a society, we must work together to convey the message that these actions will not and cannot be tolerated.

Throughout the past decades there have been many incidents of violent killings of innocent victims. Some were killed because of their colour, because of their religion, or simply because they were in the wrong place at the wrong time, but the innocent victims struck down a year ago at École polytechnique were killed because they were women. As we condemn their murderer, we must also better understand and deal with the attitudes which led to this tragedy and to all acts of violence against women.

To change attitudes one must start with the beginning, with our children. By working together, families and teachers, we must teach children that violence against women—indeed violence of any kind—is wrong, building a new set of attitudes among our children to take their place in a better society.

In co-operation with women's organizations, research organizations, educational institutions, and thousands of women and men across the country, we must continue to work for women's full partnerships in all spheres of endeavour, in all spheres of society. Let us work for a time when violence against women will be an historical fact, rather than a tragic reality.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the members of this House were elected to put forward the aspirations of the Canadian people. Therefore, in memory of these 14 young women and all other victims of violence, we must work together to put an end to violence.

[*English*]

Let the House, by our actions in our laws and policies, and through the ideals to which we aspire, let us work together towards that ultimate goal, to eliminate violence against women and to eradicate violence against all innocent victims in Canadian society.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax):** Mr. Speaker, the cold horror of the Montreal massacre remains with us all and will remain with us all, all our lives. Fourteen young lives snuffed out. Fourteen young women singled out for

death because they chose a non-traditional career, and because a disturbed and unhappy young man—himself a victim of domestic upheaval—decided that feminists were to blame for his failures.

In the year past, we have heard many pundits tell us that Marc Lepine was a psychotic killer and therefore there was no significance to the victims being women. The women of this House, the men of this House, and the women of Canada know differently. They know that those young engineering students were killed because of their gender and because there is a tragic sickness alive in our society that places every woman in jeopardy and causes every woman daily moments of fear.

The hazards are everywhere: poorly lit streets, deserted parking lots, empty office buildings, lonely apartment entrances, and on and on. Every woman driver knows the experience of unlocking her car and switching on the dome light to check the back seat before she gets in. Every woman who has spent a night alone in her house or apartment has had the jolting experience of an unexplained noise or a ringing doorbell after midnight. Every woman knows the worry over adequate security in her own home.

Since the Montreal massacre we have seen an increase, not a decrease, in violence against women. We have seen an increase in the domestic murder rate, an increase in sexual assaults in our cities and, most particularly and most frighteningly, on our university campuses.

We are all angry. We are all, as women, afraid. Attitudes must change, yes, but so must laws, so must judges, and so must legislators. Gun control, judicial response, programs for the abused and a royal commission on violence against women would be a start.

• (1510 )

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from the award-winning article by Stevie Cameron which appeared in *The Globe and Mail* a year ago today and is reprinted today:

> Fourteen of our bright and shining daughters won places in engineering schools doing things we, their mothers, only dreamed of. That we lost them has broken our hearts. What is worse is that we are not surprised.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, in formulating this statement for today I faced a very difficult dilemma. Given the solemn nature of today's ceremony, do I soften my words to ensure that the House feels comfortable with what I say? Or, do I tell it like it is?

Well, I think the House would agree that I must tell it like it is.

The event we are commemorating today is just too horrific to feel comfortable about. It is not so much the Montreal massacre that parliamentarians need to be reminded of. That would lend itself to a feeling of comfort. The massacre is behind us and life has, indeed, gone on.

Rather, parliamentarians need to be reminded that the incident represented the most extreme form of sexism in our society. For if the massacre is over and done with, the aftermath of the massacre is not. There has been graffiti saying that the women deserved what they got, clubhouse skits ridiculing the massacre, banners proclaiming "no means yes", and, just two months ago in my own province of British Columbia, invitations to women university students to partake in campus frolics or to risk being raped and mutilated. All this, Mr. Speaker, not before, but in the wake of the massacre.

So what are we parliamentarians doing to stamp out hate for the sake of hate against women? Five among us attended a vigil this morning in Montreal. Others in the House may do that tonight. But to what end? To remember? Mr. Speaker, who could forget?

It is not enough for us simply to remember. Legislators have to act. We have to enact. That is precisely why last summer I introduced a bill calling on the House to declare December 6 a national day of remembrance and action on the issue of violence against women. All members, no matter what their political persuasions, surely can unite behind this initiative. Many of us have offered to unite behind other initiatives. Most recently, we offered to unite behind gun control.

We parliamentarians enjoy a privileged role in today's society. We have the power to improve the quality of life; in this case, to disprove the inherent inequality of over half of our population.

My caucus colleagues and I urge parliamentarians to spend the approaching minute of silence thinking about their mothers, their wives, their daughters, and their sisters. Let those thoughts inspire December 6 to become, not only the day Canada's legislators realized that we had sacrificed 14 promising minds to the barrel of a gun, but also the day that Canada's legislators resolved not to trade another promising mind for mindless promises.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would ask hon. members to stand.

[*Editor's Note: The House stood in silence.*]

* * *

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, would the government House leader indicate to members of the House what the business of the House will be tomorrow and the remaining days of next week.

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I would like to call Bill C-93 dealing with the Bretton Woods agreement for second reading, as well as Bill C-71 dealing with the UN convention on contracts, to complete the final stages, and Bill C-82, Port Wardens Act which has to do with Quebec harbours.

Monday will be the last allotted day, an opposition day. Tuesday, at this point I probably will call Bill C-84, Petro-Canada, although there is a possibility of calling Bill C-74. We will engage in discussions in that regard.

At this point in time, I am unable to give any indications for Wednesday, but the usual discussions among House leaders will ococur over the next few days.

**Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might put a supplementary question to the government House leader. As he knows, my own House leader presented to him on behalf of the government a resolution dealing with the release of hostages in Iraq.

As we know, the news today indicated that the President of Iraq has submitted to the Iraqi National Assembly a request that they approve the release of all nationals.

It would seem to me very appropriate that the resolution that was put forward by my colleagues from the New Democratic Party, the Conservative Party and from my party, the Liberal Party—a tri-party level—would be very timely in terms of endorsing that kind of move and to transmit a message to the Iraqi Assembly that we would like to see that action take place forthwith.

I wonder if the House leader could give us some commitment of time, perhaps on Monday. I am sure it would not take away from the House time because I think there would be an all-party agreement on that resolution.

**Mr. Andre:** Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, I know, has possession of a draft of the resolution. I understand it is just a question of looking at the language and assuring himself, along with his officials, that in fact it would be helpful.

Along with the hon. member, I certainly welcome the news from Iraq. I hope that it turns out to be true and that all hostages, Canadians included, will be home soon.

Any actions that could be contemplated by this House that would facilitate that, I can assure the hon. member will get as expeditious treatment as possible and the full co-operation from this side of the House.

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, on the same point, I just want to indicate on behalf of my colleagues from the New Democratic party that we, too, fully support a resolution. Indeed, the member for Fundy Royal, the member for Winnipeg South Centre and myself did together draft a resolution.

There have been discussions. I hope that there will be an opportunity for this resolution to come before the House, particularly given the very encouraging news today that the Iraqi president, Saddam Hussein has agreed to the release of all foreign nationals, and, I might say, to the encouraging news from the Canadian perspective that the elderly Muslim couple, the Rustins, will be coming home tomorrow from Iraq.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that there would be an opportunity for this House to speak to this important matter very early in the coming week.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I wish to inform the House that because of ministerial statements, Government Orders will be extended 11 minutes. Therefore Private Members' Business will begin at 5.11 o'clock p.m. Orders of the Day.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1520)

[*English*]

### PETRO-CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-84, an act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada, as reported (without amendment) from a legislative committee and Motion No. 2A (Mr. Langdon), Motion No. 14A (Mr. Langdon) and Motion No. 19 (Mr. Lee).

**Mr. Lyle Kristiansen (Kootenay West—Revelstoke):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to engage in the debate on Bill C-84 now before us.

This is a bill which, described very simply, is an act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada.

In looking through the bill, and I recognize that we are dealing particularly with Motion Nos. 2A, 14A and 19, -it is interesting to note that in the pages opposite the proposed legislation itself, there is not a single word of explanation, but simply the recommendation that His Excellency, the Governor General, recommends to the House of Commons: the appropriation of public revenues under the circumstances and for the manner and purposes set out in a measure entitled: "an act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada."

There is no explanation. There is nothing other than our own experience—we have a wealth of experience with this government and its intent over the last number of years—setting out in layman's language exactly what the purpose and impact of the legislation as a whole or its various component parts are.

We have seen in the years since the election of this government in 1984 a series of actions, probably commencing with the emasculation of the Foreign Investment Review Agency, now called Investment Canada, so as to completely detooth it and render it absolutely ineffective to deal with the question of foreign ownership of our economy.

We have seen the systematic emasculation of VIA Rail, the rail transportation system in this country. It began under the previous Liberal administration and has proceeded under this government with ever increasing regularity and severity.

We have seen what surely is going to lead to almost the complete destruction of the Canada Post Corporation. The philosophy seems to be: Make its services unacceptable to the public; make the corporation behave in such a way that nobody has much use for it any more because it does not do its job effectively. It does not provide the services in the communities that demand them. Sooner or later, we will end up privatizing the whole of that as well.

We have seen the selling off of Air Canada. We have seen airline deregulation, and we can see the beginning of moves that are going to result in the isolation of one community after another outside of the major metropolitan areas.

We now hear of the open skies policy of the government, which again will serve to place many of our more isolated communities in jeopardy in terms of air service.

Just yesterday we had the announcement of the severe emasculation of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, tearing its roots out of many of the communities that make this country what it is, a nation not just of urban dwellers and of cities, but of people with close links to the resources and the land who have a feeling for what makes this country.

One thing after another, the government wants to destroy, sell off, deregulate or emasculate almost every agency in every institution that can hold this country together. What is behind it? What kind of blind faith, dogma, doctrine and ideology does this government have that is causing it to proceed on a course that can have no other final result than the disintegration of Canada? The Conservative Party obviously believes in the positive

power of the private and unregulated marketplace, in free market forces to produce beneficial results, despite all the evidence to the contrary.

It is fine to have a philosophy; it is fine to have a principle to operate from but if it blinds you to the actual result of specific policies, that is simply blind dogma and doctrine which can lead down a path to our entire destruction as a nation. This country was built in spite of market forces and in spite of the marketplace. Nobody looking at a map and knowing the demographics of Canada could believe that this country was ever created because it made economic sense; it never has; it was an act of political will for social, political and philosophical reasons. A number of people from sea to sea decided that they wanted to build a nation in this half of the North American continent that was somewhat different in its priorities and principles from its neighbour to the south. It was built in spite of those market forces that tend to pull all the links north and south. If we give up yet another instrument that allows us to develop our own resources for our own use and profit as a people, then we are led to believe that this doctrine and this dogma are leading us down the path of disintegration and the government ought to know better.

There are three amendments currently before us. One is that the chairperson and members of the board of directors of the corporation must be Canadian residents. Surely, in this day and age, that is not too much to ask. It does not guarantee anything but at least it is a beginning.

Motion No. 14A would change the limit of foreign ownership from 25 per cent to 1 per cent of all shares. Now members opposite may say: "Well, that is unrealistic, given their purpose", but what is their purpose? Should the Canadian energy industry, or at least a significant part of it, serve the interests of Canadians or not? There is the principle of its development at stake.

Motion No. 19 prohibits foreign governments or their agencies from owning Petro-Canada shares. We have seen a number of examples, over the period of just the last few weeks of how other corporations which have been sold off by this government, now have applications for ownership or, in fact, have been sold to agencies of the German government, the French government, almost any government, except the Canadian government. That has happened in the research and development area, airline industries, and a number of other areas.

Why do we have a country? What is next? Is it telephones tomorrow? We know about the hearings that are going to take place in a few short months, apparently having to do with introducing competition into the area of telephone services across the country. Where does that lead us? It will likely mean that rural Canada, once more, is going to pay the price for this government's dogma and doctrine.

As a social democrat, I have always believed that if it works, do it; if it could work better, change it, and if it does not work, scrap it. That is the nature of my philosophy as long as it is consistent with responsible government , belief in a democracy. It is not the kind of blind faith, blind doctrine and blind dogma that we see from the other side of the House. The most dangerous kind of politician is the one who believes in his own b.s. Those guys tend to do it; they are a danger to Canada. It is ending with this kind of legislation that we have before us and sooner or later somebody has to put a stop to them.

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, I have been listening for a few hours now to members of the opposition and I got a big charge out of the last speaker. His philosophy is: if it ain't workin' scrap it. If that were the case, they would have got rid of the post office a long time ago.

• (1530)

What has happened is this government came to power and put in people to run it. It is running much better now. Its efficiency rate has grown dramatically. The number of outlets in Canada has grown dramatically. Service is far better and it is making a profit.

I know members of the NDP hate that. It is a swear word to them. They plug their ears. Every time they hear the word profit, they say: "Oh, horrors". In any event, had we adopted the hon. member's philosophy of if it ain't working scrap it, I am afraid we would not have a national postal system today.

I have listened to the ideologues on the other side talking about Petro-Canada, our national oil company, and how important it is in the over-all scheme of things. I remind the House of a few facts. Petro-Canada is one of between 2,500 and 3,000 energy companies in Canada. I want that to be very clearly understood. It is not a monopoly on the industry. I know members of the NDP

would like it to be a monopoly on the industry. That is their philosophy: one oil company in the country. That is what they would like. It is responsible for 6 per cent of the upstream activity and about 19 per cent of the downstream activity. They should understand those facts as well.

They should also understand that it has a number of reserves in hand today that it wants to bring onstream. It is a very expensive proposition. This will allow Petro-Canada to obtain money in the capital markets, like the other companies do, to bring on its known reserves and to look for more energy in this country. This will allow this Canadian company to grow, prosper, create employment, and secure energy for Canada and for Canadians.

I hear members talking about the ideology of the Conservatives. I find that rather interesting when I take a look around the world today at the governments of all political stripes. Even the socialists, heaven bless them, are taking the lead in many areas. Communist countries and countries of all political stripes are realizing that governments cannot be all things to all people and are getting out of businesses. Mexico has privatized 260 companies over the last period of time. It is selling its telephone company now to the public. As a matter of fact, it is allowing 49 per cent foreign ownership in its telephone company.

In this legislation we have assured the people of Canada that this company will be controlled, directed, and managed by Canadians. Control over this company will be maintained by Canadians. These amendments today do absolutely nothing to improve the bill whatsoever.

For example, the Canadian Business Corporations Act, which Petro-Canada falls under, says that the majority of directors must be Canadian residents. It says that in there, and they are governed by that. This is already covered. We are assured that it will be controlled and directed by Canadians.

I tell hon. gentlemen across the way that sometimes it is to the advantage of a company to bring in directors offshore if they can provide good, sound, solid advice. Many Canadian companies do that.

Northern Telecom is one of the finest examples of a Canadian company there is. It has R and D expenditures at 12 per cent of its sales. Its chief operating officer happens to be an American. He is resident in Canada, a very fine gentleman, and is very dedicated to this Canadian company. What they would do is prevent the company from getting some of the best talent available.

These particular amendments have been discussed at great length today. I am told that negotiations have taken place with the opposition, with the idea of reasonably debating the amendments that they have brought forward, because I believe they need to be debated in a reasonable and timely manner. But I understand that negotiations have taken place, so I am going to read this very carefully. I do not want to get caught like I did the last time. I give notice that an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 78(1) or 78(2) with respect to an allocation of time to the report stage of Bill C-84, an act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada, 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 that stage of the bill, and at the third reading stage.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member for Essex—Windsor on a point of order.

**Mr. Langdon:** Mr. Speaker, it is fascinating to hear that. The minister has suggested that discussions have taken place, which, as I understand it, are a requisite for such a motion.

As the person who is responsible for this legislation on the part of our party, indeed no discussions have been communicated to me, which I would suggest means that this particular motion is simply out of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Any minister can move a motion. I see no problem with that.

**Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Mr. Speaker, which motion are we debating? Could I just have some clarification? A motion was just put to the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** It was just notice. Debate is on Motion Nos. 2A, 14A, and 19.

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Mr. Speaker, I have waited for some time to be able to contribute to the debate on this piece of legislation which, if passed, will have the effect of privatizing the national energy company of Canada, in effect, Petro–Canada.

Petro–Canada legislation was passed in days gone by because the government of the day felt that it was in the best interest of the Canadian public to have a window on the energy market. There used to be a feeling in this country that the resources of the nation belonged to the people of the nation, no matter where they lived. In certain areas such as energy supply and security of supply it was important that the government, through programs or departments or in this particular case through a Crown corporation, have some input and a window on that particular aspect of Canadian sovereignty.

Through the years Petro–Canada has played a very important role in energy development in this country. It started with a lot of criticism from members opposite. It came in at a time when the government of the day felt that it was important to do so. This country has been blessed with a great energy resource, oil and gas, particularly in our western provinces and off the Atlantic coast, although that is not as fully developed as we would like it to be. There was a responsibility of the government to ensure that the Canadian interest was paramount in the development of that particular resource. That was in keeping with the way we used to think about this country. Many of us on this side still think that way, that this country is here for all of us and that it is the job of government to manage, as best as it can, those resources to the benefit of all Canadians.

I want to speak to these three amendments, but I feel I have to give a bit of background. When the Minister of State for Privatization came in with this latest scheme to try to take away something that was uniquely Canadian called Petro–Canada, he met with a lot of criticism. I know that many editorial writers, such as Geoffrey Simpson and many at *The Globe and Mail* and other newspapers from coast to coast, including some of the western papers in places like Alberta, said that this government was proceeding with a plan of privatization of a very necessary Crown corporation, one whose history, I will agree, was very controversial, especially in parts of western Canada. Maybe some of that was for the right reasons, but perhaps this was not the right time to pursue this particular policy.

If we go back to the late 1970s, particularly 1979, we see that the previous Conservative government, when the right hon. member for Yellowhead was Prime Minister, had a different position on the national energy corporation, PetroCan, every second week. Those Conservatives were going to do away with it during the campaign. Then they came into power and they were not going to do away with it. They were going to privatize it; then they were going to abolish it. They were going to restrict it; then they were going to restructure it because they did not know what in the name of goodness to do.

• (1540)

At one point the current Minister for International Trade, after he was elected to this House in a by–election, took a tour of the west. He was one of those people who thought it was absolutely crazy that we had a company called Petro–Canada in the energy industry.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what happened? It was like the conversion on the road to Damascus. He got back in this place, and he could not say enough good about Petro–Canada and the important role it was playing in ensuring energy self–sufficiency in this country. He loved it. He could not say enough about it.

The current Governor General, in his former capacity as minister in this House, flip–flopped a number of times. When he was a minister, when he had some responsibilities in this place, particularly to the energy sector, he did not quite know what he stood for at any point in time.

We see that members of the government have almost been obsessed with Petro–Canada. In the beginning they got into typical Tory rhetoric that, if it cannot be done efficiently in the private sector, the public sector has no right to participate. That is typical Tory philosophy. We have seen it, particularly so in the last few days while they go in like a demolition derby and break apart national institutions such as CBC. They have gutted VIA. I listened with interest to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Communications today saying something which I am sure the minister of energy or the minister of privatization could have just as easily said about this particular bill on Petro–Canada. He said: "We had to cut it to make it better". It is like saying that we

have to kill you to cure you. That is basically what they are doing here.

The amendments that are before us right now dealing with Petro-Canada are important amendments. Canadians believe that our energy sector is one that has implications on our sovereignty. In the east coast of this country we have to rely on imported oil, gas, and crude oil even though this country is a net exporter of oil. Petro-Canada has played a major role in the development of Hibernia. It has played a major role in the Syncrude projects in western Canada. It has taken the leading edge because Petro-Canada's mandate was to look after the interests of Canadians, not to look after the interests of those in the corporate boardrooms in New York or over in some capital of Europe.

The amendments that we have before us are very important because of this crazy piece of legislation. I find it very difficult to listen to the minister of privatization at the best of times, but I tried very hard to listen to him because I figured that maybe there were some pearls of wisdom.

The only pearl of wisdom I could find was one that I had to sift through the sheets on: the reason it is going forward with the privatization of Petro-Canada at this point in time. When we have a major crisis in the Persian Gulf, when the very supply of crude oil to Atlantic Canada and other places is in question, and when Canadians once again are getting concerned about having a window in the energy sector so that they can direct and develop the energy sector, out of the blue the government, after many abortive attempts to do something with Petro-Canada—goodness knows what it wants to do; I am not sure—came in with a bill to privatize it.

One would have to come to the conclusion, after listening to the minister and watching what is happening across this country to Tory fortunes, that this bone was thrown out as a diversion for some caucus members, particularly the western caucus, who were getting their butts kicked solidly because of their support of this government's crazy GST, which has put them at 7 per cent in the polls. They will do anything for a diversion. I think this Petro-Canada privatization legislation at this point is such a diversion.

The minister opposite laughs. I think it is a nervous laugh. I do not think it is a belly laugh. I have seen a lot of ministers on the other side of the House doing a lot of nervous laughs the last little while. Every time a piece of legislation comes in that the Canadian public does not want, they all get the giggles over there. They say: "Gee, isn't it funny? The opposition is getting up and telling us the truth. It is telling us that we are doing something again that the public doesn't want". It is like a siege mentality, particularly on this bill. They really believe that everybody in the country is wrong and they are right. If they just put their faith in Brian, at some point in time everything will come out fine and smelling like roses. That is what they believe over there. It is little wonder they get kind of giddy at times.

The proposed amendments which we are speaking to today are important. If this government is going to pursue this crazy policy at the very time the people of Canada are seeing the energy reserves and resources as a national resource that can affect our sovereignty as a nation, they are going too far with it.

These amendments simply try to point out some difficulties. The motion that has been put forward by my colleague from Scarborough—Rouge River, who has done a tremendous job, an absolutely phenomenal job of exposing this government for what it is and for what it is trying to do in the energy sector, shows that the government is bankrupt on policies. It does not have an national energy policy and wants to base everything on the marketplace. If it can be sold to the highest bidder it does not matter if it is a Canadian resource, just get rid of it. Get a few bucks in the coffers. If we cannot manage the economy, we cannot manage the government, we certainly need more money in the coffers. Forget about preserving and managing a national resource such as energy, oil and gas, for the benefit of everybody.

If the government wanted to do something perhaps it could have brought in some amendments to Petro-Canada to make sure that Petro-Canada was serving the interests of the consumers and the producers in western Canada.

The particular amendment, Motion No. 19, put forward by my colleague, who has piloted this legislation for us on this side of the House, the member for Scarborough—Rouge River who has done a great job, basically

says that the effect of this would be to prevent the ownership of shares in Petro-Canada while the Government of Canada still has shares.

What he is clearly trying to do is keep the government from an embarrassing situation where it will probably have some banana republic somewhere in the nether-nether land come in and see what a great deal Petro-Canada is and they can actually get a handle on Canadian energy reserves and resources. We just do not want the government to have other people in the energy sector and across the world sitting down comparing this government to one of those small banana republics because in this case that banana republic and its administrators will look a heck of a lot better than this government would.

**Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina—Lumsden):** Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by saying that over the last number of months I have never felt so depressed and distressed about the welfare and good order of my country and its survival, its independence and sovereignty and nationhood, as I have under this government, and I have been here under several governments.

I must say to be fair that the present Conservative government and the Prime Minister have accomplished some things. Their main one is that they have contributed more to anger and outrage, alienation, than any other government since Confederation if not before.

Mr. Speaker, you can make a list as long as your arm, whether it was the Crow rate, the at and east rates, the two-price system on grain, whether it was the post office, VIA Rail, Petro-Canada, or anything else they have privatized. All they have done is remove from our society and our country the kind of things that kept us together and working. Of course, the CBC yesterday was just as bad a tragedy.

I would not mind if it could not help it, if it did not know better. It is when the government works at it that I get angry and depressed.

Motion No. 2A states that the chairman and members of the board must be Canadian residents. Well, Sir, I would rather they had to be Canadian citizens, but residents if they qualify under the appropriate regulation I guess is better than nothing. So I will buy that.

• (1550)

Motion No. 14A changes the limit of foreign ownership from 25 per cent to 1 per cent. I will buy that, too. If we had to compromise somewhere in between that, well, let's talk it over.

I want to quote the present minister of privatization—I am sorry he had to step out for a minute—because in the late unlamented nine months of the Clark government in 1979, he took great pains to emphasize the Canadian ownership line.

On December 11, 1979, at page 2255 of *Hansard* he is quoted as saying:

> —only eligible Canadians—eligible Canadians—should be permitted to own shares in Petro-Canada and only eligible Canadians—Canadians, I repeat—should be entitled to buy shares in the after-market. I have stated many times that the shares must go to and remain in Canadian hands.

I do not know what happened to him since then, because obviously he knew better in 1979. In fact, he was applauded when he made that statement in the House. I do not know what happened to him. He was not on the road to Damascus. He was on the road to Sodom and Gomorrah since then.

There is something else I want to point out. I hate to use these words. Anything that impinges upon and hurts, that cuts down Canadian independence, sovereignty and nationhood, that destroys many decades of traditional behaviour by Canadians to be something more than and different from other countries—particularly our neighbour to the south—is a betrayal. We have adopted and implemented measures and laws in Canada that are unique.

Some are the envy of many other countries. I will not go into a long list of them. Anybody who flies in the face of that—I am prepared to make changes in accordance with that history—I have to say and I do not want to but I will, I call that nothing more than traitorous behaviour. It is a betrayal even of the present Conservative members' forefathers in Parliament; Mr. Diefenbaker and Sir John A. will be rolling over. Maybe they are now, I have no way of knowing.

They sure as heck would not have stood for this. No way. I am not one noted for applauding Mrs. Thatcher, the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, but even in her privatizations, and there were a bunch of them, she

always kept a back-up provision so that if the privatized company misbehaved, she could correct it.

Of 10 companies she privatized, she kept what is called "a golden share", only one share. That one share allowed her and her government to over-rule any privatized corporation from doing something that in her view and in her government's view was not in the national interest. She kept that golden share for a good reason. History and experience in our country and that of the United Kingdom have shown that if you turn a private corporation—whether it is multinational or national—loose to operate on their own, without any checks and balances, they are going to do what is best for them in the first place. What is best for their country takes second place, if that high. In fact, it probably takes third place. They will put the interests of the shareholders in second place. The country in which they have the privilege—not the right—to do business, takes a lower priority.

I do not understand why the minister will not accept amendments. Maybe he will. I hope I am wrong, but I do not think he will do the things outlined in these three amendments.

The third amendment would prohibit a foreign government or an agency of a foreign government, be it a Crown corporation, board, or anything else, from owning any Petro-Canada shares. Surely that makes some sense, which the minister was heckling my colleague about.

It makes common sense, because you are either master in your own house, or you are not. If you are going to turn this over to anyone and everyone to do with as they please for the sake of making a buck, and to hell with the welfare and the good order of Canada and its people, then they have no business here. They lose their privileges. No corporation has the right to exploit resources and ignore the welfare and good order of my country.

I hope these amendments will pass and that we can get on to the other ones.

**Mr. Howard Crosby (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board):** Mr. Speaker, before I make some remarks on the proposed amendments to Bill C-84, respecting the privatization of Petro-Canada, I would like to bring to the attention of the House one matter because it is a day of commemorating tragedies.

We have heard our colleagues in the House remark on the sad events which took place last year in Montreal on December 6. I just want to remind the House of another very tragic event that took place in the city of Halifax 73 years ago on this same date, December 6. That was the Halifax explosion which resulted in the tragic loss of 1,600 lives and over 9,000 injuries. Over 20 per cent of the population of Halifax was directly affected by that tragic event.

Without detracting in any way from the remarks made on the tragic event in Montreal, I think it is well to record that again in the House and remind members of it. I hope 83 years from now we will again remember both events because they are sad days for all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, may I now address Bill C-84 which before the House of Commons.

I would like to deal with the facts because we hear a great deal of rhetoric about national corporations like Petro-Canada, as we hear about Air Canada, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and so on, and it is now said without feeling, I hope. I respect the views of those who regard these organizations as national institutions which should be preserved at whatever cost. It is simply that I do not share that view.

I believe these are utilitarian organizations which perform a function and if we can perform the function in a way that saves taxpayers' money, that provides services, then we should look at those possibilities. That is, indeed, what we are doing with Bill C-84. We believe that Petro-Canada has served its function. It can continue as a utilitarian corporation providing services to Canada in another way.

For those reasons I want to deal with some facts, because when Petro-Canada was created, it was intended to give a window on the industry for reasons that occurred at that time. But let us look at some of the evolutionary aspects of Petro-Canada. When they took over Canadian Petrofina, what happened? Vast amounts of money were spent on that acquisition. They were never properly accounted for. We do not know who received the benefits of those extensive payments. We never did get a clear financial picture.

• (1600)

As the member well knows, the courts have made decisions on this subject. The files are closed. They are sealed. They are not available to Parliamentarians, nor to the Auditor General. So we do not know what really is

the history of Petro-Canada. We do not know what chicanery took place among supporters of the Liberal Party who were shareholders of Petrofina and who were engaged in this exercise.

It is not as if Petro-Canada had a clean history among Canadians and in the business field. It might have been conceived in good faith, but it evolved into infamy. That is why I want to look at Petro-Canada, in terms of whether it has performed any function for the people of Canada. They may ask: "What has it done for Canadians?"

If one was to go to a Petro-Canada dealer, one would find that he enters into the same kind of contract with the corporation as any other commercial petroleum dealer does. He is required to buy tires, batteries, and accessories from the company at inflated prices.

I can tell you of a specific case, Mr. Speaker, where a Petro-Canada dealer was forced to buy window washing material at a price higher than it was available for at Zellers. As you know, Zellers makes the boast that it has the lowest prices, but it is a retail outfit. The Petro-Canada dealer could get a lower price at a commercial retail store than he could from Petro-Canada. Why? Because Petro-Canada was profiteering at the expense of its dealers. In that respect it is no different, in its operation and its management, from any other company. Members opposite know that the government, Liberal or Conservative, did not ever interfere in the day-to-day management of the company. It was left to function like any other petroleum corporation.

I assure you that if you go to a Petro-Canada station anywhere in Canada, you will pay the same price that you pay at other stations. You will get the same lack of guarantee, if you get repairs, and you will have the same kinds of arguments. Do not tell me, as a Canadian consumer, that Petro-Canada has done anything for me. It has functioned simply as a commercial corporation. The window that we thought was there is not there. Thus, the *raison d'être* for Petro-Canada has been diminished, if not eliminated altogether.

Let me get on to some of the other rhetoric that we have heard in the House of Commons. There is a great fear of foreign takeovers. Every time the New Democratic Party members get upset about kind of a transaction, they bring in the myth, the bogey, of the foreigners who are going to come in and take over Canada. That makes an interesting point because a business writer for *The Daily News* of Halifax, one John McLeod, has made this point about our friends in the New Democratic Party. In an article today, December 6, 1990 he states, and I quote:

> It's instructive to note the difference between New Democratic Party economic policy as espoused by an out-of-power federal leader, and the economic policy of the new NDP government in Ontario.

Let me tell you what has happened in Ontario, Mr. Speaker. Notwithstanding this great fear of foreign takeovers, and notwithstanding "Canada for Canadians", "Let us own all of our corporations", "Let us have restrictions on ownership", and "Let us make ownership available only to Canadians", what happens when the Ontario government under Premier Bob Rae gets its first test? It approves the sale of Consumer's Gas to British Gas, PLC. Why did it approve the sale of a Canadian corporation in the energy field to a foreign corporation? Because it was in the best interests of the people of Ontario, so it said.

All of the ideology that it spoke of in the House in this very debate, that went out of the window because it had to face the practical problem of: What are we going to do? We have a request from a foreign company, British Gas, to take over a Canadian company, Consumer's Gas, so what are we going to do? Are we going to decide it on ideology, like our federal friends do? No. No ideology for us. It is out the window. We are in government now. We have to decide it on the practicalities of the case and the practicalities of the case dictate that the right decision is to approve the sale. That is what Bob Rae did and I do not know what the New Democratic leader is going to say about it when they meet. They had better get together.

I hear they have a television set over there in the lobby to keep on eye on the legislature. The reason they have two television sets is because they know they are saying two different things in the two different places and they are trying to bring them together. The ideology they espouse in this Chamber clashes with the practical facts. It was right and proper to allow British Gas to take over Consumer's Gas. That is the decision the Ontario government made.

*The Financial Times* has some advice for Bob Rae, as well as John McLeod. It is saying, "Listen, Mr. Bob Rae, listen Mr. New Democratic Party and Mrs. New Democratic Party, you will have to find a better way to preserve domestic control of strategic companies and sectors." There must be a better way. It has nothing to do with shareholdings. It has nothing to do with ownership. It has to do with legislative control. You can control corporations, as Bob Rae now knows, by legislation. You can make corporations do what is in the public interest by legislation. You do not have to worry about ownership.

We found out with Petro-Canada that it does not make a bit of difference. Petro-Canada explores where Petro-Canada wants to explore. Petro-Canada sells what Petro-Canada wants to sell. Petro-Canada charges what Petro-Canada wants to charge. It did not do us any good in the Parliament of Canada or across Canada to have this window in the industry. We might as well recognize it and let the commercial forces take control as they have in the past.

I hope the New Democratic members have learned a lesson from their friend, Bob Rae. I hope they will be practical. Ideology is nice, but let us face facts.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Before I recognize the hon. member for Comox—Alberni, 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 Haldimand—Norfolk—Supply Management; the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby—Status of Women; the hon. member for Saint-Henri—Westmount—Health.

**Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I suppose I feel very much like the previous New Democratic speaker and the member for Winnipeg—Transcona did in speaking on this privatization bill. Having seen what the Conservative government has done to the country and to its fundamental institutions over the last several years, a lot of people in the country have serious and grave doubts as to whether the country is going to continue to exist for much longer after the systematic attack that has been taken on the fundamental institutions of Canada.

Before I get into the actual detail of the amendments and the bill itself, I would like to talk a bit about the comments that have been made about ideology by the last few speakers on the Conservative side. It might be worth-while to recall to those speakers that the New Democratic Party has not nationalized a single corporation or set up a single corporation federally in the country.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, as the Tories admitted in the debate yesterday and in previous days, was set up by the R. B. Bennett Tory government back in the 1920s and 1930s. Canadian National Railways, back in 1923, was set up, I believe, by a Liberal government of the day. Air Canada was set up as one of the projects of C. D. Howe, a Liberal cabinet minister.

In looking at the provincial story, Mr. Speaker, you will recall as a member from Alberta, that the Pacific Western Airlines was at one time nationalized by Peter Lougheed, one of the great free enterprisers of Canada.

In my recollection of British Columbia history, B.C. Electric, which is an offshoot of the Power Corporation of Canada, was nationalized by W. A. C. Bennett and his Social Credit Party, the so-called free enterprise party of British Columbia, which was formed back in the early 1950s when the Liberals and the Tories jumped into bed with each other and nationalized the power company.

The simple fact is that Crown corporations are not set up on the basis of ideology. The vast majority of Crown corporations in Canada were set up because the government of the day, regardless of political stripe, recognized a need that was not being fulfilled by the private sector. It said that in the absence of investment by the private sector, the government has to take action in order to develop the country, move the country ahead, and achieve the kind of progress that we are looking for. As a result, those governments of those days—whether Conservative, Liberal, Social Credit, or even New Democrat—got involved in the nationalization or the establishment of Crown corporations.

• (1610)

We did the same thing in British Columbia when we were in government. We set up an insurance corporation. That insurance corporation in fact brought a financial centre to Vancouver based on hundreds of millions of dollars of premiums that in the past went to Zurich, New York, or Hartford, Connecticut. We repatriated that money to the benefit of British Columbians and it was the basis of a financial centre in Vancouver that has grown and thrived to this present day. It was done strictly on a pragmatic basis. It has nothing to do with ideology.

I remember meeting with the minister of agriculture for Sweden, Mats Hellstrom, who is playing a role in the GATT talks in Brussels this very day. He advised me that when the democratic socialist government was in power in Sweden, it did not nationalize a single corporation and its policy was opposed to it. It preferred that the corporations operated in a tightly regulated free enterprise sector.

However, when the right-wing government took over from the social democrats, it nationalized some corporations that were held by a lot of its friends and financial supporters who had gone broke. They persuaded the right-wing government to take those corporations over and the taxpayers ended up bailing out those corporations.

In some cases, that is exactly what happened here in Canada. The government of the day recognized the need of some of its financial donors to have these corporations taken off their hands. After all, Canadian National was not nationalized. Its private operators bankrupted it and then the government was forced to take it over.

The same thing happened, as my colleague reminded me, in British Columbia with the B.C. rail system, the former Pacific Great Eastern Railway. When the railway sold off all the land grants that were given to it by the province and ran the railway into the ground because it started from nowhere and ended nowhere, the government of the day took over the Pacific Great Eastern Railway and completed it from terminus to terminus. Now it operates as one of the great railways of the country, performing a service to developing the central and northern part of British Columbia and shipping our lumber out into export markets. It was done strictly for pragmatic reasons in some cases, but also it was done by Liberal and Tory governments to bail out their bankrupt supporters and to use taxpayers' funds to take over these corporations.

I am more concerned right now about what this government is doing to our national institutions. I am concerned about the destruction of the post office as a community centre and as a means of communication that represents Canada in virtually every single community in every single riding in the country. There is the destruction of Canada's national airline, Air Canada, which was sold off by the Conservative government through a privatization process and now Air Canada is in the process of selling off its assets, its share of an aircraft leasing corporation based in Ireland, selling off its aircraft, cutting down on its services, and cutting down on the communities that it serves in the country. It is now in the private sector and it does not have to have a commitment to the Canadian people and to each and every community in Canada.

The government has done the same thing with VIA Rail. Railways were the first things that brought the country together. When my family came from Ireland in 1819 to the country, they came as many Irish people did, to build the railways in the country that were the initial ties that bound the provinces and ultimately the country together. Now, this government has severed those ties. It has broken up the rail system and this major institution of Canada that brought the country together, and continues to hold the country together, is now in jeopardy as a result of what the Conservative government is doing.

I do not think the Conservative government is privatizing Petro-Canada because it is going to improve the corporation's operations. I think it is going to operate the same way as they have instructed it to operate now. If it is gouging people, it is going to continue to do so, but it is only doing so now because it has been instructed or permitted by the Conservative Party in government to do so, so that the people of Canada will lose their respect for the institution of a national petroleum company and refuse to support it.

Basically what they are doing is following their ideological bent. This is a new ideological bent. This is not the old Conservatism of John A. Macdonald, R. B. Borden, or Meighen, all of whom had as their goal and as their objective the progress of Canada and the progress of its institutions.

This is Conservatism that derives itself from the new-right Republicanism of the United States, a Republicanism exemplified by the presidency of Ronald Reagan. He talked about fighting the deficit, yet he ran the deficit of the United States higher than any other president, any other political party in history. He talked about privatization. He talked about deregulation and we know exactly what happened to the thrifts and the savings and loans institutions in the United States. Deregulation meant that every crook and gouger who

could get into the savings and loan industry could gouge money out of the savings of citizens in the United States, spend it on useless projects, and totally enrich themselves at the expense of the United States. That is precisely what this party and its friends in private business are doing.

They are draining the cup of Canada. They are draining the assets of government, and they are destroying the fundamental institutions of this country, and that is exactly the meaning of this bill.

**Mr. Mike Breaugh (Oshawa):** Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly of the three amendments to Bill C–84. I spent some time this morning going through the work of the committee. First of all it struck me as odd that in the middle of an oil crisis the Government of Canada is selling off one of its assets.

It struck me even more strangely that in the deliberations before the committee, it was very anxious to sell off this company but it did not seem to have any idea how much money it would get for it.

I spent a fair amount of time in the Ontario legislature. There I became accustomed to a group of Tories who were extremely pragmatic people. They did not have an ideological bone in their body; whatever was good for Ontario at the moment they would do.

If you wanted to nationalize something and they thought that would be popular, that is precisely what they would do. Ideology had nothing to do with the way they made a government function. If it needed to be done, they would do it.

I notice that there is a lot of discussion in this Chamber about the Ontario legislature and things that are happening there these days. I was there for 15 years and I think I can relate to members a fairly good sense of what that place is all about. I heard a member somewhat shocked that the new government in Ontario allowed a business decision to be made.

Well, I think the government in Ontario is simply acknowledging that it might like to do a lot of things these days but the federal government has put the province of Ontario in a very bad recession. They do not have the money, frankly, to do a lot of the things they want so they made again a very pragmatic decision to allow for the takeover of Consumers Gas by British Gas.

**Mr. Boyer:** You can blame the Liberals who were in power and left a $3 billion deficit.

**Mr. Breaugh:** There is an interjection here about the Liberals leaving a big debt. That is true. As I went through the committee deliberations on these amendments, one of the things that struck me was when you search for a reason for why this government is trying to privatize this particular corporation at the moment, one eludes you.

As you read through the deliberations in committee, it seems that a pretty comprehensive argument was being made that this would be a sensible corporation to retain, that there were things that could be done with Petro–Canada that would assist us in terms of making the environment of Canada a better place, and that we had concerns now about our own energy needs. I disregard totally the old cliché that you need a window on the industry because it seems that one of the faults of Petro–Canada is that that is about all it ever was—people standing at a window looking at the private sector at work.

There is a lot more potential that was there that should have been realized. One of the things that surprises me about these amendments that are before us now is that this appears to be the last little thread. Even Maggie Thatcher on her worst day when she was selling off the assets of the British government, at least had the common sense and the common decency to say that at least it ought to be retained in the hands of people from this country.

• (1620)

This government seems to reject that notion. I do not know why it would be so anxious to reject that. I am not certain at all why it would take a business decision at the moment. It appears to me, at least, to be a very bad business decision. In the middle of an energy crisis, it seems to me you would look at something like Petro–Canada as an asset, not a liability. It seems to be making money. That is my definition of a good business proposition.

As strange a notion as this is, there are those who believe in the world of corporate socialism. I am not one of them. Obviously the members opposite on the govern-

ment side believe in that kind of socialism. They believe that all taxpayers in Canada ought to fund the corporate sector somehow.

If you look at the government's tax policies, it certainly does that. If you look at this particular bill, it seems to follow in the same vein. The government feels that somehow the people of Canada had an obligation to set up an oil company; to bear all of the costs, trials and tribulations it would take to get that set up, then at the point where that company might make some money, it ought to be sold off to the private sector. I do not understand that.

Petro-Canada seems to be a corporation that has developed a role for itself. It is certainly not the role that I would want it to play. I have a much higher set of expectations for it than the government does.

It seems to me that during the committee proceedings members from all three parties and people from Petro-Canada accepted the notion that we could do some very good things with this oil company, that this would give us an opportunity to develop things that are environmentally sound, to make our people more conscious of their energy use. It would make sure that we had a constant supply of energy. We certainly have gone to great pains all across the country to see that there is a network in place to do something for this corporation and for this country; that it would ensure our constant energy supply.

I do not know why the government would reject amendments such as these. It seems to me that they are minimal at best. It seems to me they simply address that this is a company which the people of Canada put a lot of money into. I do not think anyone has an accurate total of what the total taxpayer investment is in Petro-Canada, but it has to be huge.

It does seem that there is a vendetta here; that this current government still is chasing Pierre Elliott Trudeau around. It might gather up some sympathy from me on that, but it does seem to me that it has not used common sense. Here is an opportunity to retain a corporation with great potential that is beginning to do something useful, and it ought to try to retain it. I am not sure that it is their ideology. I am not sure that that is the right word. This is certainly Tories of a different stripe at work than the ones that I am used to.

The amendments that are before us are amendments that ought to be supported by all members. They are certainly minimal. They are amendments which attempt to keep some Canadian connection in Petro-Canada. It seems to me that this government, even in privatizing it, wants to do that.

I read the proceedings of the committee and I looked for the arguments that said why the government would not accept these amendments. To tell you the truth, I did not find them. Perhaps they are here. Perhaps during the remainder of this debate, one of the things the minister might do for us is instead of standing in his place and giving us a little diatribe about ideology, he could address the amendments that are before us and provide the House with some rationale as to why the government is not prepared to accept the amendments that are currently before the House.

**Mr. McDermid:** I did.

**Mr. Breaugh:** The minister is yelling across the House that he did. I followed the proceedings in committee and the debate in the Chamber this afternoon, and I have not heard that. There is at least an obligation on the part of the minister at some time during the course of the proceeding to intervene and provide us with a logical, rational explanation of what the government is up to. I do not believe we have heard that so far and I would appreciate it if the minister would do that before we finish up this particular part of the debate.

I want to conclude on this note. I have never been much of a fan of Petro-Canada, to tell you the truth. It has never done the things that I wanted it to do in my community. It has not exactly been a great asset. What it has been is an oil company, like any other oil company, charging the same amount of money, putting small operators out of business, tearing down service stations and putting up self-service gas stations. That is not exactly my version of what Petro-Canada should have done.

There were good arguments made during the course of the committee proceedings and good arguments here on these amendments which indicate to me that we ought to retain this. We ought at the very least to accept the amendments that are before us and see if we could take something, even if the government feels in its own heart of hearts that it does not belong there. They have it. It is

an asset, and it is beyond me why this government does not try to utilize that asset for the people of Canada.

**Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on the amendments to Bill C–84, an act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada.

I am very pleased to see that the Minister of State for Privatization is in the House. Perhaps I could comment with regard to what the minister said in 1979.

The Conservative minority government at that time was in an election. It talked about privatizing Petro–Canada, and half way through the election campaign decided that the Canadian people did not want that, and so reversed its decision.

I will start off by stating what the late Tommy Douglas, New Democratic Party Leader, said in the House of Commons on November 15, 1978:

> Every person who has looked at the situation knows that any industry which controls the energy resources of a nation has its fingers on the windpipe of that nation's economy.

Petro–Canada itself represents the clear choice, in his words:

> —the choice in this country is whether or not we are going to develop the petroleum resources of Canada for the benefit of Canadian people, or whether we are going to continue to be the economic colony of which our vital energy resources are owned and controlled by foreign multinational corporations.

I am alarmed at what has happened this term in this House of Commons since I came back in 1988. We have seen the privatization minister involved with the privatization of Air Canada, VIA Rail cutbacks, Canada Post cutbacks in our small rural areas, shut–downs and signing contracts in other areas of Canada Post without legislation.

This is privatization without legislation of the worst kind where people cannot even discuss or work out the policies.

What we have is a government that is incompetent, one that has found itself in financial difficulty with its high interest rate policies and high Canadian dollar, and is finding itself in financial straits and starting to sell off its assets.

As a New Democrat, I find that very offensive, because not only has it put us deeper and deeper into debt but it is now selling off its assets at a whirlwind rate so that there will be nothing when other governments come and try to take over after it has left.

It is going to cause future governments some very serious problems with regard to the privatization that has taken place in trying to bring it all back.

Now, I would like to, if I may, quote what the Minister of State for Privatization said in 1979. Even the current privatization minister took great pains to emphasize the Canadian ownership line on December 11, 1979, and I quote:

> —only eligible Canadians—eligible Canadians—should be permitted to own shares in Petro–Canada and only eligible Canadians—Canadians, I repeat—should be entitled—

• (1630)

**Mr. McDermid:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member is quoting me out of context. I have the page from *Hansard* here. I will pass it over to him. I want him to read the entire quote so that it makes abundant sense. He is misleading—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** That is not a point of order; it is a point of debate. The hon. member for Kootenay East has the floor on debate.

**Mr. Parker:** Mr. Speaker, I can understand why the minister would be sensitive to my remarks. He wants 25 per cent to be sold to anyone and this amendment is calling for 1 per cent, so I am sure he minister would be very disturbed at this.

Let me continue to quote from *Hansard* of December 11, 1979, at page 2255:

> —Canadians, I repeat—should be entitled to buy shares in the after–market. I have stated many times that the shares must go to and remain in Canadian hands.

This indeed is a reversal to what the minister was saying in 1979. It shows the rationale for the legislation that this government is bringing forth and putting before this House.

I want to commend both the New Democrats and the Liberals for bringing in amendments. We cannot stop the government from attempting to privatize, but surely to goodness we can protect the interests of Canadians to ensure that we are not going to be dominated by foreign capital and foreign investment coming in and taking over something as important as the energy of our country. We just cannot stand idly by. We must speak out against this. We must urge this government to support our amend-

ments. We must also urge this government to start paying attention.

This government passed a bill for $1 billion of Canadian taxpayers' money to be invested in Petro–Canada, in the Hibernia oilfields. We asked at that time that refining be done in Canada if we were going to be spending that kind of money. The biggest and most profitable part of this industry would be in refining and, if Petro–Canada was able to do its job, it would enter into the refining process instead of letting it be done in the United States and having the Americans get all of the benefits of the large investments that were made.

We have a government that is determined to privatize. We have a government that is not listening to the people and to what their concerns are about where we are going. The last I heard, oil was selling on the market at somewhere around $30 to $33 a barrel and large profits are being made by the oil companies. This government decides it is time to sell off a portion of Petro–Canada. That is not acceptable to us.

If it is going to happen and if this government is determined to go ahead with the policy, then we are saying: accept our amendments and ensure that the Canadian people will be the shareholders and that 25 per cent of the ownership will not go outside Canadian hands. We are asking this government to reconsider and to support our amendments.

There is another amendment to the bill regarding the president and the officials of the company. It requests that they also be Canadians so that the top people of the industry will be making decisions in interest of Canadians because it is headed by Canadian people. Again we urge the government to support that amendment.

The government is not always correct when it drafts a bill. Surely it can admit there is some improvement it can bring about to upgrade a bill. Perhaps it could sometimes accept some of the good amendments that the opposition on the other side puts forward. I urge the government to consider not only the amendments but to reconsider the bill itself. I urge the Minister of State for Privatization to take a back seat on this one and withdraw Bill C–84.

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Mr. Speaker, I am one of the people who has had a life–long fascination with the oil industry, having grown up in one of the original oil patches in Alberta in the Black Diamond Turner Valley oilfield. I can remember, as a child growing up, that the whole discussion in that community focused on the development of our oil and gas industry in Canada. I lived there at the time the Leduc oilfield was discovered. The shift from the town was almost wholesale as it moved from the Turner Valley Black Diamond area to Leduc.

Even at that time people were concerned about who was controlling our industry, who was going to benefit from our industry. Would it be foreign oil companies? Would it be the average resident of Alberta? Would it be the Canadian public with reliable, cheap energy resources? Or, would it be turned over to the free enterprise international marketplace?

Unfortunately, over the years a far too great percentage of our petroleum industry has been controlled by foreign capital and foreign investment, where the profits have been taken out of the country and where the decisions being made are being made not in the interests of Canadians, but in the interests of the profits of a foreign company.

Of all times for Canada to be surrendering its only instrument in policy in the petroleum industry, now could not be a worse time. Right now we are in the middle of the gulf crisis, and the gulf crisis is about oil. Anyone who thinks it is about anything else other than the control of oil fields is sadly mistaken.

Last winter I had the opportunity to spend two weeks in the gulf area, in the United Arab Emirates, another one of the Arab countries much like Kuwait. It is an oil producing country wherein the oil productivity is only benefiting a very select group of people; not the average person and not the workers of which 80 per cent are imported, but the wealthy sheikh families.

This is basically what we have done in this country, only we call them corporations. We have let the large multinational corporations control and direct our oil industry, not for Canadians but for the benefit of themselves.

We have a piece of legislation before the House that is bad. It is wrong. It is fundamentally wrong, particularly at this point in time. We are trying to get the government to show some reason, some understanding, and accept some amendments that would at least make sure that,

even if it were privatized, it would still be in the control of Canadians.

We are suggesting two or three amendments. First, the people on the board of directors must at least be residents of Canada; not even Canadians but at least residents of Canada so that hopefully the decisions will continue to be made in Canada, not in the boardrooms of the United States.

Second, we are suggesting that we must reduce the percentage of permissible foreign ownership. Right now under the present set-up we could end up with the effective control of Petro-Canada being outside Canada. If you have three foreign owned blocks, two of them with 10 per cent and one with 5 per cent, 25 per cent controlled by three co-ordinated companies that were foreign, and the rest of the shares dispersed across the Canadian public, with a 25 per cent block you could control that company effectively. There are many corporations in this country that are effectively controlled by a 25 per cent block of shares.

• (1640)

We are willing to pass legislation that says we will let effective control be in the hands of foreign companies. That is shameful. It is a total bewilderment to me as to why the government would do this, particularly in light of the free trade agreement which says that once you establish a maximum that becomes the minimum base. We can never bring that percentage back down. It can only go up. It is very critical that we look not only to the immediate future but to the long term. We must be able to regain control of the petroleum industry and ensure that it is very minimal, that no more than 1 per cent is controlled outside of Canada.

One of the things the Conservatives talk about is that this privatization is a part of their great economic plan. Their great economic plan has led this country into a depression, an economic slump. It is very interesting to note that both free enterprise parties, the Liberals and the Conservatives, have in the last 10 years brought this country twice to its knees. In 10 years they have brought the country twice to its knees in the form of recessions.

Quite frankly we sometimes forget that is what the free market is all about. It is a manipulation of the economy. It is throwing the economy open to all the manipulations that take place without protecting individuals. We saw the results of it in this country when the Liberals brought us into a depression in 1981 and 1982. Now the Conservatives are doing it again.

This privatization is part of that. It is a blind privatization. Many of the industries in this country that have been government run and government sponsored have been some of the best businesses and industries. Particularly I look to British Columbia where the B.C. government had to take over B.C. hydro and it became a Crown corporation, a very effective Crown corporation.

**An hon. member:** There are lots of good examples in British Columbia.

**Mr. Karpoff:** Yes, I have lots of examples from British Columbia of where the private companies could not run ferries economically, efficiently, or any other way. Finally the B.C. government had to take over Black Ball Ferries and form the B.C. Ferry Corporation, which is now being run on a very service oriented basis and is providing a vital link and service to the people in that province. It is one of the biggest ferry fleets in the world.

We have the whole insurance system in B.C. We have mentioned earlier that it was brought in as a Crown corporation and now provides the best, the most efficient, and the most effective automobile insurance in all North America. It also retains its earnings in British Columbia. It does not send its earnings to Hartford or Zurich or Allstate or wherever else they have their headquarters. It has all its offices in the province. It has all its assets in the province. It has been a vital economic boon to that province.

What we are going to lose with the privatization—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret the hon. member's time has expired.

Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The questions have to be put on Motion Nos. 2A, 14A and 19. I will put the question first on Motion No. 2A. 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), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 14A. 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), the recording division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 19. 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), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Motion Nos. 4A, 6A, 8A, 12A, 15 and 23 will be debated and voted on separately.

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor)** moved:

Motion No. 4A

That Bill C-84 be amended in Clause 9 by adding immediately after line 26 at page 3 the following:

"(a) provisions requiring that all unrefined hydrocarbon product produced by Petro-Canada be refined at a refinery located in Canada;".

He said: Mr. Speaker, this particular motion is to suggest yet again a way in which we can see to it in the future that Petro-Canada contributes more fully to the country than if simply left to marketplace dictates. A private company, which had not been paid for, whose creation had not been established by the people of Canada, could not be expected to simply follow a course which required refining of unrefined hydrocarbons products produced by Petro-Canada in this country.

This motion attempts to set out a requirement for Petro-Canada that all hydrocarbon products which are pumped out by Petro-Canada will have to be used for refining purposes within this country.

• (1650 )

I think it is important that the contribution of this company to this country be constrained, that it be required in the future to be as great as possible to the people of Canada.

How do you do that? You do it through a number of mechanisms. You do it by some of the mechanisms which we have been debating about ownership, which I hope will ultimately be accepted by this House. You do it through suggestions on the important environmental role which Petro-Canada can play in the future. You also do it by emphasizing a Canada-based refining policy for this company. It is not, it seems to me, something that runs against the previously expressed views of the Conservative Party.

The minister of privatization got into an exchange with one of my colleagues about a quotation which he claimed had been wrongly quoted, taken out of context by my colleague, and indeed by a number of my other colleagues earlier today. In fact, what my colleague was quoting when he quoted the statement of the minister

was that Petro-Canada should be owned only by eligible Canadians.

What he was quoting was the minister's reference to a task force of the Conservative Party which had been established. It was a task force whose recommendations had been endorsed by the minister and other members of the Conservative Party. One would have thought, therefore, implemented at this stage by this government, it would be a Canada-first approach to Petro-Canada privatization.

In practice, however, that is not the approach which has been taken by this government. When my colleague, the member for Edmonton East, brought forward suggestions such as this within committee, these suggestions were rejected by the Conservative government majority within that committee.

It has been very clear that what we are talking about here is seeing to it that the Canadian resources which are produced and extracted by Petro-Canada create downstream jobs in this country; jobs in the refining industry, indeed jobs beyond the refining industry. Specifically, the jobs within the refining industry should be expanded by a commitment that Petro-Canada will see to it that all refining take place in a refinery located in Canada.

It is especially important at this stage because we are talking about a period in our country where the Conservative government, as it has done in the past when it has been in power, has led us into an economic slump.

We recall the period of John Diefenbaker's government when the Conservatives were last in power for a six-year period. At that stage it was successful, as usual, in reducing economic activities in this country, in leading us into an economic slump, in creating levels of significant unemployment through this country, and in exacerbating the economic inequalities among regions throughout this country. Now, once again, with this Conservative government that we now have back in power under the Prime Minister that we presently have, we see precisely the same devastation to our economic situation taking place in 1990 as took place under the Diefenbaker government in the early 1960s.

It seems every generation or so, it is necessary for Canadians to elect a Conservative government, go through the devastation, the learning experience which is required to teach them that the Conservatives should be kept out of power for yet another generation. I am certain that this will be the case with respect to this government.

One of the reasons that it will be the case is that our unemployment rate is approaching 9 per cent. It is likely to go over 9 per cent this Friday. In the context where that is taking place this government is, nevertheless, not prepared to accept an amendment which creates jobs in Canada by seeing to it that downstream refining activity by Petro-Canada is a requirement of this legislation.

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, it will come as no surprise to you that we cannot possibly support this amendment which has been proposed by the New Democratic Party. I am not sure if the hon. member was at committee at the time, but it was indicated very clearly by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources that this amendment would be a direct violation of GATT.

As a matter of fact, the New Democratic Party is always talking about GATT and how important it is. It says that we should abide by GATT, we should not have a free trade agreement and we should deal with GATT. Yet, GATT said that this particular clause would be inconsistent with the GATT. That is the first reason why we would not bring it in.

The second reason we would not accept it is because we would be tying the hands of Petro-Canada. If they could not export oil they discovered but cannot use economically in its own facilities, sometimes heavy oils or whatever it may be, can be exported for refinery elsewhere.

The other problem is that he does not describe what refinery is. How far down the process does the New Democratic Party want this to go? There are many products that are made as feedstocks from petroleum products down the line, that are not made in this country, for example. Therefore, he would be tying the hands of the Canadian company. All the other Canadian companies could export but Petro-Canada could not. That is silly. That type of thing, I would assume, not being a lawyer, would not be allowed by the Supreme

Court of Canada. That is discrimination of one private company over all the other Canadian private companies. Let's face it, we cannot accept this particular amendment.

I am enjoying this debate so much that I would like to see it continue. Therefore, I move:

> That the House continue to sit beyond the ordinary hour of adjournment for the purpose of continuing consideration of report stage of government Bill C-84, an act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada.

• (1700)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The House has heard the terms of the motion. Will those members who object to the motion please rise in their places.

*And more than 15 members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** There are more than 15 members. Therefore, the motion is deemed to have been withdrawn.

Motion withdrawn.

**Mr. Waddell:** I was rising on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, but I think it has been answered. I wanted to find out about Private Members' Hour, but I gather it will go on after this. Is it at 5.11 p.m.?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Yes, at 5.11 p.m. The hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River has the floor on debate.

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak very briefly to this amendment proposed by the New Democratic Party, Motion No. 4A.

When there is a bill before the House and you sit in opposition and you want very much to see the bill not passed, you sometimes have difficulty participating in some of the debate surrounding the bill. You propose amendments in the hope of making the bill better, even though you do not like the general thrust of the bill. That is where I find myself today.

This particular amendment is pretty bold in its intent. I see the purpose, but I find that the amendment as it is drafted falls very far short of the standard of precision that is necessary for a statute here in this country.

The first thing I would note is that the amendment is very unclear and very unrefined in what it means by "an unrefined hydro-carbon product". One starts with the crude that is pumped from the ground, which may or may not already have an additive to help bring it to the surface. Maybe that is unrefined-minus-one. In any event that additive must be taken out and this particular phrase "unrefined hydro-carbon product" does not make it clear whether one is free to deal with a semi-refined or semi-unrefined product. It really is not workable.

The second item is that the amendment as it is worded would require Petro-Canada to bring back to Canada all of the hydro-carbon product that it would pull out of the ground from anywhere in the world. Petro-Canada is participating in oil development plays all around the world, including southeast Asia. I hate to think it would have to build one of its own refineries just to deal with a level of production somewhere else in the world. It is not a good amendment from that point of view.

Another example, related to the same thing, is what does this require Petro-Canada to do with the product produced in Hibernia, where Petro-Canada is about a one-quarter partner? Does this require Petro-Canada's one-quarter share of the Hibernia product to be refined in Canada? Right now, that one-quarter share or its undivided interest in the whole production would be shipped to a refinery, I understand, in the United States. Given that the Newfoundland refinery at Come-By-Chance is not geared up and properly built to refine the crude product being pumped at Hibernia, I appreciate the thrust of this amendment. It is an attempt to make us have a fully, completely comprehensively, vertically-integrated oil company in Canada and it falls short of the mark of accuracy and precision that we should have here in the House.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, I would just like to follow up on some of the things that the minister has been saying during the course of the afternoon with respect to this motion and also on his other comments. He has made general comments about the ideological nature of the debate, regardless of what amendment we happened to be debating at the time.

It seems to me that the minister labours under an illusion with respect to the nature of ideology. Ideology is a word for the general concepts out of which a particular political party or an individual works. One generally develops one's ideology out of an analysis of what will most readily achieve the goals a society, or a particular country, has set for itself. In that sense, ideology is not a bad word. It just means that there are

differing ideologies and differing analyses about how we achieve these goals.

Ideology is only a bad word when it seems that people are no longer operating out of an analysis any more but out of a commitment to an analysis that may have been developed in a different situation but no longer applies to the current situation. On that basis, I would say that it is the government, and not the opposition, which is operating in the negative ideological sense.

As the minister himself has indicated, Petro-Canada is involved in only 6 per cent of the oil and gas activity in the country. If that is the case, why would the government be obsessed with getting rid of Petro-Canada unless it had an ideological commitment—in the negative sense of what it means to be ideological—to get rid of any and all forms of public ownership? If it is not ideological in that negative sense of being committed to a particular analysis, regardless of the fact that in this case public ownership is hardly massive in the oil industry in Canada, why would it not allow that Crown corporation to exist even as a form of strategic insurance so that should the day come when we wish we did have a publicly-owned oil corporation for strategic purposes in an energy vulnerable world, it would exist? Surely, this should have been the intelligent option for a government committed to privatization.

It could have kept an umbrella corporation called Petro-Canada and privatized elements of the activity of Petro-Canada. It could have kept that strategic capability by still having a form of Petro-Canada that it could activate and use in future if that sort of action was required on the part of the government. But the government did not do that. The reason it did not do that is because it is the government that is operating out of an ideology, in the negative sense of what it means to be ideological, not the opposition.

All we are suggesting here is that it makes good sense. It is practical to keep PetroCan as a possible future instrument of public policy. If the government wanted to put that instrument of public policy into a state of suspended animation for reasons of its own pursuant to how it perceives the current context, that would be up to the government. What it is doing here is writing off, for good, the possibility of that public policy instrument ever being revived. That is a very serious mistake, but typical of the kinds of things that this government has done over the last six years.

• (1710)

Instead of making judgments and formulating policies which embody its will for the moment, it has done things such as signing the free trade agreement, privatizing Petro-Canada, and a variety of other things. It is implementing its view of the appropriate policy for the moment which proscribes forever various other options that other political parties, other governments, and other Canadians might want to take in the future. That is the most serious political crime committed by this government, the proscribing of future options.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** It being 5.11 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's *Order Paper*.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—BILLS

[*English*]

### CRIMINAL CODE AND SUPREME COURT ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Tuesday, October 23, consideration of the motion of Mr. Domm that Bill C-210, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Supreme Court Act (*habeas corpus*) be read a second time and referred to a legislative committee.

**Mr. Doug Fee (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by congratulating the hon. member for Peterborough for presenting his private members' bill, Bill C-210, to improve the extradition process. I have received comments from many people commending the hon. member for his perseverance on this issue and his over-all dedication to the cause of justice in Canada.

I regret the necessity to make amendments to our Extradition Act. As a Canadian, I am embarrassed that we have such a slow and cumbersome procedure, one that appears to allow foreign fugitives to languish in Canadian custody at Canadian expense, rather than face justice in their own country.

Many members of that public have become discouraged, disillusioned, and even mad about what they see about a lengthy and expensive process that seems to deny justice, rather than expedite it. For this reason, these amendments have been applauded by the media and public alike.

The hon. member for Peterborough did a good job of explaining what the bill accomplishes and how it can shorten the time from initial requests to final decision by up to a year and a half.

There has now been close to a month elapsed and, very briefly, I would like to go into how the extradition process works right now. To begin with, when an individual who is suspected or convicted of a crime in another country crosses a border into Canada, and authorities of that country become aware that he is here, they would make an official request to Canadian authorities to extradite him. The Canadian authorities would then have to ask a judge of a county or superior court to issue a warrant to arrest that fugitive and place him in detention before surrendering. The judge would issue that warrant if the other nation's conviction of the fugitive is proven or if the offence he is accused of in the other nation is an offence in Canada.

At this point, the individual may apply for a writ of *habeas corpus* to another superior court judge to be removed from prison. That is, in effect, to block the extradition. The individual at that point would be questioning his liability for extradition. A judgment would be issued on that writ of *habeas corpus* which the individual can then appeal to the court of appeal of the province he or she happens to be in. In this appeal hearing, there is no production of evidence, no witnesses, and no cross examination, but simply discussion of the legal issues. Assuming the appeal is denied, in the present system the individual can then request permission to appeal that decision to the Supreme Court of Canada.

The case would then, assuming it is upheld again, be referred to the Minister of Justice who must wait at least 15 days from the expiration of the date of the final appeal before indicating his or her decision as to whether or not to surrender the fugitive to the other nation's authorities.

It goes on, because the individual can then attempt to challenge the decision of the minister to surrender or extradite him.

The second stage of recourse is much narrower in scope. The individual may apply to the Federal Court and then appeal to the Federal Court of Appeal. If unsuccessful, the individual can ask permission to appeal that judgment to the Supreme Court of Canada again. This is an extraordinary remedy.

I do not want to comment on the specifics of the Charles Ng case, but it is significant to recognize the desire of the Minister of Justice to expedite a final decision in this case, which has been dragging on in the Canadian courts for far too long.

The minister has referred the appeal of the minister's decision directly to the Supreme Court, thereby significantly shortening the second level of appeal.

In future cases, we do not want the minister to have to make direct referrals. We want to improve the system. Bill C–210 does that by removing two levels of appeals, one to the provincial court and the other to the Supreme Court.

The minister since our last debate in this House has made a response to the report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Solicitor General. Quoting from that, she has offered serious consideration and discussion leading to a new act or significant amendments to the present law.

I applaud her decision, but I do not feel they should preclude the interim improvements such as those proposed in this bill. The study will take some time. We have the opportunity for action and improvements now. Passing this bill will signal our resolve to improve the Extradition Act and help restore some waning confidence in our justice system.

The minister's study may well offer more substantial improvements, but if we can act on this bill we will show our determination to tighten the system and make our country with its legal system less appealing to foreign fugitives.

I do not see any reason at all why this House should not unanimously agree with the principle in this bill and get on with it. In fact, if the New Democratic Party had not filibustered last month when the bill was first

introduced, it could have been off to committee and possibly even back here for third reading and approval today.

The principle in this bill has the support of tens of thousands of Canadians. From my own riding I presented thousands of signatures on petitions calling on the Government of Canada to do exactly what this bill proposes. These petitioners do not want Canada to become a haven for foreign fugitives from justice. I have not met or heard from a single Canadian who supports the *status quo*. These people want an indication that we are prepared to act, and act now.

It is important to keep in mind that the individuals affected by these amendments will still have the opportunity to appear before Canadian courts. They will still have due process available to them. An individual who is not a citizen of this country will still have their rights protected. They will still be entitled to have their cases heard and appealed.

This bill simply limits the number of those appeals and it will make Canada slightly less appealing as a haven for foreign fugitives.

I would also suggest that the average Canadian, and I include myself in this group, cannot comprehend why we have such a problem and why we allow it to continue. How can a non-Canadian charged, accused, or even convicted under the laws of another sovereign nation, tie up our legal system for five to six years.

Why are we willing to spend so much money and time to keep them from answering charges in their own country? I cannot answer, and I do not understand.

I am not a lawyer. However, my understanding of law has always been that the purpose of law is to establish order in society and to protect the values, safety and security of that society.

I would suggest that if the law goes too far in protecting the rights of the individual without requiring any responsibilities, there is a very real danger that the law is going to have the effect of destroying the very society that it sets out to protect.

That destruction starts when the members of society lose confidence in the law, begin to ridicule it and hold it up to contempt. This act and recent cases involving it are one instance where to protect individual rights, we have allowed a situation where the law is attracting abuse and contempt. We cannot allow this to continue.

The present system takes too long. The chances of convicting a guilty person must reasonably decrease with the passage of time. It is wrong to allow someone to use the Canadian legal system to stall for time while witnesses' memories fade or witnesses move or die. Even more significant, while our system slowly moves, victims and victims' families wait for justice.

I am sure that we are all agreed that everyone is entitled to due process, but justice is not served by delaying resolution. The Canadian taxpayer is not served by allowing foreign fugitives to languish in Canadian jails at Canadian expense. Let us pass this bill.

Let us improve our system of extradition and show Canadians that we are reasonable; that we believe in and accept the need for due process; but also that we believe in the responsibility of the individual to answer for his or her actions and that we refuse to allow foreign fugitives to hide out in the Canadian judicial system. Let us approve this bill.

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to rise to speak to this private members' bill of the hon. member for Peterborough.

It deals with an area of law that a number of us in Parliament have been looking at very closely over the last year or two.

• (1720 )

I recall in January of this year the former justice minister addressing the issue publicly as an item of very compelling public interest. On the one hand he had certain function quasi judicial to take care of which prevented him from speaking too much on the issue but, on the other hand, he had his public responsibilities here to the people of Canada and to us in the House of Commons.

Certain commitments were made at that time to address the area of the Extradition Act and the Fugitive Offenders Act. A few months later in the justice committee, the current justice minister and officials appeared and indicated that the matter was under study. We all know that the matter has been under study for a long time and it is still being studied and I, for one, cannot

figure out why approximately three statutes are taking so long to decipher and a solution so long to be generated.

The hon. member for Peterborough with this private member's bill has provided the House of Commons with an opportunity to address this problem area directly and concisely. I gather that if the bill is passed by members, it can go to either a legislative committee or the justice committee which would take a closer look at some of the administrative implications.

The way this area of law is structured now—it is not embarrassing to stand here because it is a public issue—if the public was truly aware of the duplications, the complications, the conflicts, the redundancies, the absurdities, in the four federal statutes that govern this area, people might be lined up at the front door here. I do not get a sense of good management here; I get a sense of terrible management and a lack of interest. I grant that there have been other public issues in the justice area, that have kept the justice minister busy like gun control, the Meech Lake Constitution process, the abortion issue and other very compelling national matters, but these provisions in the Extradition Act and the Fugitive Offenders Act, the Corrections Act, and the Immigration Act are starting to embarrass us and, as my friend, the hon. member for Red Deer, just mentioned, there are 25 or 30 million people in the state of California trying to figure out what 25 million people here in Canada are doing. They cannot figure out how someone who is a U.S. citizen can suddenly show up on our doorstep and camp out until we no longer have any use for him.

I have read the provisions of the Immigration Act which state very clearly that an individual who is incarcerated can be removed or deported, it is very simple, upon the expiration of the period of time which he must serve in an institution, and that is approximately two-thirds of one's sentence.

I do not want to mention the individual's name, there is not need to, it has been mentioned in the House, but why the immigration officials did not go to the penitentiary in which that convicted person was and have him dealt with at a deportation hearing the day after two-thirds of the sentence had passed, I do not know. Since that time we have been participating, along with him, in what has become a growth industry involving our legal aid system, our judicial system, up and down, back and forth, to and from, the Supreme Court. This is costing us all money, not to mention the embarrassment. We do not seem to be able to move a body out of this country when it is obvious from our Immigration Act that we have the authority to do so. We just continue to sit back and do nothing.

We can remove an individual who has not committed a crime, but we cannot get rid of an individual who has committed a crime. This is an absurdity. I know in other parts of the world, if an individual of this type were to show up in another country and officials in that country were aware of it, that person would have a hearing. Depending on how the hearing turned out, the person would be taken to the airport and sent back home where he or she belongs.

People in this country are tired of providing safe haven to criminals. We do not mind being the haven to convention refugees under the United Nations Charter. We have done an admirable job and we are justifiably proud of what we have done. It has cost us dearly but we are happy to do that. But we are not happy to be a safe haven for criminals.

This particular bill gives us an opportunity, if I may use the term, on a fast-track basis, to take that narrow focus of extradition law, the focus of the difficulty we are having now, pass it at second reading, move it to a committee and then, hopefully, pass it into law and assist the justice officials and the Minister of Justice in completing this area of badly-needed homework.

**Mr. Bob Horner (Mississauga West):** Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to rise in the House today to support this private member's initiative from the member for Peterborough.

This is only one of a number of issues that the member for Peterborough has taken on and, believe me, he has great tenacity. I believe that something has to come of this bill. I would like to see the bill put to a vote today. I would like to see the bill referred to the justice committee. I do not see why we have to re-invent the wheel. We have already submitted a report with recommendations to the minister. I could read part of this report. Before I do that, I realize that I only have 10 minutes, and I would like to discuss the emotional issue of this. I heard my friend from Scarborough—Rouge River discussing 25 million people in California who cannot understand what

25 million people in Canada are doing. He is absolutely right.

I know the Department of Justice is very concerned about extradition and the length of time that these things take. It is hard to talk about these things without referring to the cases of Mr. Ng and Mr. Kindler. What we are doing here in the House today may not affect those cases but may affect future cases which will come before this country and cause us to be a total embarrassment and a safe haven for fugitives all over the world. We know that people in prisons in the United States plan their escapes to Canada because they know they are not going to go back.

What has happened in the second week of November? Mr. Bruce McLaughlin, an assistant deputy minister in the Department of Justice, along with other government officials, went to Sacramento, California. They talked with people. They spoke with Paul Cummings, the District Attorney from San Francisco. They spoke with John Martin, the District Attorney from Calaveras County. They spoke with Mr. Eidelberger from the California State Attorney General's department, plus people on the Ng task force. There are people in the United States who want this man to go back and face a trial in that country. They are saying that if you are going to send him back with conditions that apply to your country and do not apply to ours and if you are going to send him back with conditions that the capital punishment situation can never come to pass, we do not want him. It is costing the taxpayers of this country $100,000 a year to keep that man here.

**Mr. Waddell:** Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the Ng case is before the Supreme Court of Canada for decision right now. We are not supposed to be commenting on cases. As the member knows, this bill does not affect the Ng case at all. The Ng case is almost totally irrelevant to this bill.

• (1730)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I must suggest to the hon. member that if he would not mention the case that would be sufficient.

**Mr. Horner:** Mr. Speaker, I hope that the intervention will not be taken off my time. I did mention that I realized that the provisions of this bill do not apply to the Ng case.

This afternoon representatives of Victims of Violence, a fine organization in this city, telephoned some of the victims. I have always in my political career, when I talked to someone, tried to put myself in their position. I would like members of this House to put themselves in the position of the people who have lost loved ones, who do not know where their loved ones are, who have no idea where the bodies are hidden. They spoke to different people. I will name a few. They spoke to Richard and Sharon O'Connor in California, and they said they support the California stand. They spoke to Virginia and David Nestle, and they support the California stand. They spoke to Dwight Lola of Stapley and Joy Ireland, and they support the California resolution. They spoke to Roger and Marlene Geraldton and family, and they support the California resolution. I could go on and on. This is a very emotional issue.

Let us get to the mechanics of the bill that were very well explained by my colleague from Red Deer. The NDP does not like this bill. I congratulate the Liberal Party for supporting us on this. What we have here is the current extradition process: the extradition hearing and it moves to a writ of *habeas corpus*. From there it goes to an appeal, a relevant provincial court appeal. From there it goes to appeal to the Supreme Court. Then it goes to the Minister of Justice for a decision. The minister's decision is appealed then to the Federal Court Trials Division. Then it is appealed to the Federal Court of Canada Appeals Division. Then it is appealed to the Supreme Court, and they start over again. This is absolutely ridiculous. It has to be fast-tracked in some way.

All we are asking to do is to remove two parts. The NDP says: "We don't want these parts removed because you must have an appeal to the relevant provincial court of appeal". However, what I am informed is that when you take away that appeal you have to put something in its place. You have to put in an appeal to a three-judge tribunal.

We are not asking for a big thing. We are asking for a small step to make Canada have some respect in its laws. We have submitted in the third report of the justice committee four recommendations to the minister. I could read from it: "The committee has considered aspects of the law and the process of extradition", and so

on. We go on with four recommendations. The NDP says: "We support these recommendations".

However, our recommendations were not accepted at this time by the minister. The minister stated her reasons. She goes on to say in the conclusion as well: "The recommendations raise broader issues which require thorough consideration". Fine, let us take one small step. Let us support this private member's initiative.

We all remember the times when private members did not have a say in this House. They did not have very much say at all. The McGrath commission changed that, and now we have private members' bills that pass. In the last Parliament we had five private members' bills of great significance that passed. In this Parliament I want to see one pass, and I want to see this one pass.

I know that the NDP caucus members have great deep feelings for these victims. I know that they feel as deeply as I do. However, they cannot take a stand against this bill in all good conscience and I can tell you why. I have in my possession a letter from the former justice critic of the New Democratic Party, the member for Burnaby—Kingsway. I would like to read this letter into the record. The letter is to George Bears, Director, Victims of Violence. It reads:

> Dear Mr. Bears:
>
> My colleague, Audrey McLaughlin, has passed your memo on to me expressing your concern about the lengthy process of extradition in the Charles Ng case.

I am sorry to mention the case, but it is in the letter. It continues:

> I share your concern on this question. I believe that current provisions of the Extradition Act lead to inordinate delays in extradition. There are too many steps in the appeal process. The legal requirement that a fugitive who has been accused of an offence in Canada (not the extradition offence) or who has been convicted and sentenced for a crime in Canada, cannot be surrendered until after he or she has either been acquitted or has finished serving the sentence imposed by the Canadian court is unacceptable. Indeed, in contrast with this mandatory wording, the treaty with the United States provides that surrender in such a situation is discretionary.

This was from the justice critic of the New Democratic Party. In his last paragraph he writes:

> In light of these weaknesses in the Act, I am preparing a Private Member's bill to respond to these concerns and to tighten the Act. I will be pleased to send you a copy of my bill when it has been drafted.

I have never seen it. I have checked. There is no such bill, but there is a bill from the member for Peterborough. I ask for the NDP to support this bill, put it to a vote, refer it to the justice committee, and let us get things done in this Parliament.

**Mr. Lee:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In the ordinary course of the rotation in the House, I think it would have been a turn when a member from the Liberal caucus would have spoken. Having spoken with the hon. member for Peterborough and others, we feel that in the interest of attempting to expedite the process and not delay it we would defer at this time. Perhaps the Speaker would want to move to the next spot in rotation.

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, let me reply to some of these points. We want to speed up the extradition process too. We think it is a flawed process. That is what the former critic said.

First of all, I want to point out that the Ng case does not affect this bill or this bill does not affect the Ng case. The Ng case is before the Supreme Court of Canada. It is going to decide. It has nothing to do right now with this bill. We are talking about the future.

**Mr. Domm:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I hope that member of the New Democratic Party would respect the concerns spoken in this House earlier and try, whenever possible, not to refer to the Ng case.

**Mr. Waddell:** *Touché, touché.* That is right, but this bill is dealing with the future. That is what we are dealing with, so let us deal with this bill.

The process needs streamlining. We all agree with that. There is a solution to that. The solution is the report of the justice committee, signed by the member for Mississauga West, who was the last speaker for the Conservatives. As the member said in his own speech, it was not accepted by the Minister of Justice. That was a three-stage procedure.

Now the member for Peterborough comes along and introduces a two-stage procedure. Does the member for Mississauga West really believe that the Minister of Justice is going to accept a two-stage procedure when she thought a three-stage procedure was too fast? Come on now, let us not have hypocrisy here. Come on, let us be honest with the Canadian people. Let us quit scoring

cheap politics. This is cheap politics. The solution is in the justice committee report. We want a streamlined system. We want a legal system.

Let me tell you about the flaw in the bill. I will go through the procedure, as did the member who first spoke suggested. Right now there is an extradition hearing. There is an appeal by a writ of *habeas corpus*. That is not anywhere in our law. That is a common law right. Then there is an appeal from the *habeas corpus*. The reason there is an appeal from the *habeas corpus* is that the *habeas corpus* is heard by a judge at the same court level that hears extradition cases. It could even be the same judge. That is why there is an appeal from that. That is why, if this bill goes through, the courts are liable to declare the bill unconstitutional. The courts are liable to declare the bill as violating the charter of rights.

• (1740)

You ask me what is my authority for that. My authority is the legal opinion of the justice department of the federal government which states exactly that on page 6 of the report.

**Mr. Domm:** It is different entirely.

**Mr. Waddell:** No, it is not different entirely. It is exactly on that. It makes sense too. It makes sense because how can you not restrict an appeal from a *habeas corpus*? If you start restricting that, you will be in some deep constitutional problems. What will happen—I won't mention the name Ng—and hopefully it will not happen is that if another fugitive comes here and gets a smart lawyer, the lawyer will go to court on this bill and delay it even further. If we pass this bill we will be in a bigger legal morass. We will be in deeper.

What we have to do is get smart. We have to put the onus on the Minister of Justice and follow the recommendations of the justice committee, which was a unanimous report that made legal sense. It streamlined the process.

Let me go back again in this process. Right now there is an extradition hearing, a writ of *habeas corpus*, an appeal from that, then an appeal to the Supreme Court, then a decision of the minister, and then there has been appeals. That was what Mr. Ng was doing, appealing that to the Federal Court and to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court is going to make a decision soon and likely, whichever way it decides, that will eliminate about three steps because that case will already be decided; the issue being: How does the charter of rights apply if you want to send someone out of the country where there is capital punishment in the other jurisdiction or there is harsh and unconscionable punishment? That will be decided. If we were smart, we would wait for the Supreme Court. The decision is pending now. We should wait for that decision. That will likely eliminate three parts of the procedure. Then what will we be left with? The member for Peterborough's bill, which will be an extradition hearing, a quick *habeas corpus*, and then out of the country. That is too fast, and it may be illegal and unconstitutional.

There are all kinds of future cases we may have on extradition. Remember Leonard Pelletier? He is now languishing in a jail in the States through trumped-up evidence, which legal scholars now agree was a pretty unfair hearing. We have to get a procedure that is streamlined but fair. My colleagues and I do not like what is going on with Mr. Ng and so on in those kinds of cases. We want to streamline the procedure, but we want it to be constitutional and legal.

I said there was hypocrisy. The government put up more speakers than the NDP. The Liberals have almost put up more speakers than the NDP, but we are getting blamed and they are putting up the speakers. The minister, who told me personally that she was against the bill, and the parliamentary secretary, who is against the bill but does not want to speak, will put it off to this committee and then prorogue Parliament. That will get the best of both worlds. They will claim to the victims of violence that they let it go through. Then they will claim to the justice department and the lawyers that it did not really go through. That is hypocrisy. The victims of violence are owed better by this government and by members of Parliament. We have to be honest and straightforward.

It is not easy to stand here and take the flak that is going around. I believe it is the truth, that this is a flawed bill, that it will get us into deeper legal morass, that there is a better way of doing it, and that the better way is the justice committee report itself which is legal, streamlined and the way to go.

If we were the government over there, in two months we would have a government bill and we would streamline this process. We would not engage in this hypocrisy.

I am surprised that the Liberals are falling for it, quite frankly.

**Mr. Keyes:** Then the Liberals should be government.

**Mr. Waddell:** Well, we will see. I just want to read what the committee said in its third report: "The committee believes that the Extradition Act can and must be streamlined by eliminating some of the steps available in the process, but this must be done in a manner consistent with Canada's international obligations and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms".

Right on, and here is what you do. You take that and you have an extradition hearing. You cannot stop a writ of *habeas corpus*. It is in English common law. It has been there forever. You have the writ of *habeas corpus*, and there has to be an appeal from that. You cannot stop that but you can have one appeal, not two appeals. You do not allow two appeals, you allow one appeal from that and then you have the minister's decision. The Ng case, when it is decided, will have dealt with most of the other points about sending them to the United States. When we have dealt with that, we will have a streamlined procedure which works.

**Mr. Lee:** We'll do it in committee.

**Mr. Waddell:** The hon. member says, "We'll do it in committee". We cannot amend this bill in committee.

**Mr. Lee:** Nonsense.

**Mr. Waddell:** It is not nonsense. You cannot add to a bill. I have just been in committee this afternoon trying to add to the young offenders bill and had all my amendments ruled out of order. You cannot add to a bill.

The way to do it is to have the government bring in a bill. This bill is going to die anyway because the House is going to prorogue. Let us be honest with the people, the victims of violence. Why do we not put our efforts into getting a government bill that works? Bring in a government bill that works early in the next session of Parliament. We will put up a speaker, and we will put that bill through. You know that—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member's time has expired.

**Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, at the outset, speaking in favour of the bill, that the member who just spoke, the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam, I have known for a long time as a prosecuting counsel. I think we started the same week or month in Vancouver together down on Main Street. I want members on all sides of the House to know that I have high respect for his intellectual honesty, both as a lawyer and as a parliamentarian.

I am confident that he is speaking from the heart and from the head on this issue. He genuinely disagrees with the bill for reasons which he has just stated. In fact, he was kind enough to make available to me a copy of the justice department opinion which was tabled some time ago, and I understand fully the complaint and the concern which he is expressing.

I would remind the member that former Senator Eugene Forsey, in his memoirs, *A Life on the Fringe*, has made it clear—and I think all members should read that book, particularly the chapter where he talks about some of the legal opinions which came from the justice department in his career. The member for Port Moody—Coquitlam knows perfectly well that a lot of opinions coming from the justice department, and I speak as someone who used to work in that department, are full of holes and are rubbish. It depends, as he knows, on who has prepared the opinion. Maybe he knows who did the opinion but I don't. Perhaps he knows whether it is worth the powder to blow it to Hades.

If this bill goes ahead today, the legislative committee considering it will be able to call for legal opinions of all kinds, including, of course, the justice department. We will be able to amend the bill to take out any probable unconstitutionality in it. The member may think that is impossible but I submit that it is worth trying.

The situation is sufficiently serious that this is at least a step forward and, if it is unconstitutional, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the member, we can try to take out any possible problems with unconstitutionality under the Charter of Rights. I would urge the member and his colleagues not to talk the bill out at 6.10 p.m. today, which is in about 20 minutes.

I would like to pay my respects to the member for Peterborough, to all of the members who have taken part

in this issue, and to the about 100,000 people who have signed petitions in favour of the principle of this bill.

I also would point out, although it has now gone by the boards, that the member for Peterborough asked each party to speak for 10 minutes and not longer today and then, by unanimous consent, we could have a vote. As an independent member, I will not speak for the full 10 minutes. I would simply make a plea to members of the New Democratic Party, because I think all other members here are agreed to let the bill go to committee, not to filibuster the proposal and I would give them three reasons. Earlier today we heard eloquent tributes in this House to the women who were killed in the tragedy at École polytechnique in Montreal exactly a year ago today. How is it consistent for us in the same afternoon not to try to push this bill into committee, at the same we are all very distressed about what has happened in Montreal, across the country, and probably in every one of our constituencies?

• (1750)

I gather we are not to mention the name of one of the accused. That again is the sort of mythology that goes forward. That is considered to be improper. I know the member for Burnaby—Coquitlam is aware that so many of the victims of these kinds of violence are women. How can we do something to light a small candle for these victims? Is it not better to push this bill into committee than to talk it out and say that we will bring in a better one next time?

I would point out to the members of the New Democratic Party that a recent *New York Times* article has estimated that there have been 250,000 homicides in the United States over the last 10 or 15 years. Would sending this bill to committee not speed up the day to come when people like the two people I am not to mention will find it harder to seek refuge in Canada, or sanctuary in Canada, than many have found it today?

Mr. Speaker, I might say as a former prosecutor of a number of homicide cases that there is now considerable dissymmetry between Canada and the United States, as I think the member for Scarborough—Rouge River pointed out. I recall a murder case in Alberta where the accused fled to California, her co-accused was tried in Fort McMurray. When she was found in California, as far as I can determine, the immigration authorities simply put her on an airplane, told the RCMP in Vancouver when she would be landing, and she was arrested at the airport and brought back to Alberta for trial.

That may not be pretty, it may offend all of us who believe in the rule of law, but that is the kind of dissymmetry that operates now between our two countries on matters like this. Do any of the members think that if the unmentionable person had committed these alleged crimes in British Columbia that the authorities in California would have waited very long before they would have shipped him back to face trial in Vancouver?

Something is wildly out of whack, I put it to the member. If the bill is not perfect it is better than what we have now, and it is a step forward, I put it to them.

Mr. Speaker, I think my time is up. I would urge the three members of the New Democratic Party who have not yet spoken in this debate, but have the remaining time following the speaker from the government side, to think seriously and recognize, I believe—although I am not allowed to refer to people in the gallery—that there are thousands and thousands of concerned people in Canada who think this is a step forward, not a measure that might be unconstitutional. I would urge them to think very seriously of what they are doing before they talk this bill out in the next few minutes.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly to this bill and do so from the perspective of someone who is not a lawyer. I do not apologize for not being a lawyer—

**Ms. Blondin:** Thank God.

**Mr. Boudria:** My colleague behind me says "thank god I am not". I can reassure her that that is not the purpose of this intervention.

The reason I mention those words is because to the average constituent that each of us has, the fact that someone can be a convicted murderer, enter this country, be arrested and have more rights as it were—perhaps not technically, but in reality—because he or she was arrested as opposed to not being, is just a little beyond the comprehension, I would suspect, of a number of our constituents.

Frankly, it is beyond logic simply because, as some people have indicated in the past, if you catch someone at the border you just send them back. If you catch

someone in Canada who is here illegally, you send them away, Mr. Speaker.

But if they are arrested and put in jail, they seem to have means of appeal available to them that they would not otherwise have. That is very disturbing.

Some colleagues today are discussing whether or not this bill has a chance of being law. Others are mentioning that it does not really have a chance. Maybe we should talk it out instead, because if we do give this bill a chance, it might die in committee because the House will likely prorogue if the government gets some of the legislation that it is looking to get, namely, the government perhaps launching its goods and services tax bill and then proroguing Parliament.

Whether that will happen or not, Mr. Speaker, frankly I do not know. It might very well, but what do we have to lose by giving this bill a chance in committee. The bill could proceed to a committee. We could deal with the issue there, and if the bill is not satisfactory, perhaps we can amend it.

My colleague, the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River has mentioned that the bill, in his opinion, is fine the way it is. Witnesses will no doubt contribute. Members will contribute their knowledge. The justice department will give its advice and so on, once it reaches committee stage.

That being said, what if we arrive at a situation where we discover this bill does not do all those wonderful things that we expect. Incidentally, it does not dramatically change that many things. It might remove a few levels of appeal, but there are still a number of them left.

Even if we deem it at that point to be unacceptable, what on earth stops us from defeating the bill at report stage or at third reading? There is nothing at all that stops us from doing that later. That is only if the bill does not work at all and if this bill is worse than the present condition.

There is no proof that I have heard today or the other day that convinces me that we should absolutely talk this bill out to ensure that it is not discussed in committee in case it passes afterwards and in the unlikely event that it is worse than what we have now.

I have heard no such evidence. What I have heard from the vast majority of members of this House is that this bill is an improvement over what it is now. For those who do not think that it is an improvement, there is ample opportunity to make that case and to convince other members at committee and to act accordingly, of course, once the bill comes back to this House.

**Mr. Waddell:** I hesitate to interrupt my friend, but I just want to check with the Chair. I understand this will be a votable bill after so many hours of debate here.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** In another hour it would be.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I suppose our friend is technically correct. This bill is a votable bill, but it is not necessarily votable today.

Individuals could talk it out with, of course, the hope that by the time the bill comes up again in the House of Commons for debate, Parliament might have prorogued by then.

The issue of prorogation might come in again, but from an entirely different angle. There might be those who would like the bill to be talked out one more time in the hope that it will not come back up.

In any case, we will see a little later if the vote is permitted today. Of course, there are two means by which we could complete this bill today: first, we could, of course, extend the hours. That is certainly possible, and everyone could speak to his or her heart's content.

• (1800 )

Second, the other way of doing it is simply for a member who would not wish for this bill to proceed to talk it past the hour of termination, which I believe is 6.14 p.m. or thereabouts today. Of course, that process will delay the bill until next time.

**Mr. Waddell:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member might be inadvertently misleading the House, but I understood this is a votable bill. The member is indicating that for some reason it may never come to a vote. It will come to a vote.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** That is not a point of order. It is debate. The hon. member has the floor.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, if the member was not knowledgeable on procedure, those points of order would be almost excusable. But he is, of course, far more knowledgeable than that and his points of order are totally ridiculous.

He knows of course that the bill will be votable, but not necessarily today. I was just explaining how one could ensure that the bill was not votable today by either talking it out or using some other means, in the hope that Parliament will have prorogued before the next time it comes up. That is not today. Of course, we can vote on it today. In a few minutes from now, we will have that tool available to us.

The hon. member from Port Moody—Coquitlam a little earlier today said that this bill might not be amendable in committee. That depends. Under rule 773 of Beauchesne, even if his amendment which he says is required, is in fact required—and that is yet to be determined— it would be out of order only if it went beyond the scope of the present bill. I am not convinced that his amendment would bring the bill, as amended, beyond the scope of what it is already. That is to be determined.

In any case, I am not even convinced that the amendment is required. That is to be determined at parliamentary committee, as our colleague I am sure knows. He knows far better than some of the things he has been telling us.

Other members could perhaps convince us that they are not very knowledgeable. For this member to pretend that is just a bit much because we know him well. We know of course he is very clever and very knowledgeable, in terms of parliamentary procedure, the law, and everything else. Therefore, I do have some difficulty with some of the arguments that he is putting before us today in terms of the reasons why we should not proceed with a vote today on the bill and continue talking on it for some time to come.

The ideal situation for us today would be to terminate this debate prior to talking out the time— talking out the time for today, I want to add, so that I am not again interrupted on a point of order by our colleague from Port Moody—Coquitlam. Before that talking out time today, which I believe to be 6.11 p.m., we should vote on this bill. We should vote at that point before 6.11 p.m. this afternoon.

If some members do not want the bill to proceed to committee, they can vote against it. I happen to think it should go to committee. The people who have sent me here are fed up with seeing what we see now. The convicted murderers of other countries come here because this is a way that they can delay, or possibly evade altogether, trials or sentences that they would otherwise be subjected to in their own countries.

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Mr. Speaker, I have sat here with a great deal of perplexity because I have found out that the Liberals and the Conservatives are accusing the New Democrats of talking the bill out, but then I find out that all of the discussion has been by Conservatives and Liberals.

The last time this came up the NDP got one speaker in two minutes. Today we are going to get one speaker and I guess I am going to get five or six minutes. If the members wanted it to proceed, why did the Conservatives put up two speakers again today? The Liberals put up two speakers, and an independent person, who cannot decide whether he is a Liberal or a Tory, spoke.

The issue of extradition is an emotional one. I want to make it very clear that the New Democratic Party supports the recommendations made by the committee. It was an all-party committee which reported unanimously. Many of the people who spoke today were on that committee.

The committee stated that it believes that the Extradition Act can and must be streamlined by eliminating some of the steps available in the process. But this must be done in a manner consistent with Canada's international obligation and Canada's Charter of Rights and Freedoms. It recommended a three-stage proposal.

What we cannot understand is why the minister simply has not brought forward a bill based on the committee's recommendation. It is the responsibility of the minister to bring forward legislation.

We are beginning to be perplexed about this new justice minister, particularly those of us from British Columbia, because we have seen her fumble every piece of legislation she has been responsible for. There was the abortion legislation which nobody likes; the gun control legislation which she basically had to withdraw by

shuffling it off to a special committee; and now, her inability to draft proper legislation that will streamline the extradition procedures that will hold up in court.

It is very nice for people to pass a bill such as this, but the result may be that it would delay extradition. We have seen in Canada where flawed legislation simply goes before the court and delays and delays. All sorts of constitutional arguments come forward that delay the process for years.

If we are going to have proper extradition procedure, let us do it right. Let us make sure that we have legislation that will accomplish what we want, which is a speedy extradition procedure, streamlined and legal which will hold up in court and protect individual's rights. There are times when people come to Canada who are being extradited, where their rights have not been protected in other countries. We must guarantee that this kind of thing does not happen.

One of the things that is now happening, and it would be arguable, is that the legal opinions simply say that the bill would be unconstitutional and that we are then going to have litigation again.

**Mr. Boudria:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps you would want to ask the House if we could get unanimous consent to proceed with the remainder of the time at second reading today so that we could have a vote today on this bill. In other words, that all five hours of this bill be dealt with today.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Mr. Waddell:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe this is particularly in order and my friend is more of an expert than I am. But it seems to me we have a process for dealing with a bill. We deal with a bill for three hours, as I understand it. We have a vote at the end of that period. That is the procedure we see. We are quite prepared to have a vote at the end of that period.

We would prefer to push the Minister of Justice into a bill that really works. I think this is out of order, but I am waiting for a ruling from the Chair.

**Mr. Domm:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Well, we only have a minute left before 6.11. The hon. member for Peterborough has the floor on a point of order.

**Mr. Domm:** I do not wish to delay this matter, but by way of correction, we have three hours at second reading. We now have completed almost two. What is being asked is for the third hour that is before second reading vote take place now. Any member who wanted to speak could speak, and then we would refer it to committee. I turn it over to you, Mr. Speaker.

• (1810 )

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member for Port Moody—Coquitlam is right. So are the other members. The House can do anything it wants, if we get unanimous consent. We did not get unanimous consent. Therefore, we cannot do it.

**Mr. Waddell:** Mr. Speaker, I wanted to know if it was in order to do this. It seems to me we are changing the procedure. I have not had any experience of this procedure of ever being changed. I do not know if it is in order. You cannot get unanimous consent for certain things if they are already in the rules, it seems to me.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** We could agree not to see the clock and continue for another hour to complete the bill, but we did not get unanimous consent. Therefore, there is no sense in talking about something that is hypothetical. I heard a no.

It being 6.11 p.m., the time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has 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*.

---

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

In accordance with Standing Order 38, a motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been moved.

### SUPPLY MANAGEMENT

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk):** Mr. Speaker, I, and many others who value our Canadian agriculture industry, take strong objection to the answer of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to my question of November 22, 1990.

The minister took no time to refute recent editorials, consumer groups, and foreign governments which have been attacking supply management. He is leaving it to us

alone to set the record straight. Let's be truthful and get the facts straight.

Prior to the 1970s and the establishment of marketing boards in Canada, the dairy industry and prices of dairy products to consumers were continuously experiencing roller coaster highs and lows. Farmers could never rely on a stable income and the consumers' food budget was always fluctuating, creating financial instability for all concerned.

Economic policies based on the vicious laws of supply and demand are responsible for the surpluses and create the prices below the cost of production that we find in the United States and Europe. With no controls the market is flooded with surpluses and milk producers begin consistently to overproduce, creating huge stockpiles of butter, cheese, and non-fat dairy products.

Producers finally concluded that the only way for them to provide high quality products to consumers and achieve stability and a fair return for their labour and investment was to implement a production program to manage supply. Most importantly, our supply-managed system was implemented within international law, under Article XI of GATT.

Our dairy production is regulated to meet Canadian demand for dairy products, with adjustments for traditional imports and exports. Under supply management, the dairy industry produces a high quality product at a fair and reasonable price. Perhaps equally as important, Canada is now nearly self-sufficient in dairy products.

To say that dairy farmers are inefficient is a blatant lie. Since the introduction of supply management, milk yields have increased about 70 per cent in Canada, compared to 46 per cent in the U.S. and 31 per cent in New Zealand.

These groups continually talk about Canadian consumers being penalized by higher prices. Those who talk about the inefficiency of supply management neglect to mention that, while milk may be cheaper in the U.S. than in Canada, American milk is sold below the cost of production. U.S. producers are subsidized with tax dollars through surplus and herd buy-outs. The consumer pays in the end.

A popular conception by the media is that marketing boards and supply management systems are actually a form of subsidization. Supply management provides a fair return for producers from the marketplace without using huge amounts of taxpayers' dollars.

When supply management was first implemented under GATT, it was understood that subsidies were something that came out of the tax base.

Now the U.S. in particular is trying to argue that if consumers pay more than world price, that is a subsidy.

The GATT aggregate measure of support is a calculation used to qualify all government support programs for an industry and give these programs a monetary value. This calculation supposedly allows GATT to determine which support programs are trade distorting and which ones are not.

For the Canadian dairy industry, the AMS calculation considers both the domestic world price differential and the direct payment to producers. Such a calculation is misleading as the basis for 86 per cent of AMS calculation as it applies to the Canadian dairy industry is simply the difference between Canadian milk prices and world prices.

Such a calculation is irrelevant, and it is unfair because world prices reflect dumping by countries of the subsidized surplus production. The fact is that world prices are far below the actual production costs for most dairy producing countries.

The sensible marketing strategy these economic wizards appear to suggest is for our dairy farmers to produce huge surpluses below the cost of production. Yes, dairy producers and those who raise products under supply management in Canada have viable and successful operations, but does anyone ever stop to think of the huge investment they have had in their operations, or the 75-plus hours a week? They work milking cows twice a day like clockwork for 365 days a year.

It appears instead that these groups believe that dairy producers, and for that matter all farmers, do not deserve to earn a decent living for their families. Do they not have the right to a stable income? Do these groups expect them to accept a lower standard of living than other Canadians, living off the land?

Those agricultural sectors without supply management are continually plagued by boom and bust. Would these people like to have their salary go up and down like a yo-yo? The Department of Agriculture has predicted that farm incomes will fall by 25 per cent this year. What

would these people do if their salaries were decreased by a quarter? How would they manage?

For that matter, how would we manage without a healthy food sector? On condemning supply management in our agricultural industry, these people all too often forget the importance of agriculture to our total economy.

For example, today there are some 35,000 dairy farmers in Canada. Each of these farmers supports two families; hence, there are some 70,000 farm families that depend on the dairy industry.

In addition, there are approximately 25,000 Canadians working in the dairy processing industry at nearly 400 plants located across this nation. The total number of people directly employed by the dairy industry is close to 100,000 Canadians, which represents approximately 14 per cent of the total aggregate business and employment.

Critics of supply management in agriculture forget that other sectors also have management of supply. Do you think General Motors or any other auto manufacturers produce an unlimited number of cars? What about subsidies and safety nets? If everything was based at world price and it is going to be considered a subsidy in agriculture, how long would it be before our social programs, old age pensions, CPP, OHIP, et cetera and other types of safety nets will also be considered as subsidies?

In conclusion, farmers are only asking for what other Canadians want, the right to earn a good living and support their families by hard work and struggling. We have built an agricultural industry that is envied the world over. We must not allow it to be destroyed.

**Mr. Murray Cardiff (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to respond to the member's concerns and the indication that they stand alone.

That is certainly not the case. This government has demonstrated many times how it supported supply managed sectors and the farm industry in this country. We recognize that supply management is a very important part of the Canadian long term agricultural policy.

I can assure everyone that the federal government is very committed to supply management, and that commitment is very firm. It is also clearly endorsed in our discussion paper *Growing Together* that we are all very familiar with.

The supply management in Canada has been very highly successful in reducing market risk to producers, and I am sure the member agrees with that, preserving the family farm and ensuring that consumers have access to high quality food products at reasonable costs.

Since the introduction of supply management, price instability has become a thing of the past and Canadians have been assured of products of the highest quality and safety in the world, which are very important.

Price increases for supply managed products have generally been lower than for other foods and products. Over the last four years, the average increase in the Consumer Price Index for dairy products, turkey and eggs was less than 3 per cent. This compares favourably to that for all food at 3.9 per cent and for all items 4.4 per cent.

• (1820)

Canada's support for supply management is embodied in our position in the Uruguay round of multilateral trade talks in these negotiations. We all know that we tabled our position last March to clarify and strengthen article 11, and we know how important that is to the supply management sector.

The agrifood sector has a lot at stake in these talks, and we are hoping and working very diligently to make sure that we have a successful outcome to those negotiations and the GATT talks.

With regard to the dairy industry which we believe is the best in the world, this government has put in a five-year dairy policy that previous governments had failed to do. We have a poultry task force working with the farmers as well. But our position of maintaining supply management is firm and very well known.

STATUS OF WOMEN

**Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, I have stood in this place many times stating sobering statistics on violence against women, and here I am again tonight.

Tonight, let us forget the figures. Let us philosophize about a theme: the penalization of feminism. That is exactly what the Montreal massacre was about. It was about killing women who considered it natural to study a profession that interested them; women who did not realize that they would be physically punished for being feminists, unwitting feminists.

Like them, thousands of other Canadian women are punished for wanting self-sufficiency. Why did Chantal Daigle have to resort to wearing a disguise, sneaking out of the country and sleeping at a campground in order to access a medical service? Why, despite Supreme Court opinion, do Canadian women now face the possibility of being forced to reproduce by having to deal with doctors who could be branded criminals at someone else's whim? Why are women, who demand to exercise their own priorities, being in the words of a former chief justice, "profoundly interfered with"? Because these women are becoming too revealing. They are revealing their feminism. So, they seem to deserve punishment.

How bizarre it is that this government can criminalize a perfectly safe medical function and yet deliberately resist criminalizing the unwarranted possession of guns, whose prime function is to slaughter? One-third of these victims are women.

Why such blatant hypocrisy? Because, in each case women chose to choose, to practise feminism, something which unless punished enough, I suppose, might become a habit.

No wonder this government turns a blind eye to the lawmakers, interpreters, and enforcers who explain away violence against women by citing a number of things. They cite temporary loss of control, or work-related stress, or misunderstood signals from women, or my personal favourite, "She got what she asked for". Of course she did. She stood up for herself. She sought help. She fought back. She was a feminist. She was wrong. She had to be told.

If feminism is so wrong in the eyes of this government, why bother reprimanding anti-feminists at all? Why bother giving three day sentences to confirmed wife batterers? I stand corrected. In some instances only a weekend sentence follows; the compassionate judge having made allowances for men who cannot miss their Friday night rituals. Mind you, I am not really complaining. Feminists have rituals, too. We have vigils. We call them vigils to help us remember those whom the judges forget.

Why even consider issuing demerit points, you know, the kind of demerit points that are issued to school yard bullies to university men who threaten their female colleagues with rape. Is it my mistake again, Mr. Speaker? In the University of B.C. case, none of the men has been officially sanctioned, nor are there signs of a formal inquiry in the works. Forgive me for suggesting that there should be. What can I say? Perhaps I want too much.

Why should we give so-called street women an economic break by allowing them to communicate the sale of their bodies in private? Or is once more my feminism leading me astray? To give credit where credit is due, this government has ensured that even those women who want out of prostitution will have problems finding decent work, thanks to their criminal records and a pitiful lack of reform programs.

The insults of women having to sneak around, sneak across the border for abortions; of prostitutes having to consider themselves outlaws except under the wink-wink, nudge-nudge circumstances; of women having to see their efforts undermined in a gun control bill whose very introduction came because of their efforts; of women having to get handcuffed to keep women's centres open; of women having to beg police officers to charge the accused, or plead with judges to sentence offenders adequately, and of women's votes being lured with hollow promises of a national child care program while domestic violence continues to dig the graves of Canadian women and children.

These realities contain two messages. First, that feminism has become such an integral part of the consciousness of Canadian women that it now threatens established power. If a threat cannot be destroyed, it must be disciplined. It must be punished.

The second message is that under this government the early 1990s are echoing the early 1890s, when the Criminal Code made birth control, and advising about birth control, illegal, and when etiquette manuals proclaimed that "women who overtax their vital energies by intellectual strain are self-made invalids and must accept the penalties of their position."

Penalizing feminism, Mr. Speaker, will not make it go away. It will only make it stronger. Female enrolment in engineering programs across Canada is higher than ever. Feminist resolve to amplify voices until government stops punishing them is greater than ever. The ultimate goal is clearer than ever: to liberate men as much as to liberate women so that "feminism" can be uttered by both sexes without anticipation of penalty.

This feminist will now await her penalty: three minutes of watching the government apologize first and give select information to puff up a pathetic record on action on violence against women.

Mr. Speaker, the penalty hardly suits the crime.

**Mr. Murray Cardiff (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member realizes and recognizes that it is difficult to respond to all of her concerns in three minutes on the very delicate and very sincere situation and the concerns she has raised.

The government and the judiciary are keenly aware of the problem of judicial attitudes to issues such as gender equality and child sexual assault which may result in the making of ill-considered remarks. This was one of the reasons why the federal Minister of Justice of the day, along with his provincial and territorial counterparts, and the Canadian Judicial Counsel, agreed to establish the Canadian Judicial Centre in 1987.

One of its core functions is to respond to the educational requirements of both the federally and provincially appointed judiciary in Canada by designing judicial educational services to meet the requirements of the Canadian Judiciary and Skills Training, continuing professional education and professional enrichment.

The centre has become a central forum for the development of educational programs on gender equality for all levels of judges in this country. The centre is jointly funded by the federal, provincial and territorial governments. The commitment of the federal government to the work of the centre is demonstrated by the fact that the level of financial support to the centre has recently been doubled.

The Minister of Justice considers the centre to be an appropriate body to assist the judiciary in developing a better appreciation of issues such as equality of the sexes, child abuse, and family violence, issues in which it has thus far shown considerable interest and concern.

The Canadian Judicial Council in conjunction with the Canadian Judicial Centre provided a course on gender equality at its 1990 summer seminar for federally appointed judges. This course was mandatory for those attending the seminar and focused on gender issues in the court room and in the application of the law.

Furthermore, the training seminar is given to all newly appointed judges and includes mandatory sessions dealing with gender issues. The Minister of Justice has called a National Conference on Women and the Law to be held in late 1991.

Continuing traditional education is an effective way of impressing upon members of the judiciary the need for the courts to reflect the changes in societal attitudes to gender issues, including child and spousal assault, which have occurred over the past few years.

• (1830 )

With the increasing enrolment of women in law schools and especially with the presence of more women judges at all levels of court, attitudes are changing. Judges and law makers are more aware of women's concerns and more responsive to them. Indeed, with 81 women currently holding federal judicial office, including three members of the Supreme Court of Canada, the courts of every province and all the federally constituted courts are to an increasing extent being exposed to the presence and the views of women.

## HEALTH

**Mr. David Berger (Saint-Henri—Westmount):** Mr. Speaker, everyone is familiar with the old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. If one applies this adage to health care, I suppose one would say that preventing disease is better and less expensive than treating sick people. Yet as a society we spend billions on curing sick people and relatively little on preventing disease. This was the crux of the question which I raised in the House last Thursday and which I

had raised on previous occasions in June and earlier this fall.

The federal government spends $216 million on medical research, while it spends only $28 million on health care research which includes prevention of disease and health promotion. While the government spends relatively little on health care research, this is precisely the area that was cut by the Minister of National Health and Welfare in recent months.

In last year's budget, the minister was directed to reduce the expenditures of his department by $12 million. As was pointed out to me by one researcher, this amounts to 4–100ths of 1 per cent of the Department of National Health and Welfare's total budget of some $35 billion. As this researcher suggested to me, when one is asked to cut $12 million out of a budget of $35 billion or $40 billion, the largest budget of any department of the Government of Canada, surely there are ways that this could be done, surely there are ways that the pain could be spread around, rather than cutting the budget of the health care research program by some $4 million, which is what the minister chose to do.

The National Health Research and Development Program is the only funding source for applied health care research. It is the only funding source for areas of research such as cancer prevention, native health care, care for Alzheimer's sufferers, women's health care, health promotion, prevention of child sexual abuse, and prevention of family violence. Again I specify research into all these areas. Yet the minister reduced the budget of this program by $4 million and froze the budget for five years.

As a result of these cuts this fiscal year's competition was cancelled. In other words, no new projects will receive funding this year. And next year, when the competition is re-opened, the budget will be 13 per cent smaller.

[*Translation*]

To try and understand the impact of this cutback, Mr. Speaker, I recently spent some time meeting and listening to researchers involved in health care research. I met members of the interdisciplinary health research group at the Université de Montréal. These people were doing research on emergency facilities. It is a known fact that crowded emergency wards are a problem that is very difficult to deal with. I met another researcher who is analysing decisive factors in the use of preventive services, such as the use of mammograms and Pap tests for cancer detection in women.

Mr. Speaker, many women do not take advantage of these tests. The point is to find out why and to convince them they should use these services.

Because of the cutbacks, these research projects have been postponed for one year, and researchers told me how negative the impact will be. Entire research teams will be lost because research assistants, doctorate-level students and programmers will decide to go on to something else, which means either working for the private sector or pursuing a career in medicine, which is more lucrative than research. Mr. Speaker, these cutbacks are also detrimental to the careers of researchers, since they are evaluated on productivity, the amounts of money they can raise and the number of articles they publish.

[*English*]

I spoke as well to a researcher from the University of Toronto who explained to me how two years ago many health care researchers underwent the difficult task of altering their areas of specialty to come into line with the government's stated priority at that time. The government sets up a program, people move into the field, they develop some expertise and then the government shuts off the funds. Research, this person told me, just does not work that way.

I am disappointed with the minister's reply to my question of why he chose to single out health care research for such harsh treatment. The minister said that this program is 55 per cent larger than it was in 1984. I never said that he cut 100 per cent of the budget. I only asked him why he cut 13 per cent. That he has not explained.

I will conclude by saying that this sorry episode demonstrates two things: first, the need to restore the funding to this health care research program. I hope that somehow researchers in the field and members of Parliament can convince the minister to do so. Second, we have to give the national health research and development program an independent status similar to that of the other research councils so that cuts of this nature, which are very damaging to research, to health care in Canada and to the careers of researchers will not occur again.

**Mr. Murray Cardiff (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I just want to say at the outset, there is no doubt that the federal government is strongly committed to funding health and medical research in this country.

The National Health Research and Development Program of the Department of National Health and Welfare plays a major role in the over–all federal effort, but the NHRDP is not the only federal funding source for health and medical research in Canada. Others include the Medical Research Council, the networks of Centres of Excellence Program, payments under clause 31 of Bill C–22 and other federal departments. Additionally, an extra $5 million is being provided in federal funds over five years to ensure the funding of an additional network addressing research problems related to seniors entirely in the research area normally supported by the NHRDP.

Furthermore, on Friday, November 30, 1990, the Deputy Minister of the Department of National Health and Welfare announced a new $2.5 million joint program with the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council to stimulate the creation of centres for health promotion research.

Since we came to office the NHRDP budget has increased by 55 per cent. It was this government that recognized the need for more research related to seniors, AIDS, alcohol and drugs, family violence and child sexual abuse. The number of projects and awards supported by the NHRDP has increased from 640 in 1985–86 to over 1,000 in 1989–90. Since April, over $8 million has been approved for new public health and health service research in addition to the $7 million study on Alzheimer's disease.

I would like to remind the hon. member since it may have escaped his notice that health services and public health research are alive and well in the Montreal area. As well, in the member's own riding $3 million, or more than 10 per cent of the current NHRDP budget is being spent this fiscal year.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** A motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at ten o'clock, pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 6.40 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Friday, December 7, 1990**

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### BRETTON WOODS AND RELATED AGREEMENTS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

**Hon. Marcel Danis (for Minister of Finance)** moved that Bill C–93, an act to amend the Bretton Woods and Related Agreements Act, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

**Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South):** Mr. Speaker, it is surprising that Bill C–93 is not being spoken to by a member of the government to introduce to the House and to the people watching us the importance of this piece of legislation.

It is a bill which brings into effect certain amendments made to an international agreement to which Canada is a party, establishing the International Monetary Fund. The effect of the legislation and of that agreement entered into earlier this year by members of the International Monetary Fund is to increase Canada's quota, as well as the quota of many other nations, to the fund and to provide certain additional sanctions for borrowers from the International Monetary Fund who failed to meet their obligations.

• (1010 )

I am sure that all members of the House are well aware of the success of the International Monetary Fund, as an international institution, in providing a means of funding the balance of payments of nations around the world. It has been a useful institution in providing advice and direction to many countries, both developing countries as well as developed countries, in the context of providing the financial services that it does.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. At the beginning of Government Orders today, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance did stand, but was not seen at that point and the opposition was seen first.

I gather the opposition would prefer to have the government's speech, in introduction of the bill, occur first and, if that is the case, we would certainly give unanimous consent to begin with the parliamentary secretary and then move to the member who is now speaking. Of course, the member who is now speaking has the right to continue, but it would be the choice of the opposition as far as we are concerned.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I must say that the hon. parliamentary secretary was not rising. The Chair did not see him. But, with consent, if there is agreement, I would be glad to recognize the parliamentary secretary.

**Mr. Dingwall:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks by the Chief Government Whip, we would like to know which minister will be introducing this particular bill at second reading before we give our unanimous consent.

**Mr. Hawkes:** It will be the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of State for Finance who would proceed to explain the bill to the House on behalf of the government.

**Mr. Dingwall:** Mr. Speaker, we had hoped that the traditions of the House would be adhered to and that a Minister of the Crown, who has taken an oath of office, would stand in his or her place to provide the government position in regard to second reading. However, in view of the fact that that cannot be, because either there is no minister readily available or they refuse to introduce this particular bill, we on this side of the House, in the spirit of Christmas, would want to be unanimous in allowing, on one hand, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance to commence his remarks if, on the other hand, the time which is allotted to our speaker

will revert to the normal provisions of the Standing Orders.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I see no problem with that. Does the House agree?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Dave Worthy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs) and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank our colleagues on the other side of the House. I guess it is because of my inexperience that I was bobbing up and down here, two or three times. I am not just sure exactly when you have to have your head up and when you have to have your head down. I can assure the hon. Whip of the Liberal Party that I also have taken an oath of office and I will try to fulfil my responsibilities to the best of my ability.

I would like to begin today's debate on Bill C-93, proposing amendments to the Bretton Woods and Related Agreements Act, by reminding members of the International Monetary Fund's role in the world financial system. The International Monetary Fund, or IMF, is a central institution of the international monetary system.

The IMF has two central roles. First, it monitors the economic policies of all its member countries, assessing the consistency of policies among countries and providing policy advice. Second, it provides credit to countries facing balance of payments financing problems. For the most part, financing is provided on the condition that countries undertake policy reforms designed to eliminate the imbalances within their economies, thus creating the conditions necessary for sustainable, non-inflationary growth.

The IMF's continuing ability to operate effectively is crucial to the smooth operation of the world monetary and financial system. This is particularly the case in the early 1990s, when the international financial situation is facing difficult and challenging conditions. There is uncertainty about the world economic outlook and prospects for further sustained global economic growth arising from a number of factors. Foremost among these is the crisis in the Persian Gulf. The evolution of global payments imbalances necessitates a continuing need for balance of payments financing, possibly on a substantial scale.

An agreement was reached last spring by the fund's interim committee—the major policy advisory body of the Fund which, to our honour, is chaired by the hon. Minister of Finance—to increase total fund capital subscriptions by 50 per cent. Quotas are an important feature of the IMF. They serve three purposes in its operations.

First, the quotas which members subscribe are the major source of funds which the IMF lends to countries in balance of payments difficulties in order to correct their imbalances, without resorting to protectionist or other disruptive measures.

Second, quotas serve to determine the amounts which members can borrow under the various facilities of the IMF. Finally, quotas determine the voting strength of members and the composition of the executive board.

The proposed increase in IMF quotas is part of a regular cycle for reviewing fund quotas. The higher level of total IMF quotas is required to ensure a better balance between the resources available to the IMF, and the needs of members for balance of payments financing over the next few years.

While other institutions will provide the bulk of development financing for the developing world, the IMF has the specific responsibility to use its resources in support of growth-oriented economic adjustment programs, for both developing and developed countries. In turn, IMF financing should catalyze additional financing from private and official sources.

There will be a need for the fund to continue to play a major role in the international debt strategy by supporting countries which are having problems servicing their external debts in their efforts to restore creditworthiness. Developing countries have made extensive use of IMF funding in recent years, and will likely continue to do so.

For its part, the fund has shown innovation and flexibility in its policies in response to the special needs of the major debtor countries. One clear example of that innovation was the decision to use IMF resources and those of the World Bank to permit developing countries to buy back a portion of their commercial debt at a discount in the secondary market, thus reducing their over-all debt burden. The proposed increase in IMF quotas would create scope for similar innovation in response to future needs.

But fund resources are not restricted simply to the developing countries. An important element of the fund's activities in the period ahead will be to facilitate market oriented reforms in east European countries. In fact, the emerging democracies of eastern Europe are already looking to the IMF for advice and financial support. Poland, Hungary and Yugoslavia currently have fund programs, including policy guidance as well as financial support. Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria have recently joined the fund and have already begun policy discussions with the IMF staff. We expect close co-operation among the IMF, the World Bank, and the new European Bank for Reconstruction and Development in support of the economic transformation that is now taking place and will be required in eastern Europe.

• (1020)

The last increase in fund quotas was seven years ago. That increase served to support in conjunction with large-scale borrowing the fund's policies on the use of its resources in responding to the debt problems of many developing countries. During that period, however, arrears to the IMF accumulated and it started to threaten the fund's continued ability to assist members in dealing with their balance of payments problems. The reason for the accumulation of arrears by countries such as Sudan, Liberia, Peru and Vietnam are many and complex.

However, one characteristic is shared by all these countries. Each has suffered from a fundamental failure to deal with its economic problems head on through a commitment to sustained economic policy reform.

In response to its mounting arrears problem, the fund has undertaken policies to prevent arrears from increasing and to promote the elimination of existing arrears. As a further measure to strengthen the funds arrears strategy, it was agreed during the quota negotiations that the quota increase would be conditional upon the passage of an amendment to the articles of the agreement, allowing for suspension of the voting rights of members in arrears.

This would be an intermediate step between powers which the IMF already has under the articles. The articles it has now is an initial sanction of suspension of borrowing rights and the ultimate sanction of expulsion. The new quotas will come into effect when members having 85 per cent of present quotas have consented to the increases in their quotas and to the suspension amendment.

I would also note for the House that at the Houston economic summit last July, the Prime Minister and the leaders of the other major industrial countries called on the IMF, the World Bank, the OECD and the New European Bank for Reconstruction and Development to conduct an extensive evaluation of the economic situation of the Soviet Union. This study is now progressing, reinforcing the vital and central role of the IMF in the entire world economy.

The fund must also stand ready to deal with crisis situations, both with regard to individual members as well as more systemic threats to the international monetary system. The fund has recently demonstrated its flexibility in responding to countries affected by the events in the Middle East and will be a key player in helping these countries adjust to changed economic circumstances.

It is in this context, Mr. Speaker, that I propose the legislation before us today, Bill C-93, to amend the Bretton Woods and Related Agreements Act. Bill C-93 is a central element in Canada's continuing commitment to the smooth functioning of the international monetary system. It provides for an increase in Canada's quota subscription in the International Monetary Fund from 2,941 million special drawing rights, or SDRS, to 4,320.3 million SDRS.

This is confusing, Mr. Speaker, to most people in the House and I am sure to most people following. In Canadian dollars this would mean an increase in Canada's quota from approximately $4.9 billion to $7.2 billion, an increase of $2.3 billion.

I would note here, Mr. Speaker, that although our subscription in terms of Canadian dollars will increase by $2.3 billion, the actual Canadian dollar payment is $5.8 million.

This payment is a non-budgetary expenditure. Of the remainder, 25 per cent will be paid in special drawing rights from our international reserves, while the balance of our commitment is held in reserve in the event that the IMF needs to draw upon additional resources. Commensurately, the larger IMF quota adds to the

resources available to Canada in the event of balance of payments needs.

The increase in Canada's quota will allow us to continue to lead a constituency at the fund, composed of Ireland and a number of Caribbean countries.

More important, agreement by Parliament to the proposed amendments to the IMF articles will allow Canada to maintain an effective voice on the IMF issues.

Canada has been a full participant in the activities of the IMF and strongly supports its role as a central institution in the international monetary system. In order for the IMF to continue to play a critical and an effective role in the system, and in order to Canada to show leadership on international financial matters, Canada must act to ratify the quota increase and suspension amendment.

Recent developments in the Gulf and uncertainties in the world economy makes it desirable to bring the quota increase into effect at the earliest possible date. I believe strongly that it is important that Canada show leadership by earlier ratification of the amendment.

Our legislative approval of the quota increase and a suspension amendment will demonstrate the importance Canada attaches to the role of the fund.

I urge my hon. colleagues in the House to give timely consideration and early passage to this bill.

**Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South):** Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should, under the agreement whereby I interrupted my previous introduction of the bill, remind the government that we are back to the usual time.

As government members may be aware, one of our colleagues down the corridor in the other place is endeavouring to set a record for the longest participation in debate. It is something like 45 hours. I would like the government to know that I do not intend to be outdone by a senator. Since I have unlimited time, I intend to do my best to exceed 45 hours in discussing Bill C-93.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I would just like the hon. member to know that it is now 27 minutes after 10 by these clocks.

**Mr. Manley:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the parliamentary secretary for providing me with a copy of his remarks. With respect to his comments concerning the IMF and Canada's role in it, I am pleased to associate myself with those remarks.

As I was saying earlier, the IMF has performed a very useful and distinguished role in the world economy. Canada has been an active participant in the activities of this fund since it was established after the Second World War. I believe we should continue to strongly support the IMF in its central position in international financial matters. Consequently, I do not see that there will be any difficulty in the Official Opposition supporting the proposed amendments to the agreement, as Canada has already agreed to these, because they make ultimate sense in the context of the international arrangements.

I would like, though, to draw out one point that the parliamentary secretary did refer to in his remarks. This would be of concern to many of our constituents. In increasing Canada's quota in the fund, there is no impact on the budgetary position of the Government of Canada.

Essentially, what we are being asked to do is to increase the amount of special drawing rights that are held on account in the International Monetary Fund for Canada. It is as though we are putting additional funds into a different bank account. It is not an expenditure. It does not affect our ability to pay for other things. I think it is important that Canadians understand that.

What we are doing here is agreeing to an increased commitment to international financial stability in not committing ourselves to an increased expenditure of Canadian taxpayers' money.

As I understand it, the actual amount of cash to move from Canada into the fund which would be on deposit for Canada is in the order of $6 million which, while a lot for an individual, is not a lot for the Government of Canada, nor is it an expenditure by the Government of Canada. The only thing I can say about this bill that gives me any cause for concern is the fact that the Minister of Finance for Canada played a role in negotiating these amendments to the agreement. That gives me cause to pause, given the condition of our economy at the present time. Despite that reservation that I expressed, I can say on behalf of the Official Opposition that we will be supporting this bill.

• (1030)

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am slightly shocked that the member from the Liberal Party that will, without question, support this kind of a bill. We recognize the need for this and the need for it being in place.

His party and the party across the way were both signatories to a report which was established by the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade called *Securing our Global Future* which indicated very specific concern with the method that the World Bank and the IMF are following.

Although this bill has a very innocuous name, the Bretton Woods and Related Agreements Act, it is a very misleading title. Perhaps when these institutions were put in place in 1944 they had some specific value. They operated at that time to aid the world.

This act has done a lot to enslave much of the Third World. It was not intended to do this. Enslavement is not in the mandate of either the international bank for reconstruction and development, nor is it in the list of purposes for the International Monetary Fund. After all these years, enslavement has been the result for millions of people in countries which have taken the bait and thought that they were on their way to prosperity and health by borrowing from these august institutions.

In fact, most of the Third World countries which have accepted this process are harvesting death, hunger and increasing poverty. I am not suggesting that was the mandate, but that is the result. Canada has not helped to alleviate that result. We are being asked here today to acquiesce once more, without thought or without analysis, to being part of the failure of this world financial structure. Should Canada yield to the world financial institutions and put its signature to the disaster of unmanageable Third World debt? Should it stay part of this structure?

This debt is having the effect, as I said before, of killing children, starving people and devastating the countries which have accepted it. For what? It is designed to protect the financial system from its own failure. Failure is the only term that I can really apply to the impact of the Third World debt and the relationship of those Third World countries to the Bretton Woods institution.

On Thursday, June 7, 1990, the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade passed its fifth report entitled *Securing our Global Future*, Canada's stake in the unfinished business of Third World debt. That committee requested a comprehensive response in accordance with Standing Order 109 from the Government of Canada.

The report was an invitation to the Government of Canada to take some leadership in solving the problems of Third World debt. It was a plea from the members of the committee, members of every party in this House, to the Government of Canada to take some action to break the tradition of accepting the World Bank and IMF domination and say that people are more important than some myth which these financial institutions perpetrate, a myth that the world will fall apart if these debts are not paid back to the IMF or the World Bank, and if they are not paid on time and paid in full.

What this bill does is add to the quota and make more money available to Third World countries because they are in trouble as a result of having borrowed previously.

The committee recommended and specifically urged Canada to seek the support of other governments for an international conference on debt and sustainable global adjustment. Such a conference would aim for negotiated commitments to policy reform by all countries, not only the poor and indebted. One of the things that our international financial structure has done to these Third World countries is to enslave them by saying: "If you want money to pay your debt, you must follow certain requirements", and certain conditions are put in place.

The subsequent recommendation of this committee spelled out the principles and directions that it thought should be the basis of the process of global reform in handling Third World debt. Canada was asked by the committee to take a leadership role, and Canada came up lacking. The response to this report, which was required under the regulations, did not pick up any of the recommendations. Instead of a world conference which would look at world debt, it suggested a seminar. It denied the Third World countries a forum in which they could share the information as to how these institutions are affecting their economies. It refused to give these Third World countries an opportunity to share

information about the pain and distress that they are feeling. Canada denied them this opportunity.

What does this have to do with the bill? I quote the committee report:

> The sub-committee does not offer a blueprint, a *perestroika*, in a Bretton Woods institution such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. But we are convinced of the need for structural adjustments here, not just in developing countries, and not on the basis of some utopian ideal, but as a pragmatic necessity for the future of the planet.
>
> There is no alternative to concerted political action among the major developed-country governments. Canada is a respected member of that group and active in many international organizations. We have a seat on the United Nations Security Council. Finance Minister Michael Wilson now chairs the key policy-advisory committee of the IMF's executive board. It is time for Canada to use its international position and influence to maximum advantage.

• (1040)

That was part of the report of an all-party committee of this House, its recommendations and its discussion with the government.

What is this debt that we have been discussing? There is a $1.3 trillion debt which has been accumulated by the developing countries. Sixty-seven of these countries, roughly one-half of all the so-called Third World countries, are experiencing debt servicing difficulties. It means that their debt has become unmanageable relative to their economies. Their indebtedness has threatened their economic development and political stability.

In most debtor nations, real per capita income has eroded in absolute terms to the position where their standard of living is at 1960s levels. The World Bank, but particularly the IMF, have invested in scheduling this $1.3 trillion worth of debt. That is what this money that we are talking about here today is for. The $1.378 billion that Canada is expected to come up with is for rescheduling by the IMF. It is intended to allow these countries to reschedule their debt. If one already has no possibility of paying the debt that one has, what value is rescheduling? It is fairly obvious that no amount of rescheduling can possibly resolve the problem.

In most of the debtor countries, the total national debt exceeds the total national income by several times. Also, debt services, that is interest paid on the debt and other services, are more—and this is an average across the board—for these countries than two-thirds of these debtor countries' export earnings. Export earnings are the only way they can get the money. If the services take up two-thirds of those export earnings and they need something to live on, what is left? Therefore, the payment capacity of most debtor countries is declining even as the IMF is rescheduling their debt.

Mr. Speaker, do you get the feeling that this bill might just be asking us to throw some good money after bad? If we continue to use the structure that is in place, as far as the World Bank and the IMF is concerned, that is the only thing that we can assume. This seems to be an almost bottomless pit under these circumstances, a bottomless pit which is soaking up whatever funding is served up and will continue to do so.

The IMF and the World Bank are both institutions which are considered business-like in their approach. But what they have done, as do all banks—at least I am told—is through initial loans and rescheduling loaned at least $4 for every dollar that these institutions have received from their donors. Canada, of course, is one of those donors.

They have loaned out $4 for every dollar they have received from the donor. If this thing suddenly collapsed, not only would they lose the donors' contribution, but they would have to go to those donors and find another $3. They do not think that would happen. So they go on perpetuating their structure and hoping that some day it will clear itself up. I am not at all sure that that will happen.

When the World Bank and the IMF cannot collect from an impoverished country with an unmanageable debt, they impose what these institutions call structural adjustment. The World Bank and the IMF, and possibly commercial banks because they work through the IMF, will decide how a nation generates its wealth from now on.

For instance, if a country needs yams to feed its people, but it can sell bananas, it grows bananas because it will be able to sell those bananas and get some money. The people will go hungry. The World Bank and the IMF decide how people will spend any wealth that they manage to produce.

The first thing a country must do is pay the interest on its debt, whether the people are hungry or not. Then a country is required to pay, if possible, some of the principle but it is not supposed to any of that wealth that it has created to increase the people's productivity, such as on health and on education.

The World Bank and the IMF will tell these countries how to invest any wealth that they might have. They invest only in more banana fields, not in something which might, in the long term, increase their productivity. What the IMF and the World Bank want is short-term cash tomorrow. A country produces bananas and sells them. There is no investment that might increase the standard of living of the people of that particular country.

Debtor countries are not free to set monetary or fiscal policy. They are not free to set export or import quantities. They are not free to set social and health programs, or wage and price policies. In other words, the structural adjustment has enslaved this nation, not only enslaved it, but removed democracy; democracy being the ability of the people of a country to make its own decisions. So they have eliminated democracy to a certain extent.

The debtor nation has by this process of structural adjustment given up its sovereignty and exchanged it for, what? Prosperity? No. It changed it for economic slavery.

Adolfo Perez Esquivel made a very worth-while statement. Esquivel is a broadcaster and a journalist in Costa Rica. He is also an 1980 Nobel Peace Prize winner. He puts it this way.

> It isn't possible to think about real democracy if the economy of a country is oriented only towards satisfying the demands of the international banks.
>
> Perez Esquivel worries that debt not only diminishes democracy, it also requires repression. Policies designed to pay the debt hurt the people; the people protest—and then governments turn to police and military forces to keep the lid on. Even civilian rulers use repression—when the belt has to be tightened more than the waistline permits.

• (1050)

That article is called "Low Intensity Democracy" and I commend it to anybody who is interested in this.

The article goes on to talk about the drain from Latin America and it says:

> —creditor nations drained an estimated $500-billion out of Latin America in the form of debt service, profits, royalties and capital flight. That haemorrhage reduced living standards to the levels they were 12 years ago; in some countries, per capita income has gone back two or three decades past—
>
> But more common is the spread of hunger and disease that kills a thousand children a day in Brazil alone. Will millions of abandoned street kids believe in a democracy that does not believe in them?

That is part of an article about Latin America by Bob Carty.

The choice seems to be democracy or economic enslavement. The NGOs across Canada, in the United States and some of the other NGOs of the world have a position paper which they call "Working Group on the World Bank". This group has actually attempted to work with the World Bank. It has been in place for 10 years but has not been particularly successful. Hopefully in the last couple of years it is making a little bit of headway because I think the World Bank and the IMF are recognizing their failure.

It commends the World Bank for doing certain things and I would recommend again that anyone who is interested in this particular area should take a look at the position paper of the NGO working group on the World Bank because it makes a number of recommendations. It comments on the structural adjustment. It comments on conditionality. It comments on the World Bank and IMF effect on the environment. It abhors the lack of participation by Third World countries and the people of Third Work countries. It also abhors the lack of information given by people who are most affected by the decisions made by the World Bank and the IMF. I could spend a long time on the recommendations of the NGOs.

Our external affairs committee unanimously, everyone from all parties in this House, gave our government an opportunity to take a leading role. As I said earlier, the committee did establish Canadian principles upon which it believed that our government could develop a world strategy which would deal with debt, not only with Canada's relation to the rest of the world or to Third World countries, but that it should take a leadership role within the the IMF and the World Bank in which we have a certain amount of commitment and into which we have put a certain amount of money. We should take this opportunity to develop some kind of world leadership and use it. I want to just briefly cover a little bit of the guiding principles which the committee said Canada should look at when it started dealing with Third World debt. The committee suggested that the Third World

debt must allow sustainable human development in the debtor countries. It suggested that the creditor countries reduce the debt service on old debt and not impose it on any new debt. It suggested that poverty and debt are the enemies of development and, if you want development, you must eliminate both poverty and debt. Adjustment can only be successful and should be supported as part of the holistic development approach in co-operation with the debtor country. In other words, it is suggesting that maybe we should pay some attention to the people who are the recipients and that they be part of the decision-making process.

I know, when you walk into a bank, you are told that you can have money under certain conditions, and if you do not like these conditions, no money. That is almost exactly the way these institutions are dealing with the Third World countries. It suggests also that social impacts of adjustment programs must be assessed. A country should not be so constrained that it cannot maintain its basic social programs. Support for debt relief and structural adjustment should be determined, case by case, but according to consistent criteria which reflect Canadian values. This means the values of the Canadian public, I hasten to say, not the values of Canadian banks and financial institutions. Those values are: the commitment of debtor countries to reform to benefit the poor and the vulnerable groups, respect international norms of human rights, encourage democratic traditions, and eliminate the linkage of economic recovery and the debt so that there can be some kind of sustainable development allowed. That is the approach that the all-party committee recommended to the Government of Canada. Again, I have to say that the government came up lacking. Our friends in the opposition supported this as well.

Instead, what is the government doing? The government is asking us to pass this Bretton Woods bill and accept the old, unsuccessful methods of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. The government is asking us to allow the kinds of things that have been done, for at least the last 20 years, to continue to be done. The original Bretton Woods institutions were established in 1944, as part of the reconstruction of Europe after the war and did, at that time, a considerable amount of good. But they do not fit the present structure and they should not be the bodies responsible for the "elimination", and that is the only word I can use, of Third World debt.

The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund have failed in their mandate. They have failed to do what their mandate insists they should do. These institutions have shown they were a failure as long ago as 20 years.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** It being eleven o'clock, pursuant to Standing Order 35, the House will now proceed to Statements by Members pursuant to Standing Order 31.

---

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*English*]

### CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, having doubled the national debt between 1984 and 1989, from $160 billion to $320 billion, the government now uses the excuse of the bottom line to lay off 1,100 CBC employees, just like that. Yesterday, there was a job; today, there is not, compliments of Prime Minister Grinch just before Christmas. It is cold comfort to hear on the air the President of the CBC say that he is sorry.

When will the government learn that people and their lives are not pawns, that it cannot cut left, right and centre CBC, VIA Rail, Air Canada, putting people on the street and using the excuse of the balance sheet. What hypocrisy. To lay off 1,100 CBC employees means a terrible shock to each of them, and beyond them, a shock to the creative and technical community which supports them.

The government's march towards the virtual dismantling of the nation through step-by-step weakening of Canadian unity continues inexorably. What a shame.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

[*Translation*]

### NORTHERN TAX BENEFITS

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes I will go back to my riding in Abitibi, and I do so with pride, now that a new tax benefits plan for northern and isolated areas has been announced. By extending tax benefits to a transitional zone, Canada's Minister of Finance has shown he understands the needs of workers

in northern Quebec, including the communities of Matagami, Lebel-sur-Quévillon, Joutel, Desmaraisville, Waswanipi, Miquelon and Mines Selbaie.

Today, I want to thank the council of northern municipalities, all economic partners, members municipal organizations, workers, unions and the people of these communities who supported me since the very beginning of this tax revolt.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Government of Canada, on behalf of the people of Northern Abitibi.

* * *

[*English*]

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Lyle Vanclief (Prince Edward—Hastings):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today once again to provide the House with a demonstration of the general public's outrage at this government's goods and services tax.

I wish to inform the House that I will be forwarding today to the Ministers of Finance and National Revenue a list of several hundred names from my riding of Prince Edward—Hastings of persons who are particularly annoyed over the government's recent advertising campaign, that cartoon fiasco, which among other faults took direct aim at the restaurant industry by encouraging people to avoid paying the GST by eating at home.

Not only does it seem that the government wants to put Canada's restaurant owners out of business by slapping a disgraceful tax on them, it now also seems to be waging an advertising campaign against this industry. It is just one more indication of the government's uncaring attitude toward small business in Canada.

* * *

## MARGUERITE D'YOUVILLE

**Mr. Walter Van De Walle (St. Albert):** Mr. Speaker, Marguerite D'Youville will be cannonized by His Holiness Pope John Paul II on December 9. A large number of residents from the St. Albert riding will join hundreds of Canadians in Rome for this historic event.

Marguerite D'Youville is the first Canadian born saint. She was born in Varennes, Quebec in 1701 and founded the Sisters of Charity, the Grey Nuns. This order has contributed to the early development of our country by educating the young and by caring for the sick and the less fortunate.

Under the leadership of Father Lacombe and Bishop Vital Grandin, the Grey Nuns were responsible for the first school and orphanage, and the first seniors' home in St. Albert. These were followed by hospitals in the province of Alberta.

Today, I join with Canadians from coast to coast to pay tribute to the Grey Nuns and their founder, Marguerite D'Youville.

* * *

## EAST TIMOR

**Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina):** Mr. Speaker, today marks the 15th anniversary of the illegal Indonesian invasion of East Timor. Nearly one third of the population of East Timor have been killed or starved since this brutal invasion.

The UN General Assembly and the UN Security Council adopted resolutions demanding Indonesia's immediate withdrawal from East Timor. Indonesia continues to defy the United Nations.

Canada abstained from the UN General Assembly resolution and has voted against resolutions endorsing East Timor's right to self-determination and humanitarian assistance. Since 1980, Canada has voted against the withdrawal of Indonesian forces from East Timor. Canada, of course, has more than $1 billion invested in Indonesia, being the third-largest foreign investor.

Canada's failure to support East Timor contradicts the position Canada has taken against the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq.

* * *

## SUPPLY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

**Ms. Catherine Callbeck (Malpeque):** Mr. Speaker, farmers from my province of Prince Edward Island are following the GATT talks with baited breath in concern over the future of our supply management system.

There are over 600 dairy, egg and poultry farmers in Prince Edward Island whose livelihoods may be significantly altered by the results of the GATT negotiations taking place in Brussels. Both the National Farmers' Union and the P.E.I. Federation of Agriculture have expressed concern about the possibility of our supply management system being significantly altered by these negotiations.

Canada's system of orderly marketing has created the most efficient producers in the world. Our system is not geared to create surplus and has not contributed to the current trade distortions in agriculture.

I call on the government to consider the interests of the dairy, poultry and egg farmers in its negotiations in Brussels and I ask it to maintain its position to strengthen Article XI.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

**Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond):** Mr. Speaker, the fate of our garment workers is now in the hands of GATT. The results of the GATT talks have left the future of the Multi-Fibre Arrangement in limbo. With the recession, high interest rates, loss of consumer confidence, free trade, Mexico, the GST, GATT and the Multi-Fibre Arrangement, Canada's garment industry has more than enough on its plate.

Mr. Speaker, Canada has about 2,500 clothing manufacturers. In Quebec, this means 63,000 direct jobs and 100,000 indirect jobs. The industry generates sales totalling $8.5 billion in this country. The rules of international trade in the garment industry are changing too fast and on too many fronts at once.

Mr. Speaker, if the Multi-Fibre Arrangement is ever abolished, we must have a fairly long period of transition to allow the industry to adapt at the same rate as the United States, our principal trading partner.

* * *

## BÉLANGER-CAMPEAU COMMISSION

**Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau—La Lièvre):** Mr. Speaker, appearing before the parliamentary commission on the constitutional future of Quebec which held a hearing in Hull on Wednesday, December 5, several witnesses stressed the lack of communication or co-operation, if you prefer, between the Government of Quebec and the federal government in a number of important areas.

Here in the Outaouais, one of the most important dossiers is the completion of highway 50 from the Outaouais to Montreal. Perhaps I may remind the people in our area that the agreements signed with the federal government go back to 1972, in which year the section from Hull to Masson was completed.

When the Parti Quebecois came to power in 1976, no funds were allocated by the Government of Quebec to complete the highway. In 1985, once again the Government of Quebec refused to invest any more money in completing the highway in the Outaouais. We are now in 1990, and the differences are political rather than constitutional. The reason why highway 50 in the Outaouais area is not being completed is because of political differences between both levels of government. We urge the federal government and the Quebec government to agree on an item that is extremely important to economic development in the Outaouais.

* * *

## GOODS ANS SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Fernand Jourdenais (La Prairie):** Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, I always knew there were some very smart Liberals. In an article I read recently, Raymond Garneau, ex-Finance critic of the federal Liberal Party, said that the goods and services tax proposed by the federal government was probably the fairest and least harmful tax to be found in this day and age of global markets.

Mr. Garneau explained that the existing federal tax on manufactured products was a disaster for Canadian industry because it was exported along with the products themselves, which made Canadian companies less competitive.

Mr. Garneau said that this tax was fair to everyone and would certainly prevent tax evasion to a considerable degree. He said it was the only solution the government had to raise more money, especially among big consumers.

As for the attitude taken by the Liberal senators, Mr. Garneau said it was unconscionable and an incredible

example of political partisanship. Nobody in his right mind believes that people welcome new taxes.

Mr. Speaker, here is another federal Liberal who finally saw the light. Liberal senators, stop fooling around and pass the GST—hurry up!

* * *

• (1110 )

[*English*]

## RAILWAY SAFETY

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern among railway workers and the general public about recent changes in rail safety policy, changes which are increasing the risk to the public and worker safety.

CP Rail is allowing unsafe or bad order freight cars to leave Winnipeg for further destinations, instead of being repaired in Winnipeg where and when the defective components are discovered.

VIA Rail has done away with visual inspections of its passenger trains in Winnipeg, meaning that there are no inspections between Toronto and Vancouver, in spite of the fact that since May 11 rail workers have detected 15 defects on VIA trains.

CN Rail is violating Uniform Code of Operating Rules No. 104 by instructing its conductors to leave rail switches in the open position, instead of returning them to the appropriate configuration following the train movement.

The 1989 Summary of Railway Accidents and Incidents prepared by the Transportation Safety Board shows an 11.9 per cent increase in derailments on the main line tracks of CN and CP. This report indicates that approximately 40 per cent of the train derailments that have occurred on the main track over the past five years have resulted from defects on the track itself. Do you remember all the section gangs, Mr. Speaker, that were eliminated? The report also made the observation that "derailments due to equipment failure increased significantly in 1989".

There's more to come, thanks to the negligence of this government.

*S. O. 31*

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre):** Mr. Speaker, the employees of CBC have once again been dealt a harsh blow. The recent announcement of spending cuts of $100 million dollars means close to 1,200 Canadians are out of a job.

It is saddening that a national institution like the CBC has to struggle to survive. Perhaps the government does not realize that it is cutting out the very heart of Canada.

Canadians last year were hit by VIA Rail cutbacks and now the government is cutting off CBC. With no transportation and no communication, how does the government expect to keep the country together?

Next Thursday, at noon on Parliament Hill, my colleagues and I will be joining other Canadians in a rally in support of our national institutions. I call on Canadians all across Canada to rally in support of the CBC.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## THE LATE JEAN DUCEPPE

**Mrs. Marie Gibeau (Bourassa):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the memory of Jean Duceppe who died last night in Montreal.

Mr. Duceppe was a great Quebecer. Of humble origins, he played all the great roles on the stage. On radio, he was well known for his energy, humour, warmth and passionate feeling. On television, he played in some of our most popular "téléromans". On the stage, he acted in some of our best "beaux dimanches" offerings, and he even founded a theatre group which bears his name and which, I imagine, will continue to exist as living testimony to his talent.

As a union organizer, a nationalist and a performing artist, Jean Duceppe made a tremendous contribution to the world of the performing arts in Quebec. He leaves us a rich and challenging cultural heritage. With Jean Duceppe, our cultural roots have blossomed.

*S. O. 31*

[*English*]

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday across Canada we remembered last year's horror in Montreal. We remembered with grief and outrage the unnecessary death of 14 women. We remembered the hate and violence that caused those tragic deaths.

We must also remember that the hate and sickness that led to those murders occur to varying degrees every day in the country. It is simply not enough to remember that one horrible day. We must act to ensure that such a tragedy never occurs again. We must work to eliminate the ongoing abuse of women that occurs daily in our society.

This is not just a women's issue. As men, we have a particular responsibility. It is our daughters, our sisters, our wives, our mothers, and our friends who are at risk. For their sakes, and for those who are yet unborn, we must work together to guarantee them safe and secure futures.

The government must proceed as a minimum with tighter gun control legislation.

* * *

## STATUS OF WOMEN

**Mrs. Edna Anderson (Simcoe Centre):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join the Minister responsible for the Status of Women in marking the 20th anniversary of the release of the Royal Commission's Report on the Status of Women.

I would like to commend the efforts of the many groups and individuals who, over the past 20 years, have helped bring Canada to the level of equality we know today.

Women's groups across Canada were instrumental in the establishment of the royal commission and in providing input to it. They continue to be important agents for change in our country.

Following on the recommendations of the commission, women's directorates in all provinces and territories have been working hard over the years to improve the situation for women in their jurisdictions. Status of Women Canada has helped bring about change since 1976 by advising the minister and other federal departments and agencies on a wide range of issues affecting women. The Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women has also played a critical role in identifying and publicizing issues of concern to women since its establishment in 1973.

Let us recognize the collaborative efforts of these organizations.

* * *

## FAMILY VIOLENCE

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today with regret to call attention to the continued problem of family violence that unfortunately characterizes our society.

On the same day that Canada and the House of Commons was commemorating 14 victims of violence in Montreal, we learned that a judge in Quebec City gave a man a suspended sentence for killing his wife. The judge commented on the wife's aggressiveness and vindictive personality as a cause. I regret, and I am certain this House regrets that once again a woman victim has been blamed for an act of violence that resulted in her death.

Those of us who have worked in social services and family court realize that domestic violence is rarely started by women. Yet, they are almost always the casualties of physical violence.

Yesterday, we showed our collective grief in commemorating 14 victims. Today, we must start dealing with violence, whenever we find it and wherever we find it, as a social problem to be attacked and eradicated.

* * *

## CANADIAN CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

**Mr. Alex Kindy (Calgary Northeast):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Supreme Court ruled that the violation against the charter is justified in a free and democratic society. We either respect the charter or we do not.

Recently, on the basis of the charter, the justice system has protected the rights of women to have access to abortion, the rights of religious groups to wear turbans and carry kirpans, and the rights of refugees to have lengthy hearings. But when it comes to senior citizens who have contributed the most to the building of this

country, all of a sudden the justice system has double standards.

The justices of the Supreme Court have made a political decision and should be censured. I hope this House, which is the highest court of the land, will bring forward a motion showing the will of its members that this decision is unacceptable.

* * *

[*Translation*]

### THE LATE JEAN DUCEPPE

**Mr. Gilles Rocheleau (Hull—Aylmer):** Mr. Speaker, a very sad news for Quebec this morning, the loss of Jean Duceppe, an outstanding artist who made his mark in Quebec history, a man who never left anyone indifferent. I felt a pang of anguish when I heard the sad news this morning. To me, Jean Duceppe was an artisan of Quebec proudness, for he made an exceptional contribution and used his remarquable talent to promote our culture. His heart-felt dedication, his love for Quebec will be our full inheritance. Wherever he is now I am sure he knows he can rely on his son Gilles, our colleague the hon. member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie, to uphold the legitimate aspirations of Quebec here in this House.

To his wife, to Gilles, to his children and grandchildren, to all the artists who will continue his work in Quebec, may I say on behalf of all Quebecers: Thank you, Jean, thank you for everything!

---

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

### UNEMPLOYMENT

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Today is another sad day for working people in the country because Statistics Canada has reported that in the past month the rate of unemployment has climbed to 9.1 per cent. Sixty-two thousand more Canadian workers lost their jobs in the past four weeks alone.

• (1120 )

These figures may be cold, hard, anonymous numbers on a page for this government, but they represent thousands of real people, Canadians who have lost their jobs, who will not be able to meet their mortgage or rent payments, who will be having increasing difficulty in feeding and clothing their children and families.

When will the Prime Minister and his government recognize the misery that their policies are bringing to thousands and thousands more Canadian families? When will this government drop its policies that create unemployment and move to new policies that will create jobs; policies of full employment for all of this country?

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, no one takes pleasure in reading unemployment statistics. No one appreciates losing their job. Anyone who has, knows the difficult periods that you must go through. We understand that.

This was not unexpected. The Minister of Finance said there would be a slowdown in the economy this year. Most of the jobs that have been lost are in the manufacturing and construction sectors.

I can say to the hon. member that interest rates have dropped almost two percentage points since the end of May. Mortgage interest payments now are at the rate they were approximately two years ago. As inflation is wrung out of the economy, those rates can continue to fall.

As far as the manufacturing industry is concerned, we have, after taking advice that has been given to numerous governments over 50 years, changed the tax system which was penalizing Canadian manufacturers.

If the hon. member wants to do something about that, he can stop his friends in the Senate from speaking 40 hours at a time.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, this government raised the current manufacturers' sales tax four times since it got into office.

**Some hon. members:** Shame.

**Mr. Gray (Windsor West):** Its policies which it is defending have created the current economic mess. All across this country we see the price Canadians are paying for the economic mismanagement of this government.

Already five out of 10 provinces have unemployment rates at double digit levels, above 10 per cent. Is this government pushing for a perfect 10 out of 10, to have every province with double digit unemployment rates above 10 per cent? That is not even counting the 1,000

workers in the CBC who have lost their jobs in places like Windsor, Matane and Sept-Îles.

Why will the government not wake up and see the damage it's policies are doing to this country? Why will it not bring in today new policies of job creation and not job destruction?

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** The hon. leader of the party opposite is talking about provinces. There was some good news in the statistics as well.

For example, the unemployment rate fell in four provinces: Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Employment rose in four provinces. The number of unemployed fell in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Saskatchewan. There are areas of light in this country.

I might tell the hon. member that if we start comparing the unemployment figures today with what went on in the period of time when he sat in the cabinet of another government, we are not going to break those records. I can assure him of that.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** As I just said, Mr. Speaker, in five provinces—Quebec included—the unemployment rate is already over 10 per cent and, last month, more that 39,000 workers were laid off in the Province of Quebec. So I ask the Prime Minister where are the policies he had promised which were supposed to create jobs? Why is he so intent on making life ever more difficult for workers throughout this country?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, my friend refers to Quebec as an example. Let me point out that the current unemployment rate in Quebec is 11.4 per cent as against more than 13 per cent when the Liberals left office in September 1984. Almost 400,000 new jobs have been created in Quebec.

As the minister just said, despite the hardships we are experiencing with respect to employment, we learned this morning that four provinces did make substantial gains in that sector. That has to be an encouraging sign, given the difficult national and international context.

As the Minister of Finance stated on a number of occasions, there is still hope and every indication is that this decline will push interest rates down. This will eventually pave the way for an economic recovery which in turn will reduce unemployment, which is what we and all political factions in this House are striving for.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The result of the induced economic slowdown in the Prime Minister's own words has been the rise in unemployment that is recorded in today's statistics.

When is the government going to come forward with policies to help those Canadians who are hurting and suffering as a result of this economic slowdown? Canadians want to know whether the Prime Minister knows that Canadians are hurting, and if he does know, what is he going to do to help them?

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** I find it passing strange, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member whose party held up an unemployment insurance bill that is providing training and retraining money to the tune of $800 million would ask a question like that. Of course we are bringing policies forward to help people for training and retraining who are unemployed. But it was held up in the Senate for almost a year.

He stands up and asks what policies we are bringing forward. That is one. Another is the GST. If the hon. member will shake up his friends across the hall in the red Chamber and tell them to get on with taking a final vote on the GST, businesses which are planning for it will proceed with that and we can restructure our tax programs to help companies and businesses in this country, not hinder them, and create economic activity and employment. That is how he could help us.

We have introduced the policies. The Grits in the Senate are holding it up.

**Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South):** Mr. Speaker, if there was any mystery about why this government is at

14 per cent in the polls it has got to be answered when the question "What will the government do to help Canadians?" is answered by "We'll bring in the GST". Who is going to believe that?

The monetary policy that this government has pursued so far has resulted in two things, the high unemployment rate that we see today and the government's budgetary deficit going further out of control so that it needs to borrow another $2.5 billion.

I ask the Prime Minister how the government can justify a monetary policy that one and the same time increases unemployment and increases the deficit?

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, we were left with a $200 billion debt and any additions to the debt today are compounded interest from the debt that was left when we took office in 1984. That is fact number one.

Second, the hon. member knows full well that the inflationary pressures in this country were at alarming proportions. They talk about the senior citizens and the low-income people. They are the ones who are hurt most by high inflation. When the Grits ignored high inflation, it went up to 13 per cent and 14 per cent, and who hurt the most? The unemployed, the poor in our economy, those on fixed incomes, and senior citizens.

This government was determined not to let that happen. Inflationary pressures are dropping. Interest rates are dropping. We want to get them down on a permanent basis. That is what this is all about for the economy of this country and its future.

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the right hon. the Prime Minister. We are aware this morning that the unemployment rate has jumped again. The recession now has taken root nation-wide in pretty well all regions of this country, with tremendous increases in unemployment. I would like to ask the Prime Minister, since we have in this country a made in Canada recession that was deliberately and methodically created by the Government of Canada to fight inflation by increasing interest rates and increasing the value of the Canadian dollar, what is the plan to fight the recession? What is the plan to put people back to work? We, in this party, have suggested a five-point program. What has he, as Prime Minister of Canada, going to do?

• (1130)

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party proposed a five-point program in a press release. There was no back-up material and no costing. Every single legitimate economist who has taken a look at it laughed, and said it would put this country into a recession like they have never seen before, causing very high interest rates and high inflation. Every economist has said that that is what would happen if the NDP brought in its policies. We do not plan to do that.

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville):** Mr. Speaker, it is about time the Prime Minister fired this minister. We call for a reduction, not an increase in interest rates.

As the leader of this country, I want to know from the Prime Minister of Canada whether in the last five or six months he has been to the unemployment lines that are getting longer and longer? Has he been to see the unemployed? Has he been to food banks in this country? Has he seen some of the almost million kids who are in poverty in Canada? What is going to say to all those people? Will he go down to those lines and talk to those poor people instead of spending all of his time sipping champagne, eating caviar, with his wealthy friends on Bay Street in Toronto?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the last time that I sipped champagne and had caviar was at a Socialist International convention, and I was an observer.

I share the sincere concern of my hon. friend about any increase in unemployment rates. I think he would acknowledge that when this government was sworn in, unemployment was at 11.6 per cent. It is now down to 9.1 per cent. In almost all of the provinces of Canada, including his own, unemployment has decreased very substantially over the period of time and employment has increased very dramatically.

For example, in the case of youth unemployment, which is a particular concern, it is down over 4 percentage points over the period of economic growth. It could not be otherwise because in the last six years, 1.5 million new jobs have been created in Canada, 83 per cent of them have been full time and 64 per cent of them have

gone to women. During this period of time, Canada has led all of the OECD countries in terms of job creation. It is a very impressive job creation record.

We are going through a period, along with others, of economic difficulties. We recognize that. We are seeking to bring about lower interest rates to re-energize the economy to make sure that we go through another sustained period of impressive economic growth. We cannot do it artificially. We cannot do it by repealing the laws of economics and instructing anybody, tomorrow morning, to lower interest rates by 3.5 per cent. We must reduce the deficit, obtain the confidence of the international investment community, attract those investment funds and create the employment. That is the way the economy moves and that is what we are trying to do.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville):** Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister is aware, the situation is worse now than it was last year. Canada is now in a full-scale recession. In Quebec, the unemployment rate has now reached 11.4 per cent.

What is the Prime Minister going to do now to create—and this is very important, Mr. Speaker—to create jobs for the unemployed in Baie Comeau and for welfare recipients in Montreal? What is he going to do now for people in Canada who are living in poverty? This is a question many thousands of Canadian men and women across this country are forced to ask. What is he going to do now? Figures are not enough. What kind of concrete action is he going to take for the benefit of those Canadians who are now living in poverty?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is perfectly right. Figures as such don't mean a thing when we are talking about an individual or a family. That is why the economic progress we have experienced for six years is particularly encouraging. The nature of this progression is such that today, 956,000 Canadians are no longer living in poverty; 333,000 women and 297,000 children and 83,000 senior citizens are no longer living in poverty.

So I think that, although our programs still leave much to be desired, we have made progress towards a fairer and more equitable deal for Canadians. Job creation and the resulting prosperity have been relatively equally distributed throughout our society. These figures are still quite substantial. Nearly one million Canadians more managed to get out of the poverty cycle during the past six years, including children, the elderly and families.

Last Saturday, some new figures came out, which indicate:

[*English*]

"Average family income in Canada now exceeds $50,000 for the first time in our history." This is the kind of sustained economic growth that we have been working on, and I think my hon. friend would agree with me that, while we have difficulties, there are areas of substantial encouragement.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, I don't think the Prime Minister should brag about these figures, because they show that in the past year, nearly 24 per cent of our jobs were lost—232,000 Canadians less are working this year compared with last year, in other words, 1,217,000 Canadians and their families will not be able to afford Christmas because they are out of work. I therefore want to ask the Prime Minister and his government exactly what kind of policy they have that will give hope to these millions of Canadians and their families who can't even think about buying Christmas presents for their children.

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, we want to ensure that programs are aligned with dropping interest rates. We now see the beneficial effects of these reductions, which although they are relatively modest, are being sustained and are starting to have a beneficial impact on the economy. Once this impact has been absorbed by the economy, we will see a drop in the deficit, and we will experience sustained economic recovery. What we see this morning is what we are seeing in the United States and in many countries throughout the world.

I agree with my hon. friend that figures as such don't mean a lot, and with the hon. member I also deplore the existence of these very human problems in a society like ours. However, as I just mentioned to my NDP friend from Saskatchewan, today, nearly one million Canadians less are living in poverty, thanks to the economic growth we experienced in Canada during the past six years. And

I believe that by maintaining our policies, we will be able to do more for the neediest in our society.

[*English*]

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is not listening.

In the last month alone, 48,000 fewer people are working in the manufacturing industry and 47,000 jobs have been lost in the construction industry. His own government is predicting a further job loss in the construction industry of over 70,000 people beginning next year.

I want to ask this question of the Prime Minister, three weeks before Christmas, on behalf of those thousands of Canadians because Canada has been bleeding jobs in the last month. What hope is he going to give to those Canadians and their families that his government will introduce specific programs before Christmas to give them a chance to get back as productive members of the workforce? What hope is he giving to those 1.2 million Canadians who are forced to go on unemployment insurance to survive this Christmas?

• (1140)

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I think there would be no members of the House who would expect us to devise economic policy based on the statistics of a given month or even of two months. There are international trends and currents with which any government must deal. We are in the process of seeking to deal as best and effectively as we can with the problems that have been visited upon the nation by an extremely high debt and a very high cost of servicing that debt.

For example, and it is very important, the United States spends roughly 15 cents on the dollar to service its debt. The province of British Columbia would spend four cents. A have-not province, like New Brunswick, spends 16 cents. The Government of Canada inherited a situation where 35 cents on every dollar—one of the worst records in the industrialized world—has to go to pay the interest on the debt.

This, of course, very severely limits the kinds of government programs that can be initiated. Inasmuch as my hon. friends in the Liberal Party are being particularly aggressive in regard to this this morning—

**Ms. Copps:** We should be.

**Mr. Mulroney:** My hon. friend says she should be and I agree with her. I point out to her that eight years ago this morning, when the leader of the Opposition, who is sitting next to her, was the President of the Treasury Board, inflation, which is today 4.8 per cent, was then 9.9 per cent and unemployment which is this morning 9.1 per cent was then 2.6 per cent and the hon. member did not have a word to say.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mrs. Maheu:** This is no joke, sir!

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mrs. Maheu:** My question is directed to the Prime Minister. Statistics Canada has just revealed that in Montreal alone, the number of jobless increased by 58,000 during the past year and that this trend continues. Of that number, 51,000 were from the manufacturing sector. What is the government doing about this particular case and what is being done by the minister responsible for Montreal?

**Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of State (Youth), Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to hear a question about Montreal's economy being raised by the Official Opposition.

I remember that in 1984, when I ran for election, the Liberals who were in power at the time did everything to kill the economy in Montreal. The then Minister of Finance, Mr. Marc Lalonde, wanted to kill the petrochemical industry in Montreal. Without the personal intervention of the Prime Minister, we would have lost about 20,000 jobs in Montreal, both downstream and upstream.

Since it is common knowledge that the Liberal Party wanted to block Bill C-22 on the pharmaceutical industry, I fail to see how today, it would dare to criticize our policies. You killed Montreal and we are trying to save it!

**Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville):** It's wonderful to live in the past, Mr. Speaker!

My question is again directed to the Prime Mnister. There are at least 386,000 jobless in Quebec, including 184,000 in Montreal. When and how does the Prime Minister intend to put a stop to this crisis before there is a depression?

**Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of State (Youth), Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, we have signed a number of agreements with the Government of Quebec, including one that will involve investing $500 million in regional development. Under Bill C-21, as was said earlier by my hon. colleague, we will invest $800 million in training programs for Canadians, and Quebec will, of course, get its fair share.

We have also investesd $350 million in a project to keep young people from dropping out of high school. What Canada lacks, of course, is training programs. This government has, I think, come up with the best training programs in the history of this country, in the form of Bill C-21. And who blocked Bill C-21? The Liberals!

* * *

[*English*]

## NORTHERN TAX BENEFITS

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for whoever is answering on behalf of the Minister of Finance.

Fourteen months after receiving the task force study on northern tax benefits, the Minister of finance 45 minutes ago released his new plan.

Under the old system, there were 3,200 communities in this country that received northern tax benefits. Under the proposal of the task force that was going to be reduced to 400 communities.

No one in the Department of Finance can tell us how many communities are still going to receive the northern tax benefit. We do know from our own work on this that over 40,000 individuals in Newfoundland alone will lose their northern tax benefit.

Can the government come clean and state how many communities will lose their northern tax benefit, and how many Canadian citizens will lose that benefit?

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance did release the tax benefits for northerners today.

As you know, there was a tremendous amount of study done. A task force looked into this and came in with a recommendation which caused a great deal of discussion in the country.

The Minister of Finance spent a considerable amount of time working with municipalities, with members of Parliament from the various areas, consulting with many people across this country to try and come to a solution that was both fair and equitable.

I believe that the announcement that he released today was a very good one, a very fair one. As the minister has said, and I will quote, "We are accepting the task force recommendation for a single northern zone and adding to it an intermediate zone that bridges the gap between the northern zone and the less isolated areas of the country. This will put an end to the arbitrary and divisive community by community approach, while continuing to ensure that communities which are both northern and truly isolated continue to have the tax assistance that they need."

I think the hon. member will agree that it is a far better system. I can remember his House leader standing up and complaining about the old system.

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, the minister, by his own definition, would say that there is absolutely no remote, or no isolated community on the island of Newfoundland. That, by his own definition and by the map that we have is how the government looks at this country. None of those communities will receive the full tax benefit. None will receive half the tax benefit under the government's proposal.

The government took 14 months before it put out a press release 45 minutes ago in reaction to the task force report. A number of Conservative MPs counselled their mayors, the city councillors, the media, their citizens, not to complain.

As the government took 14 months to come up with its response, will it give the thousands upon thousands of Canadians who are going to be cut off a chance to appeal this process?

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. member that the reason it took 14 months from the time the task force delivered its report to the government and was made public was for the very reasons that he stated, we had consultations with municipalities from one coast to the other, including Churchill, I might add. It is the hon. member's own riding, I believe. I am sure he is pleased with the results that were released today by the Minister of Finance. I can tell the hon. member that tremendous consultation has gone into the northern benefits tax package. I think it is a very fair one. I think it is very equitable, and I believe that it will benefit numerous Canadians who live in isolated areas of this country.

* * *

• (1150)

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Communications or for whoever is answering for him in the House today.

With the closing of CBC TV in Goose Bay, Labrador has been cut adrift from the rest of Canada because there is no alternative TV as there is in many parts of northern Canada.

Why, in the remote, unique part of Canada that has a story to tell, that has a voice to raise in this important national debate, is the government allowing that TV station to close at this time in our nation's history?

**Mr. Jim Edwards (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I should inform the hon. member that not one of the 1,600 CBC transmitters across the country will be shutting down, including the one in Labrador.

What is happening is that there is a reallocation of scarce resources going on within the CBC with emphasis on regional and national programming. I think it is entirely reasonable to consider that the province of Newfoundland and Labrador is a region in the context of the CBC, and that the regional coverage will continue along with news gathering taking place within Labrador and being seen on the screens of Labradorians.

**Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is a broadcaster. He knows that a transmitter is not a voice, a transmitter does not make up newscasts, it does not throw out TV films, and you cannot send a broadcaster from St. John's, Newfoundland to Goose Bay or the remote coast of Labrador to gather the news. It is unreasonable. It is unthinkable. It is incredible that the government should think of that.

Will the parliamentary secretary ask the CBC to reinstate stations like Goose Bay that are remote, that are unique, that are in northern Canada where there is no alternative. Will he give an assurance that in the further cuts to come, radio in the north, including Labrador, will be protected because this is just the tip of the iceberg?

**Mr. Jim Edwards (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, as I understand the CBC plan for Labrador, there is no intention to stop having news coverage emanating from Labrador. That is, there will be news gatherers within Labrador.

With reference to the radio part of this question, the reduction of radio affected by this restructuring within the CBC amounts to 1 per cent of the total and will not adversely affect service in any part of Canada.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, my question to the Prime Minister deals also with the cuts in the CBC's budget. Yesterday, the President of ACFO, the *Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario*, remarked concerning these cuts, and I quote: "The CBC has just wiped out French Ontario from the map".

In view of the alarming rate of assimilation of francophones outside Quebec, why does the government allow these major cuts in the CBC's budget which represent an additional threat for francophones in this country?

**Mr. Jim Edwards (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, the organization has conveyed to the government its concern about the CBC situation. I must answer the hon. member the same way the minister did yesterday the hon. member for Sudbury, namely that he should wait for the annual report which the CBC is expected to table within the

next three months to find out about the funding of the French network.

[*English*]

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, there is lots of money for GST advertising, but it seems no money to protect linguistic minorities.

[*Translation*]

Since the Prime Minister refuses to protect linguistic minorities, I will direct my supplementary question to the Secretary of State. In view of the fact that it is the Secretary of State's responsability to protect and promote linguistic minorities in Canada, is he prepared to protect these minorities which the Prime Minister and the Minister of Communications refuse to do? Is he prepared to do that?

**Mr. Jim Edwards (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications):** As far as linguistic minorities from coast to coast are concerned, Mr. Speaker, the services to linguistic minorities will be maintained in all towns and communities throughout Canada.

* * *

[*English*]

## GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

**Mr. Lyle Dean MacWilliam (Okanagan—Shuswap):** Mr. Speaker, this government's argument for the hatchet job on Air Canada, Petro-Canada, VIA Rail, and now the CBC, has repeatedly been the need to rein in the federal debt.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister where his priorities are when, this year alone, the government will commit $600 million on an air defence anti-tank system and in excess of $1 billion, on a gold-plated, radiocommunications system for our land based forces in Europe? It is my understanding that these systems are no longer even necessary. At the same time, the government pleads poverty as it takes the broad-axe to the heartbeat of Canada.

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, I really quite surprised by the tone of my hon. colleague's questions.

Is he calling into question the fact that members of our armed forces should have modern, up-to-date equipment, in order to do the kind of professional job which they are called upon to do? I can certainly assure my hon. colleague that both of the projects which he refers to, the ADATS system and the TCCS system, will provide the most up-to-date technology, to enable our land forces to continue their functions in Canada, when they are called to help serve in the Persian Gulf or in peacekeeping operations in any other part of the world.

## GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. After years of negotiating, the Uruguay round of GATT is in danger of breaking down. What contingency plan does the Prime Minister have if these talks fail? What action is he prepared to take to save the livelihoods of Canadian farmers? Is he prepared to give back to Canadian farmers the management tools that he took away from them so that they can compete internationally?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, that is a very silly question. I think it is generally recognized, even by most members of the opposition, not my hon. friend, that this government has done more for farmers across this country than any other government in history. The deputy—

**An hon. member:** How?

**Mr. Mulroney:** Well my hon. friend says, "how". One way is by increasing assistance to farmers by 650 per cent in five and a half years, that is how.

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture, with many others, are working very carefully in Brussels to seek to avert a collapse of the talks.

This government placed agricultural subsidies on the table of the G-7 at the Tokyo summit in 1986. It was as a result of that beginning, sustained then by the Cairns Group, that the question of trade-distorting agricultural subsidies has managed to make it to this part of the GATT talks.

There is clearly a very serious conflict between the European Community and pretty well all the rest of the producers, including Canada, the United States, and members of the Cairns group. There does not appear to have been enough movement, at this point in time, by the Europeans to save this particular part of the round, although the Minister of Agriculture and Deputy Prime Minister, the Minister for International Trade and their colleagues are pressing on in the hope that perhaps a formula can be found which will avert a disaster, preclude the possibility of an ongoing trade war on agricultural subsidies between the community and the United

States and restore a degree of sanity which will benefit all Canadian farmers.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Before I start Tabling of Documents, I must say that there has been a problem with the clocks in the Chamber. My clock here is in good shape, so I know exactly what is going on. We started at five minutes after and we ended up now, as you can see, the clock is back to 12 o'clock again. We ended up at 12 o'clock. Unfortunately, when there is a Question Period dealing with economic problems, sometimes it takes a little longer for members and ministers both to produce their questions and answer them. I hope that next week will be a lot better.

• (1200)

We will start with a point of order, the hon. chief Whip for the opposition.

* * *

## POINT OF ORDER

### LENGTH OF ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we were five minutes late in starting, I would hope that the Chair would want to give serious consideration to extending the length of Question Period by five minutes.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** What I said is that it started at five minutes late and it ended at five minutes late.

### COMMENTS DURING ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I want to correct an impression that I left with the House. I said that eight years ago this morning, when the Liberals were in office, the inflation rate was 9.9 per cent and today it is 4.8 per cent. I indicated that the unemployment rate today was 9.1 per cent and that it was 2.6 per cent under the Liberals. In point of fact that was a grave error. It was 12.6 per cent.



**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Mulroney:** I know that all members, particularly the member for Hamilton East, would want me to correct that inadvertent error.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister and the government members may be laughing about these numbers today. Canadians are not laughing.

I am rising on a point of order because on more than one occasion the Prime Minister and his colleagues have claimed falsely that the refusal of the Senators to pass Bill C–21 has resulted in the lack of job funds being made available.

**Some hon. members:** Order.

**Ms. Copps:** This statement should be corrected on two counts. First, the number of people who have been cut off as a result of the implementation of Bill C–21 is driving up the welfare rolls across the country.

**Some hon. members:** Debate.

**Some hon. members:** Order.

**Ms. Copps:** The second point, according to the public affairs spokesperson for the ministry of employment and immigration, the job fund will—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** That is debate. On a point of order the hon. chief Whip for the Opposition.

### LENGTH OF ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the Chair the provision of Standing Order 30, particularly subsection (5). I presume the Chair is fully aware of it, but it refers to Question Period which is to commence on Fridays at 11.15 and, of course, it is to terminate at 12 o'clock.

It seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the fact—perhaps because the clocks are not working properly today—that you allowed the right hon. Prime Minister some two minutes and 13 seconds to respond to

a question from a colleague from the New Democratic Party, you would have given some consideration to the request that was being made by this party to extend the Question Period by a minimum of five minutes.

I would ask the Chair, in the spirit in which that rule is written and the way in which we operate in this particular Chamber, if the Chair would indicate as to why the Chair refuses to grant that request, in view of the facts that have been put before the Chair.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I would like to comment to the hon. member. I said that I know we started at about 11.19 according to my clock. My clock right here is the one I look at. At 11.19 we started, and we finished at five minutes after 12. We did a minute over the 45 minutes. We had 45 minutes of Question Period.

**An hon. member:** No, we didn't.

**An hon. member:** Yes, we did.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Listen to him.

**An hon. member:** Order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** In a spirit of Christmas, again I would like to repeat to the hon. members that I have knowledge of the time we commenced Question Period, and I know exactly the time that we finished Question Period. I made sure that hon. members had an extra minute over the 45 minutes. It was exactly 46 minutes.

If there is difficulty between the chair's clocks and my clock which is up here, then I am sorry about that. I must just say that the watches will have to be cleared up next week in order to facilitate this.

**Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie):** Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I am surprised that the Official Opposition would be complaining about the time that they have for Question Period when, indeed, the government members did not have one opportunity to raise a question.

I think that needs to be put in context.

**Mr. Dingwall:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We will obviously have to accept your ruling, but I would hope, as a courtesy to members on this side, that you would undertake to check with the clerks at the Table to see whether or not in actual fact the clocks have been synchronised between you have, Mr. Speaker, and as to what they have.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I will be glad to do that. The hon. member for Hamilton East.

REMARKS DURING ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, in light of the 1.2 million Canadians who are without jobs today, I hope you will hear this point of order out—

**Some hon. members:** Order.

**Mr. Malone:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Ms. Copps:** —because the government spokesperson today claimed on more than one occasion that the passage of Bill C-21 would result in job funds being made available.

**Some hon. members:** Order.

**Mr. Malone:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member for Crowfoot, on a point of order.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, I had the floor.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member for Hamilton East has twice now risen.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Would you put the point of order, please.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that funds that should have been available, according to government statements in the House, will not be available according to the spokesperson for employment and immigration until at least April of next year.

The government members are deliberately misleading the House on moneys available. That is a point of order, because a member cannot stand up in the House and deliberately mislead us on funds which are being held back for the 1.2 million people in this country who need jobs.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member for Crowfoot, on a point of order.

**Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, the question that was raised by the Whip of the Official Opposition in part asked about the rules of the House and how we conduct ourselves here.

One of the rules of the House which we all should be cognizant of and obey is that it is inappropriate and wrong in this House to say that anyone deliberately misled anyone. That, too, is a rule that ought to be given some attention.

Mr. Speaker, you have already ruled on the question of time. There should be no argument, because you have that big clock at your feet.

Since the question of rules in Question Period has been raised, let me also submit that there are rules that say that there should be no preambles to questions in the House. There is also a rule that is found in Erskine May and Beauchesne's that would indicate that no question ought to be argumentative.

In being here, I think that in recent times I may have heard a question that might have been argumentative. Sometimes, it seems to me, that there are preambles to questions.

Since you have ruled on the one, Mr. Speaker, I might ask the Chair if you could reflect upon, since we have the electronic media, the nature of Question Period for the whole purpose of instituting the rules that we do have, such that Question Period gives us the kind of decorum in the House that the people of the country would expect us to have.

**Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South):** Mr. Speaker, on a different point of order, you permitted the Prime Minister to clarify his comparative unemployment statistics when he referred to the rate of unemployment eight years ago today.

I feel that it is appropriate, so that the record is clear, to say that the Prime Minister was comparing two recessionary periods in Canadian economic history at a point at which—

**Some hon. members:** Debate.

**Mr. Manley:** The Prime Minister did have the opportunity to make his point. I would like to explain that the recession in 1981–82 began at a different point in the year. Perhaps the Prime Minister would like to take advantage of the opportunity to compare statistics later on when the—

• (1210)

**Mr. Hawkes:** Debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** That is debate.

Tabling of documents.

*Routine Proceedings*

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

### PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

**Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of State (Youth), Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 59 petitions.

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

* * *

[*English*]

### STRIKING COMMITTEE

58TH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 58th report of the Striking Committee. This report deals with membership of a legislative committee. Pursuant to Standing Order 113(1), upon presentation such reports are deemed adopted.

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

* * *

### PETITIONS

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, now that the chief government whip has now joined us, I am sure that he would want to support me in the presenting of this petition, pursuant to Standing Order 36, which calls upon the Government of Canada to withdraw the goods and services tax.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, the petitions that I have here, which I believe number seven in total, are primarily from the province of Ontario from Ottawa, Gloucester, and surrounding areas. The petitioners have impressed upon the Government of Canada that the proposed goods and services tax, which is to be implemented with regard to books, magazines and newspapers, ought to be withdrawn.

They also believe that the goods and services tax at this time, in view of the fact that we are in a Canadian-made recession, with which I am sure my colleague would agree, that it would not be appropriate for us to proceed with the implementation of the goods and services tax because it will have a negative impact upon all Canadian consumers, as well as small businesses.

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by several dozen Canadians in which the petitioners lament and call on the government to roll back the goods and services tax as it affects books, magazines, and newspapers.

They point out that, in a free and democratic society, the printed word is the corner-stone of democracy, culture, education, and literature in a productive society, and that the GST will have a negative impact on these sectors of our economy.

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, it gives me great pleasure to present to the House a petition signed by many of my constituents, as well as many other residents of the national capital region, who are adamantly opposed to the imposition of the goods and services tax as it relates to books, newspapers, and magazines.

The petitioners are calling on the House to withdraw this unfair tax on education.

**Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke):** Mr. Speaker, I have a number of petitions signed by many people from across Ontario who are very much opposed to putting any GST on newspapers, books, et cetera.

We have never had a tax on reading in this country since Confederation. Today, when there is so much emphasis being put on literacy in the country, it is not only unfair, but totally unreasonable, to be imposing a tax on reading, whether it be newspapers, periodicals, or whatever.

These constituents from several ridings across Ontario are requesting the government not to impose any GST on reading.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

**Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I rise under Standing Order 36 to present a petition from a number of Canadians from across Canada and such places as Chapleau, Ontario; Tofino, British Columbia; Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario; Edmonton, Alberta; and communities all across the country.

These are people who have heard with some concern that the Secretary of State, in next year's budget, is planning even further rounds of cuts to aboriginal programs such as aboriginal friendship centres, aboriginal broadcasting, and aboriginal representative organizations.

The petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to consider the advisability of reinstating both the Native Communications Program and the Northern Native Broadcast Access Program at full funding levels.

Further, they humbly pray that the said Department of the Secretary of State conduct consultations with groups funded under the said programs to devise plans for the future that will serve the needs of the department, as well as the aboriginal people and their media.

[*Translation*]

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table a petition signed by residents of various Ontario communities, including Toronto, Port Colborne, Fenwick, Welland and Niagara Falls. They oppose the GST and especially disagree with the government concerning the application of this unjust tax on the printed word. They ask Parliament to reject this unfair tax.

* * *

[*English*]

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of State (Youth) and Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Shall all questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

## INTERNATIONAL SALE OF GOODS CONTRACTS CONVENTION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of report stage of Bill C–81, an act to implement the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods, as reported (with an amendment) from a Legislative Committee.

**Mr. Dingwall:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding that we are proceeding with this particular bill and will deal with it in all stages. Thereafter, upon its completion, we will revert back to Bill C–93, for the continuation for the remainder of the day? Is that correct?

**Mr. Danis:** Mr. Speaker, yes it is.

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada)** 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.

Motion agreed to.

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre)** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to begin third reading debate on this bill.

This bill was introduced to implement the Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods which was adopted in Vienna in 1980 under the auspices of the United Nations so as to allow federal entities to benefit from its provisions.

The convention came into force on January 1, 1988. Twenty–eight states are party to it, including some of our principal trading partners, such as the United States, France, Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany, and China.

[*Translation*]

The convention constitutes an optional regime that defines the right of the seller and buyer in international sales of goods between parties whose places of business are in different states, when the states are contracting States, or when the rules of private international law governing the transaction lead to the application of the law of a contracting state.

[*English*]

The convention applies to contracts of sale between parties having their place of business in different states where at least one is party to the convention. It does not apply to contracts for the sale of goods for personal use or such items as electricity, ships, and securities.

The convention applies automatically to contracts subject to it, but as the parties retain the right to make an express derogation, their will always prevails.

• (1220 )

The convention establishes rules for the formation of contracts, including rules governing the conclusion of contracts, the periods of time available to offers and the acceptance of offers, as well as formal requirements.

By providing a uniform set of legal rules, the convention addresses a need that has become more acute with the increasing volume of international transactions in goods. It provides greater certainty as to which law governs the contract, facilitates trade between parties in different states and promotes as equitable a relationship as possible between the parties.

[*Translation*]

As the law of contracts is largely a matter of provincial or territorial jurisdiction, eight provinces and one territory have already passed legislation to implement the convention. They are Ontario, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Manitoba, Newfoundland, Alberta, British Columbia and the Northwest Territories.

The convention includes a clause allowing federal states to accede even if all its territorial units have not passed implementing legislation. The federal implementing legislation will allow all federal entities, even those located in provinces that have not implemented the convention, to benefit from its provisions. Moreover, it will ensure that federal entities are governed by a uniform regime for the international sale of goods.

[*English*]

The convention provides for four reservations or declarations.

Article 92 allows a state to declare that it will not be bound by the convention provisions relating to the formation of the contract or by the material provisions relating to contracts for the sale of goods, for example the obligations of the seller and buyer and the passing of risk.

Article 94 allows two or more contracting states with similar legal rules to declare that the convention will not apply between them.

Article 95 allows a state to declare that the convention will not apply to transactions between parties within its territory and parties within the territory of a non–contracting state, even where the rules of private international law lead to the application of the law of the contracting state.

Finally, article 96 allows a state to declare that the provision allowing contracts to be made in any form other than in writing does not apply to transactions involving a party having its place of business within its territory. Following consultations with the provinces and several experts, the Government of Canada has decided not to make any reservations or declarations so that the convention can be given its fullest application.

The Federal Court and all higher courts are courts of competent jurisdiction for the enforcement of the International Sale of Goods Contracts Convention Act. The convention offers several benefits.

First, it standardizes the rules governing the international sale of goods by establishing an international system. However, it does not restrict the freedom of contract because it allows the parties to exempt any contract from the rules of the convention through an expressed derogation clause.

Second, as the convention applies automatically, it can facilitate trade by resolving the issue of which law governs the transaction. This provision is particularly advantageous in goods transactions with states whose commercial law is unfamiliar or even unfavourable to us.

Finally, the convention can reduce the effects of any inequality between trading partners because the weaker partner can ensure application of the convention more easily than the law of its state.

The business community has expressed support for Canada's accession to the convention precisely because of these benefits. In the opinion of experts in civil law and common law the convention is compatible with Canadian law.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, in short, passage of the bill implementing the Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods will enable federal departments, departmental corporations and agent Crown corporations, at their option, to benefit from the provisions of the convention in transactions involving the international sale of goods. The convention will likely be applicable for a substantial number of contracts as it is in force for most of our main trading partners.

[*English*]

I would like to thank the members of the opposition for their co–operation in dealing with this legislation and simply to conclude by saying that sometimes the most important—

**An hon. member:** And members of the government.

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** Yes, and members of the government. I am sorry. Forgive me. I am taking for granted the high quality of his co–operation and assistance, and I am grateful to my colleagues for the work they have done. It is just that so seldom one has the opportunity to express one's appreciation to members of the opposition, I feel that, as Mr. Speaker has suggested, in the spirit of Christmas one should take the opportunity to express generosity when you can.

I also want to point out, as my hon. colleague who has just spoken knows very well, that sometimes the significant things we do in this House are not particularly exciting in terms of news coverage. There are not throngs of people in the galleries to watch. But for a country like Canada, which is a trading nation second only to Germany in its need to trade to survive, any kind of legislation that facilitates our ability to carry out that international trade in a fair manner and with some certainty and protection for our own traders is very significant.

I would like to thank the members of this House for their support of this legislation.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for her kind words. I know we on this side will not allow ourselves to believe that it is going to be a common occurrence, but they are much appreciated.

We feel that this is a good bill. The minister has stated quite accurately that this is a bill in the interest of Canada. Although it is something which we have been dealing with for some period of time, it is something which we have got to pass quite quickly. As I think we all know, there are 28 countries that have already signed this accord. As a prominent trading country we must not waste any more time in becoming members of this convention. It is not only in the interest of Canada that it be passed, but in the interest of all countries.

The problem of international trade has been with the western world for quite some time. Canada and other countries first played a role in addressing this problem in 1930 with the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law. They began at that point to try to get a harmonization of trade rules and their efforts brought forward some results. They were interrupted of course by World War II. They continued their efforts until the early 1960s when they came out with some results.

Unfortunately the differences in the legal systems of countries, particularly the differences between the capitalist countries of the western world and the socialist countries in the eastern bloc, did not allow these rules to work. There were too many differences to allow the system that was instituted to be brought into effect.

We went back and through the United Nations, the agency which we have come to depend on more and more in recent years, pushed to develop what we have in Bill C–81. As the minister stated, this is a good bill. It is in the interest of Canada. It is in harmony with Canadian laws. We can support this bill without any difficulty whatsoever.

I think the reason we are number 29 in ratifying this bill probably has little to do with our not moving quickly on it. That might have been the case but I really do not have any evidence to indicate that. It may be a result of the fact that Canada is a federal country and we had to have the ratification of the provinces. This bill not only deals with trade and commerce, a federal role under the Constitution Act, 1867, but because it also deals with sales it comes under section 92(13) of the property and civil rights provisions of the Constitution. As a result, we had to have the ratification of the provinces.

As the minister has stated, we now have eight provinces which have agreed to it and one territory. It is my understanding that the remaining provinces, Saskatchewan and Quebec, and the remaining territory, the Yukon, have all agreed to ratify it. I commend the minister and the department for bringing this all together. In a federal country it is not always easy to bring things together and to have a consensus.

I would like to reiterate as well that while this is a bill that may not receive a lot of attention, it is very important.

• (1230 )

We, as a country, have come to depend very heavily on their national trade. We are also a country that has come to depend very heavily on our trading partners. We have been a country that has helped a lot of countries that have not been as economically successful as we have been.

This is going to be very important to these countries, because it is going to be able to give them a common denominator.

There are ways of accepting countries negotiating a contract under the provisions of this act, either in whole or in part, through the agreement of the countries, but it does provide unless the parties agree otherwise a common denominator that has not only international law behind it, but an international reputation.

To say that this is going to provide all the answers on international trade would be simplistic and misleading. We still have to give interpretation to this convention in the respective courts of the various countries. That is going to provide some difficulties, but I do feel that this has come a long way in helping international trade.

Because it is helping international trade, it is going to help Canada and the Canadian economy. I am very pleased, on behalf of the Liberal Party, to support this bill.

**Mr. David Barrett (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca):** Mr. Speaker, may I say at the outset it appears to be the impact of an early Yuletide spirit.

I am humbled by the comments of the minister and pleased that she is able, through you Mr. Speaker, to suggest that we have been co-operative. I tried to count the times, but nonetheless if the government is interpreting that as our action, I appreciate the very thoughtful comments.

**Mr. Boyer:** You did not come to the committee meetings.

**Mr. Barrett:** No, I did not go to the committee meetings because I was, of course, tied up in other committee meetings of the external affairs and trade committee.

I want to talk about one section, and I will come to that in a minute, but I want to say a few words generally in the context of what has happened in the last few days in Brussels.

It is extremely regrettable that, as we debate this bill that enjoys the sympathy of all the members of this House, it comes in the atmosphere and a context in which this bill will be applied on those GATT hearings.

I regret very much that those hearings have collapsed. I am pleased that they have extended the dates on the hearings. Hopefully, some compromise will be reached.

It is important that in the context of this legislation the kind of decisions that GATT makes will, of course, allow this legislation to speed up what decisions are made privately and publicly in this country relative to business.

Although we are the 29th nation to sign, the reality is with the GATT collapse, the fact that it was that far behind has not hurt that much.

I want to address my attention particularly to the minister's comments, and correctly so, on article 94 about the legislation having no impact between two unitary states. In our case, we are not a unitary state, but certainly in terms of the federal basis we make the decisions on international trade at the federal level.

What I am concerned about is in the context of Canada's position at this moment, which is extremely unclear, with regard to the Canada-U.S.-Mexico talks and the application of this UN framework for legalization of contracts relative to those talks.

We have made the agreement with the United States through a free trade agreement. I do not wish to repeat all of my criticisms of that, especially since my criticisms are coming true. They were not self-fulfilling wishes. I regret very much that the warning sounded by many people in my party and in the Liberal Party—yes, even some Conservatives—who were concerned about the impact of the FTA.

Nonetheless, that is there and we leave that for another arena and another time.

In the context of signing unilateral agreements, we are witnessing now a debate going on without a clear-cut explanation for the government's position as to how this would apply to protecting what it says we have gained in the free trade agreement and a unilateral agreement between Mexico and the United States.

Should we be sanctioning this legislation on the basis that we may be tied into some of the contracts because of accepting a universal approach? Are we going to be bound by the United States unilateral action with Mexico that would impede us in developing unilateral talks with Mexico should we so desire that, and stay out?

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** What part of the contract was that?

**Mr. Barrett:** What part of the contract is that? Section 94, where you clearly said that this does not apply to agreements between two states.

I have used this particular bill for a forum on my arguments against the free trade agreement in the past. I know that the minister is confused, but I have a tenuous link to that article to allow me to speak to the bill on this particular action. Should the minister desire the help of a lawyer to interpret that particular argument, I will assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I have not consulted one international lawyer on this particular point. I have used my political acumen as an anchor to make the point that I am making now. If the minister would not be prepared to debate me in court over this matter, I will continue with my political argument.

I think it is a serious mistake for us to take the position that we have to go to the table with Mexico to protect what we have gained under the free trade agreement and, at the same time, put ourselves at risk—

**Mr. Boyer:** Relevance.

**Mr. Barrett:** Relevance, it is relevant under section 94 and extending your own interpretation, through you Mr. Speaker, about unilateral agreements between states. I am sticking very closely to this bedrock and fundamental article in this legislation to deal with my arguments against the Canada–U.S.–Mexico talks.

There is not even a quorum in the House, Mr. Speaker, to hear what I have to say. I call for a quorum count, Mr. Speaker.

*And the count having been taken:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** There being 21 members present, not including the occupant of the chair, the debate shall accordingly continue. The hon. government Whip, on a point of order.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to the House that the NDP in calling a quorum was as blind as they usually are.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** In the spirit of Christmas, on debate please.

**Mr. Barrett:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the members for allowing the Chair to have such a slow count. Were this a world boxing championship, I am sure that a dispute would take place with the WBC. Nonetheless, the count was accurate, although slow.

Now that I have the attention of all those members who have come back to create a quorum, the point I am trying to make is while we signed this kind of legislation, the research, the technical information and the detailed knowledge that we need before we enter into any further international agreements has not been evidenced here in this debate on this legislation or anywhere else during this session.

It is all very well to praise legislation that allows the contracts to take place, but without the specific information of what the government is doing in contracts makes the argument hollow. That is the point that I am trying to make.

If the Official Opposition, the Liberal Party, refuses to understand that it is necessary to do research and to back up knowledge before one rushes into international agreements, that is on their head. I feel compelled, as a matter of fact, impelled to make the point it is necessary for the work—

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** Impaled might be more like it.

**Mr. Barrett:** Impaled, as it be. Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that business–like governments are the first ones to make dumb business decisions. Where is the research? Where is the detail? Where is the back–up?

I know that on a Friday afternoon, I have not stirred the very entrails of this nation over this debate, nor has it appeared to the government that this is a seminal discussion. Nonetheless, I convinced you more than anyone else that unless this government is serious in doing some hard research and some background information gathering before it signs agreements, this is a hollow piece of legislation that is done purely for bureaucratic purposes and does not serve the needs of all Canadians unless that work is done. Why is that work not done? I will tell you why, because the government's agenda rushes us into some kind of trade agreement that does not take into account the needs of all the provinces and all the jurisdictions, municipal and otherwise in this country. So while the bill glides through the House, and while we have this overwhelming majority of members witnessing this intelligent debate, and why we have a slow count to get a quorum, the fact is that the government has not done its job.

• (1240)

Does it want to do the job? If it wants to postpone the bill for a while and reveal all the research papers it has that it has not revealed, if it wants to table the documents, if it wants to provide us with the material that specifically proves that this particular legislation will go a long way to facilitate the kind of trade talks that it thinks will be beneficial to Canadians, then let it table the documents. But, it has not. We have lost 160,000 jobs already on one of those trade agreements, and Lord knows how many more we will lose on the second one.

It is all very well to talk about facilitating the contractual arrangements and the necessity of being number 29th and catching up with the world, but what does it matter a fig if we are not protecting Canadian interests and Canadian jobs?

This is the kind of debate we should have. I am glad to hear the minister interject, and I know her comments about co-operation from the opposition are slowly dissipating. I hope that by the time I am through, they will be completely gone. We are not a rubber stamp like the Liberal Party which represents the same interests as the Conservatives. There is no difference between the Liberals and the Conservatives.

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** We're not rubber stamping anything.

**Mr. Barrett:** Mr. Speaker, of all the provinces of Canada, British Columbia knows that best. It is in British Columbia where they change stripes from Social Credit, Conservative or Liberal depending on what day of the week it is. I do not want to give a specific illustration to this minister, but I am sure she is familiar with it. No further comment.

I understand clearly how there is this love affair between the Liberals and the Conservatives on this issue, particularly with the loss of the former leader of the Liberal Party who was a clear spokesperson against the original free trade agreement.

Article 94 of this legislation has captured my attention, my riveted focus. It is the area under which I make these comments. So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that if anybody thinks that goodwill in this Chamber is going to create the kinds of jobs or the protection necessary for Canada, they are wrong. They are wrong again. We cannot do anything about it, but I just want to go on the record to voice my opinion. The government has been a failure in international trade negotiations, has caused havoc in this country because of it, and this bill will not help one whit.

Thank you for your rapt attention, Mr. Speaker, and if you want my signature on a copy of my comments, I will make it available to you.

**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.

## BRETTON WOODS AND RELATED AGREEMENTS ACT

### MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) that Bill C-93, an act to amend the Bretton Woods and Related Agreements Act, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member Saskatoon—Humboldt had the floor. He has ten minutes remaining in debate.

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to complete my remarks, and I will take only a few minutes of the time that you have allocated to me.

The roots of the Third World debt crisis lie in a development approach that increases the relationship between the local economies and that of the world and the World Bank system. That is why we have a great concern about continued support, or at least the kind of support as long as the World Bank and the IMF are on the track that they have followed in the last years.

The debt crisis currently is being exacerbated by the requirements of the World Bank and the IMF to adjust measures in order to gain further access for their lending.

By putting on Third World countries or debtor countries, conditions which are detrimental to their economies, the financial institutions have increased the possibility, or the likelihood, that the structure will continue to fail as it has for the last five to ten years.

There is enough evidence out there for this government to take some action, to lead the world in a direction which would make the value of IMF and World Bank funds greater and contribute to the fulfilment of the humanitarian dreams in some cases, humanitarian hopes of debtor countries of the world.

There is evidence to suggest that the IMF's confidence in the structural adjustment process is not too great. There is hope that some place along the way, these institutions will take a good hard look at their method of recalling or eliminating the structural adjustments that they have put in place.

In 1944 and at various times since, the IMF and the World Bank have come together to provide assistance to the Third World. They have become those countries' worst enemies; the worst enemy of real human progress in those countries, because loans that were intended to help are now unmanageable and are causing more disaster than they are help.

I am greatly concerned that we are caught in a systemic malfunction of the world's financial structure and that no one has the guts to admit it, let alone the guts to try and fix it.

We need to take a good look at the structure of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. We recognize that they have failed in their mandate. These institutions have known this for as long as 12 and 15 years, when I spent some time in Third World countries and worked with the World Bank.

At that time they were recognizing the failures of their policies. Here we are 15 years later, and in the last five years there has been a recognition of the tremendous failure of these two institutions.

In the last five years they have done more harm than good; some good, I recognize, but much harm. They have perpetuated themselves mainly by becoming sacred cows, whose structure and decisions are not questioned by the member countries. The structure and decisions are omnipotent in the eyes of the donor countries. They have convinced the donor countries that if these debts are not paid in full and on time, the world financial structure will collapse. They have forced us as Canadians to choose between the fluidity of the financial institutions and our humanitarian values, the values which we in Canada have tried to make the major values of our community.

• (1250)

This institution, which we are helping to fund, is forcing us as Canadians to choose between the fluidity of that institution and our humanitarian values.

We have to question whether we should go on supporting the World Bank and the IMF, because as they provide assistance to the Third World they have, as I said before, become its worst enemy, and the enemy of real human progress. The loans that were intended to help are now unmanageable. The systemic malfunction of the financial institution is coming back to roost and we do not have the courage to fix it.

Canada was given a chance by the recommendations in the committee report to do something about it, to show some leadership in alleviating world debt, but Canada was found wanting.

In conclusion, I can only grieve for the millions in the Third World who have not been given the help they need, and I can grieve also for those of us in the industrial, so-called first world countries who have not been courageous enough to help.

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-93 provides increased funding under the International Monetary Fund from $2,941 million special drawing rights to some $4,000 special drawing rights and relates to the over-all operation of the Bretton Woods agreement as it affects and assists Third World countries.

I am conscious as well that the negotiations which have been taking place in Brussels this past week are designed to ultimately provide access for the Third World countries to the markets of the United States and European Economic Community countries and other nations around the world. It seems that the agreement or the negotiations have now been suspended and hopefully they will start up again early in the new year.

I think it is most unfortunate that these negotiations took place one day after the German elections when Helmut Kohl was re-elected as the chancellor of the new united Germany. It is difficult to expect that he would be able to reverse the position of Germany two or three days later at the GATT negotiations in Brussels after the commitments he made during the election campaign.

Canadian producers are very vulnerable at these negotiations, as are Third World countries, if no agreement is reached. In fact, there was already a decision by the GATT, almost a year ago that would open up processed dairy products to the United States producers without a reciprocal agreement on the American side. The decision on ice-cream and yogurt and has been accepted by the Canadian government and is supposed to be implemented as soon as the GATT negotiations are complete.

If the negotiations do not continue in the new year, then I guess they are complete now. In fact, the United States would have a perfect right to go ahead and demand access to the Canadian market for ice-cream and yogurt. It will be able to do the same thing with other

processed dairy products such as cheese, butter, and skimmed milk powder. That represents something like 63 per cent of the full dairy production in this country of processed dairy products, so we are extremely vulnerable if these talks are not resumed early in the new year. We have to hope for that.

It is interesting when we look at those negotiations, in terms of international development, the Bretton Woods agreement, and the vulnerability and the difficulty of access for the Third World countries to European countries, the U.S., and developed countries' markets. When we look at it from that perspective, I am conscious of a statement by the Prime Minister today that Canadian producers of agricultural commodities receive something like 600 per cent higher support and assistance now than they did in 1984. In fact, support programs in 1984 were $1.483 billion and, in 1991 they are projected to be $1.533 billion. So what is happening is that even though agricultural producers' pricing, commodity prices and the world price war have totally ravaged this industry for the last five or six years, that in fact the government's own projections of support and assistance are exactly or very close to where they were in 1984, when we were coming off of some very high prices and the international trade war had not even started. The Prime Minister's statement, if one looks at the exact figures of the Department of Agriculture, simply is not true.

I think he is in the habit of quoting things like that from the relatively higher payments that were made in 1987 and 1988. In fact, in western Canada, the support programs have been reduced from some $2.4 billion in 1988 to $1.2 billion in 1990. That is a reduction of exactly 50 per cent. They are further scheduled to be reduced to something over $900 million next year, in western Canada alone, at a time when world prices, in real terms, are the lowest in history, while the trade war rages on, and debt levels are very high. So our producers are in an incredibly vulnerable position.

• (1300 )

The part that really concerns me is the last proposal to be put before the negotiations, according to a wire service story this morning from Brussels, that was proposed by the chairman of the agriculture working committee, Mr. Hellstrom from Sweden. He proposes that in fact the rollback of support programs, access, and the rollback of export subsidies, be 30 per cent, which was what was originally proposed by the EEC.

The unfortunate part for Canada, if this is accepted in a renewed round in early January, is that it is based on support programs commencing in January of 1991. Over that five-year period it would be looking at support programs based on $1.5 billion for Canadian producers. A reduction of that magnitude would reduce the support programs to something less than $1 billion over the five years. This would be devastating when you take into account that programs such as the western grain transportation Crow benefit amount to some $700 million. Therefore, it would not leave very much for anything else across the nation with some five distinct geographical areas of agriculture production.

Similarly, if we increase the access to our diary and poultry industry to 30 per cent—it is 2 or 3 per cent now—then the industry as we know it would collapse. The 30 per cent reduction likewise on export enhancement assistance would not have a very great effect on our Canadian producers because we do not have a program of any magnitude similar to the Export Enhancement Program of the United States or the export subsidies of the EEC which reduce relatively high levels of cost of production and domestic prices to world price levels.

The Prime Minister needs to take a very close look at support programs. These programs, as planned by the Department of Agriculture last year, are very close to what they were in 1984. The ability of farmers to survive and the price of commodities in the marketplace are dramatically down. In fact, they are the lowest in real terms since the 1930s in the present crop year. The demand is very low because of a massive crop. Our producers are extremely vulnerable in this.

We appreciate some of the difficulties which Third World countries face. The international negotiations can take place possibly in about a month's time or early in the new year to re-establish the world trading arrangements for agriculture. We will have to hope that they will take place and that the dramatic removal of support programs that has taken place in the last two years by this government will not leave us in an unbelievably vulnerable position for the survival of Canadian agriculture in those negotiations.

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for his remarks and his real concerns for the plight of the agricultural communities across Canada.

The member will be aware that a few months ago the Prime Minister and his government caved in at the GATT on a decision regarding ice cream and yogurt. They hoped, I guess, that the GATT negotiations would be successful and that they could hide this decision behind some sort of GATT agreement.

Could the hon. member tell the House why the government has refused, as even today the Prime Minister has refused, to say what it will do now to help dairy farmers, given the fact of this GATT decision on ice and yoghurt, as well as the effect the free trade agreement is going to have on our diary industry, and indeed on our whole supply-managed areas.

Could he outline to the House his feelings in this area and what he would do to help solve the plight of Canadian farmers?

**Mr. Foster:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Haldimand—Norfolk for the important question.

It seems to me there are two distinct areas in the negotiations which are important. One area which I have spent some time speaking about is the terrible vulnerability of western grain producers because the government has effectively slashed support programs in the west by 50 per cent during the last two years. Of course, farmers cannot survive at that level.

With regard to the ice cream and yoghurt decision which was made just a year ago, essentially it grew out of the FTA—or, as the Minister of Agriculture likes to call it, the CUSTA agreement—where we essentially open our markets to access from the United States. The United States maintains its GATT waiver from 1954. We did not get any agreement in the FTA to limit the imports of commodities such as ice cream, yogurt, or other processed dairy products under that agreement.

Immediately the agreement was signed in January, 1988, the government assured us that we would be able to control imports—processed dairy products, for example—by simply putting them on the import control list.

It was rather interesting that Senator Bensten from Texas, immediately after the deal was initialled, said: "We will immediately petition you before a panel of GATT and we will have access to those products." This was after the initialling of the agreement.

The government sat back and did nothing in spite of the warnings by the chairman of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate. As soon as the deal was consummated in 1988, the government put these commodities such as ice cream, yogurt and other commodities on the import control list.

True to their word, the United States immediately took us to GATT and it got a favourable decision in September of 1989. The government hemmed, hawed, and fumed for two or three months, but ultimately accepted that decision. It said it would not implement it until the end of the GATT negotiations.

The question is: Have we got to the end of the GATT negotiations? We hope not. We hope that there will be an agreement that they will only be suspended and that they will come back with an agreement in January. Hopefully, that agreement will sweep up this massive breach in our whole dairy industry.

If the negotiations are complete, then the United States has full access and the government will have to implement it, or the United States could take retaliatory action. It could slap a special duty or tariff on commodities coming from Canada to the United States.

• (1310)

One thing is clear. The dairy industry, Carla Hills, and the entire United States administration are determined they are going to have access, while at the same time maintaining a complete lack of access for our producers. This seems to be the unfairness of the whole FTA. They maintain full embargo or lack of access for our products, while they have gained access to our markets for processed dairy products.

It is little wonder, when the Prime Minister was questioned by the hon. member for Haldimand—Norfolk, that he launched into one of his usual tirades about how much he has done for agriculture. Farmers across the country, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, are asking the government, the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Agriculture: "What have you done for me lately?" There is no answer.

**Mr. Dave Worthy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs) and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I have a brief question. I know that the hon. member is an honourable

member and he was quoting some figures in his comment about assistance to agriculture. I do not recall them exactly, but I believe he indicated it was $1.1 billion in 1984 and $1.6 billion projected for 1991.

I am sure he has used accurate figures, but I also know that the assistance to the agricultural community in Canada in the last five years has exceeded $20 billion. I think the hon. member would want to acknowledge that that is a vastly different number than the numbers he was quoting. I am sure he would want to give credit for the assistance that has been given.

Unfortunately, there have been situations around the world with the subsidies that are going on in Europe that have put the industry in such a perilous plight that the government has had to provide that support. Ideally, we would not have had it. But I am sure the hon. member will want to acknowledge that there has been very significant assistance to the agricultural community over the last five years.

**Mr. Foster:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Cariboo—Chilcotin has talked about the significant assistance to agriculture in 1987 and 1988. The argument that I am trying to put to him is that we are in the worst part of the world trade war of any time since 1986–1987 when it first started, and the government, for whatever reason, has dramatically reduced support programs in western Canada last year from $2.4 billion to $1.2 billion this year. This is a 50 per cent reduction. That is very different from the 600 per cent increase that the Prime Minister was talking about.

At a time when we should be going with all our armament to the GATT negotiations, in fact we are going with our producers totally disarmed. Programs have been slashed since the 1988–1989 budget. We would be totally snookered if we have reduced our support programs from a high in 1987 of $3.3 billion down to $1.5 billion next year. Assuming that the GATT negotiations continue in January, that would be the base year and we would be talking about a 30 per cent reduction using that new base year. All the figures that have been put before the GATT negotiations are based on 1987–1988 which were peak years.

We saw the Minister for International Trade buffooning in the House and complaining to the Minister of Agriculture that he was supporting $8.8 billion, when producers know that the net support this year was $1.9 billion, that the government plans to reduce it in 1991 to $1.5 billion. It is going down and down at a time when commodity prices are the lowest in history in real terms. The markets are very thin and skimpy.

**Mr. Ross Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief on this topic. It is one that, quite clearly, a lot of members have a lot of concern over and is quite complex, involving not only the international monetary organizations but the groups that report to them and do work for them and also the complexities of international trade, as we have seen laterally with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the ongoing discussions that are held around the world in dealing with trade.

It is important that we recognize that trade is an important component on what we, the north, the west, the developed world, or the First World can do collectively to assist those nations that need our help as they emerge and begin to be able to develop economies that bring stability and added value into the countries where, in the past, we have been so quick to remove merely resources and put nothing back.

These are countries that traditionally we have not turned our focus to to see that contributions can be made, not only in terms of money, but also in terms of advice and substance to turn economies around, to help develop industry, and to help governments be able to provide even the most meagre services. It is important that we recognize that the agencies that do that, be it the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund, be able to provide those resources and that advice, and be able to provide parameters in which economies can work as we put money into them, based on some solid but flexible business sense, and real live approaches to the problems that are there.

It is an ongoing question and one that the House, over the next number of years, will debate, I am sure. At this time, however, I would like to move:

That the question be now put.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The question is fine. Further debate.

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on this bill.

I want to take this opportunity to look at the whole question of international debt in the developing Third World countries, because it is something that Canadians should look at not only in terms of the international plight of nations, but in terms of Canada's role in that and Canada's values that we purport to hold.

I want to take a look, first, at some of the purposes that are set out in the articles of agreement of the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development. It states that one of the purposes is to promote the long-range, balanced growth of international trade and maintain an equilibrium in balance of payments, thereby assisting in rising productivity, standards of living, and conditions of labour in these countries. That is the key and goal that it set: to assist the rising productivity, standard of living, and conditions of labour in these territories.

• (1320 )

The International Monetary Fund states its purpose to use the fund temporarily available to them under adequate safeguards, thus providing them with an opportunity to correct maladjustments in their balance payments without resorting to measures destructive of national or international prosperity. Those are nice goals, but if we look at what has happened over the years to the Third World debtor nations, those goals have not been met. In fact, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the restructuring of debt has driven many of these countries into poverty and slavery to the international monetary markets.

It reminds me very much of that old coal miners lament: "Loaded 16 tonnes of number nine coal and what did I get? Another day older and deeper in debt. I owe my soul to the company store". That is what used to happen before labour unions. The companies made sure that the miners always owed more at the company store. They charged them usury rates, they refinanced their debts, they kept them in bondage. That is basically what has been happening in the international monetary market.

Let us take a look at how some of those country's debts developed. I will give two examples. Many of the debts that came out of the Latin American countries were run up by dictators who borrowed money not to assist the public, not to improve the working conditions, not to improve health conditions; but to line their own pockets, to put in developments that they or their families controlled, to make sure they had the military power to keep working people subjugated to their dictatorships. When they were overthrown they usually departed the country with the assets and the new emerging democratic countries were left with the debts. The new democracies paid the dictators' debts and forfeited their sovereignty.

The International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and private bank managers are the ones which are now dictating how the nations generate wealth, spend it, invest it, and share it. Debtor countries are not free to set their own monetary or fiscal policy, export or import measures, social or health programs, or wage and price policies. A democracy should be able to do all of those things. These new democracies have now lost their sovereignty to the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. All that the system has done is make it possible for dictators to remain in power for years and to depart the countries with untold wealth and leave the debtor nations in poverty.

Another thing has happened. If you look at many of the developments, who benefited from them? Was it the Third World countries?

I will give another example. A Third World developing Pacific nation was talked into building an international hotel, a solution to its economic woes because it would get western tourists, affluent tourists. So, it was lent the money. What happened? Of course, all the materials were imported to build that hotel because the local building materials were not suitable for a western style hotel. All of the equipment for the hotel was imported; air conditioners, cutlery, bedding, and construction workers. These people were not skilled in modern construction techniques, in concrete construction, electrical wiring, refrigeration, air conditioning, so they brought in the workers. None of the money was spent locally. It benefited solely the people in the developed countries. In the end, they operate a hotel and they bring in the food for that hotel because western visitors want western style food. They bring in the trained staff to run the hotel.

The only jobs that the local people have are jobs that relate to the menial tasks such as cleaning the grounds, cleaning the building. Their economic viability has been ruined because they now have this massive international

debt that they must try to pay. They have no economic basis on which to pay it.

I notice the Liberals are very silent on this whole thing. Of course, they sat there for years as the Canadian government and let the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank subjugate developing countries. They took no leadership role. They did nothing to try to break the cycle of debt and poverty that these nations are being put into.

**Mr. Manley:** What are you proposing; withdrawing from the IMF?

**Mr. Karpoff:** There are many things that could be done. All we have to do is look at some of the recommendations. I notice everybody is getting very jumpy but it is time that Canadians took a leadership role and looked at those countries and seen what we have done to them.

We are asking the poorest nations in this world to sacrifice their meagre standards of living so us fat cats up here can make more money. That is what we are doing.

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** How about trading with them?

**Mr. Karpoff:** Trading with them? Let us trade with them on commodities they can afford instead of trading with them simply to get their natural resources at the cheapest dollar.

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** Do you want us to be protectionists?

**Mr. Karpoff:** One of the things that we have to start to do is look at what the NGOs say on the World Bank and look at some of the things that they have to say in their assessment of what is happening. They point out: "There is no evidence to justify the bank's confidence that adjustment helps the poor in the long run. There is not any evidence to suggest that orderly adjustment, coupling with loan scheduling, offers in time a way out of the debt crisis".

We have got to start facing some realities. Further they go on to say: "Many of the elements of adjustment programs, including the rapid dismantlement and tightening of credit availability, the emphasis on export promotion and the cutting of public support for health care and education are likely to increase inequities with the historical disadvantage of rural and urban poor being cemented in the place for another generation. Often what we are forcing these countries to do is to try to grow export commodities to satisfy their foreign debt to the disadvantage of their ability to feed their own populations".

We are saying to them: "Stop growing food crops and grow cash crops to feed the international debt". As a result we have driven these countries and the people into a lower and lower standard of living." They say for the bank to make a serious change in course, it will have to do more than support new poverty-focused programs. A fundamental rethinking of the development model that promotes it is required with active participation of local populations, sustainable development that builds upon their creative capacities and the efforts of the poor themselves. The monetary fund has to start working with these people instead of shutting them out of decisions. The bank should place more emphasis on protection for the domestic market, with food self-sufficiency as an important goal that should also be pursued. Many of these countries now even have to import food because we have taken away their basic agricultural market economy.

• (1330)

Another one of the recommendations is that the bank should publicly stress the importance of land reform and of increasing local food security through greater emphasis on subsistence and self-providing crops. These are what internationally known NGOs familiar with the international field say.

Another key to this is the fact that women in these Third World countries are probably the most adversely affected by these policies. These people go on to say that for adjustment and related policies to increase food production and security over the long run, policy-makers must directly target and enhance women's productive roles. There are many other recommendations.

What this bill does is say that we are going to increase our stringent and punitive control over debtor nations. We are even going to take away their voting rights, to force them to withdraw from membership if they do not

do as they are told. They are going to ensure that they have no voice in the policies that affect them the most.

What should Canada be doing? Canada had an opportunity to take a leadership role based on Canadian values. We missed it because we agreed with the policy. We agree with what is happening. Before an indebted nation can receive more funds from the IFIs, it must agree to impose harsh internal austerity measures. These conditions often lead to massive cuts in social programs, privatization, devaluation of currency and other market-oriented policies which are supposed to lead to an improvement in credit worthiness. Such structural adjustment measures, strongly endorsed by the Minister of Finance and the president of the Canadian International Development Agency, have caused violent protests in developing countries, such as riots in Zambia and Venezuela which caused the deaths of several hundreds of people.

In the 1970s and 1980s, these countries in the developing world were told to focus on exports to improve their balance of payments situation. Instead of growing food for internal consumption, debtor nations grew cash crops such as coffee to finance their debt and to draw hard currency into imports. The glut on the commodity market has worsened the debt situation and left African nations unable to feed themselves.

The whole situation is something that Canadians cannot take any pride in. Canada had an opportunity to take a leadership role.

An all party committee, the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade, produced a report called *Structuring our Global Future: Canada's Stake in the Unfinished Business of the Third World Debt*.

This report does many things. It talks about what Canada should be doing. I am going to mention a few of the things that it recommends. It set out a number of guiding principles for Canadian policy.

The first one is that the primary long term goal of action for Third World debt must be sustainable, human development in debtor countries. It goes on to say: "But first, every means should be explored to reduce the debt services burden of all debts, including allowing debt repayment to be made in local currency for investment in human development projects in that debtor country."

It points out that poverty and debt are enemies of development, not structural adjustments per se. Adjustments can only be successful and supported as a part of a holistic development approach in co-operation with debtor countries.

It talks about how adjustment must be looked at. One minute, I am told, it states that the social impact of adjustment programs must be assessed. If there is no net benefit socially to that country, it should not be proceeded with.

Canada is a wealthy country compared to many of the developing countries, but we seem to be using our wealth along with that of most of the other developed countries not to assist in the long run the development of debtor countries, but to continue to ensure that they are always going to be in poverty and owing us money.

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I hope at least for the sake of our viewers they do not leave with the impression that Canada has not been playing an international role in trying to deal with Third World debt and development around the world.

In fact, history can speak for itself in terms of the tremendous amount of contribution Canada has made to Third World countries and developed countries. I, for one, am very proud of the contribution Canada has made in the past and continues to make on the international scene.

Having said that, I would just like to ask my colleague one specific question about the hotel. He talked about the construction material for the hotel, the workers who built the hotel, the forks, the knives, the food the plates and everything that was imported.

I am sure many of the viewers in my riding of Ottawa Centre are wondering where that famous hotel is located. I want to ask the hon. member if he can tell us about the location of that hotel, when it was built and who built it. What money was used for that?

**Mr. Karpoff:** Mr. Speaker, the same thing happened in Western Samoa, Tonga, Cook Islands and in Fiji. There are four countries.

The loan rates varied. One thing is quite interesting. The Liberals seem to say that Canada is doing a good job, but they were part of this committee that urged Canada to take a different view.

I will read again. This is what the Liberals forget that they signed up on: "There is no alternative to concerted political action among the major developed countries governments. Canada is a respected member of that group and active in many international organizations".

• (1340)

We have a seat on the United Nations Security Council. Finance Minister Michael Wilson now chairs the key policy advisory committee of the IMF executive board. It is time for Canada to use its international position and influence to maximum advantage. That is what they signed. Beyond these specific measures, the sub-committee urges Canada to seek support of other governments for an international conference on debt and sustainable global adjustment, such a conference to aim for negotiating commitments to policy reform by all countries, not only the poor and indebted. That is what will happen. We want the poor and the indebted countries to make all the adjustments, to make all the changes in terms of sustaining international development and sustaining international trade.

It is time the Liberals read some of the things that they signed. I know that they want to let this bill slip through, as they do every year, without really looking at the issues that the Third World countries are now facing. The Speaker is signalling I am out of time.

**Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South):** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member who has just addressed the House has made some points that are of interest and concern to all of us. He should know that it is not a matter of Liberals having forgotten the contents of the committee report or anything of the sort. Any of us, including myself, has encouraged the Minister of Finance in his role in the IMF to take into account the emerging understanding of development issues in the context of IMF loans being granted.

What the NDP seems to have forgotten is the issue that is before this House, not the issue before the IMF on any given day. What we have is a bill that essentially does two things. First, it increases the amount held on deposit by the IMF, reflecting the fact that world trade has increased and also that inflation has caused the volume of world trade to increase. Second, it imposes upon debtor nations, quite correctly as he points out, certain measures that the IMF can take to try and enforce payment.

I am driven to the conclusion by hearing the NDP speakers that they believe one of two things, or perhaps both of them. They believe that either Canada should withdraw from the IMF—perhaps that is NDP policy—but the very least, they do not believe that the IMF reserves should increase to reflect the increased volume of world trade. Second, they do not believe that countries that borrow from the IMF should be forced to repay their loans. What kind of international financial order would that create?

If they want to talk about direct aid, let them talk about the appropriate vehicles for direct aid. Surely they can address their minds to the issues before the House of Commons that this bill presents instead of the silly gobbledegook to which we have been listening.

**Mr. Karpoff:** Mr. Speaker, one of the things I am always interested in is watching the Liberals get up and talk about fiscal policy, after they demonstrated in this country that they could only drive the country into economic recession. Then they start saying, "Look, we are knowledgeable, we deserve to be listened to as we have some credibility".

The Liberal's credibility in fiscal and economic management is zero.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions and comments are now terminated. Debate, the hon. member for Elk Island.

**Mr. O'Kurley:** Mr. Speaker—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Point of order, the hon. member for Kamloops.

**Mr. Riis:** My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that I move:

That the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca now be heard.

**Mr. Danis:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker. After you recognized the hon. member for Elk Island I distinctly heard the hon. member say, "Thank you, Mr. Speaker". You had given him the floor, he had the floor and therefore I suggest that the motion is out of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I am sorry, the hon. member for Sherwood Park on debate.

**Mr. Riis:** Point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Point of order, the hon. member for Kamloops.

**Mr. Riis:** I think the record will show clearly that while you recognized my hon. friend from across the way, before he began speaking you recognized me on a point of order.

**An hon. member:** That is right.

**Mr. Riis:** He can speak all he wants. The point is that you had recognized my point of order. I stood up on a point of order and presented a motion. I think the record is very clear. If we do not follow the rules in the House of Commons, then why do we have rules?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I recognized the hon. member for Elk Island. He was starting to speak. Then I came back to the hon. member for Kamloops. The hon. member for Elk Island has the floor. On debate.

**Mr. Brian O'Kurley (Elk Island):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to remind the House and my hon. colleagues in the NDP that the IMF is a very specialized instrument designed to achieve many valuable and important economic goals of the international community.

One of the concepts that is embodied in this organization is the concept of balance. The proposed increases in IMF quotas is part of a regular cycle for reviewing fund quotas. The higher level of total IMF quotas is required to ensure a better balance between the resources available to the IMF and the needs of members for balance of payments financing over the next few years.

It is important to recognize here that while other institutions will provide the bulk of development financing for the developing world, the IMF has the specific responsibility to use its resources in support of growth oriented economic adjustment programs for both developing and developed countries.

The concept of working together with both the developing and the developed countries is very important. We know that that goes against the philosophy of the NDP which has shown and demonstrated from time to time through their activities and the activities of their supporters that it supports more of a confrontational approach, as opposed to a co–operative approach.

This bill is reinforcing Canada's support of this co–operative approach by offering a program to both developing and developed nations. This bill is a very valuable initiative. I should add that it does not represent any significant additional cost to our country.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would move:

> That the House continue to sit beyond the ordinary hour of adjournment for the purpose of continuing consideration of the second reading stage of government Bill C–93, an act to amend the Bretton Woods and Related Agreements Act.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Will those members who object to the motion please rise in their places.

*And fewer than 15 members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The motion is adopted.

Motion agreed to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** A point of order. The hon. member for Kamloops.

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, I seek clarification from my hon. friend, the government whip. Earlier today my assistant and I had it confirmed that the government would not do what it has just done. It was not just confirmed with me. It was with my assistant. We asked whether the government would extend hours and the official said, "No, definitely not".

I repeated that question: "Do you plan to extend the hours today?". Again he said , "No, we will not".

I want to register my concern that when an official says one thing and then the government does another, it makes it very difficult to plan to do business.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** What you people do behind the curtain is of no concern here on the floor of the House. But I will allow the hon. government whip to answer.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, I want the House to know in absolute terms that no one from the New Democratic Party, official or person, has approached me personally with that kind of a question today. It was my understanding at our morning meeting that we were to get through second reading stage of Bill C–93 and we were to get Bill C–81 through report and third reading.

• (1350)

As the day progressed it became clear to me, as the government whip, from information that came to me from other members, that the New Democratic Party was filibustering the Bretton Woods agreement. That was not in accord with arrangements that were reached earlier in the week between our House leader, who happens not to be here today, and other House leaders or their officials. It has been communicated to me in my lobby that the New Democratic Party is not keeping the commitments that were made earlier this week in terms of what would happen on this day. Whether that is right or wrong I have no direct knowledge. I simply report what I was told.

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, earlier today, the request came formally from the government House leader's office, asking if we were intending to complete second reading of Bill C–93. I indicated that I thought it may not occur. In the best interests of doing business, if the government was to introduce Bill C–81, we would, in fact, agree to the completion of second reading. Our critic undertook to accomplish that and it has been done. It was under the assumption that we would continue the debate with no extension of hours. This is what the government House leader's office communicated to us so that we would agree to pass Bill C–81, which we did. I see that that agreement did not stand up.

To carry on the business of the House it requires the co–operation and honesty of all of the players. I am afraid that that is simply—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** If there is going to be any further negotiations on the floor, I wish it could be done behind the curtain with the two whips and the government House leader.

I will listen to the chief whip for the opposition party.

**Mr. Dingwall:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps one might be able to share some information with all hon. members so that we clearly understand what has transpired. There was a disposition on Wednesday that two bills would be under active consideration today, namely, Bill C–81, which has now been completed in terms of debate and that we would proceed with the completion of second reading of Bill C–93.

I recognize, and one can never attribute motives or indeed, intentions to anyone, that the House leader for the New Democratic Party was not privy to those particular discussions. He may have a different view, quite rightly or quite wrongly. Let's be clear that when one is imputing motives of members of this Chamber, that those in glass houses ought not to throw stones.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The negotiations that are going on here on the floor of the House should be done behind the curtain and in committee meetings. They should not be done on the floor of the House. This is debate on Bill C–93. I think I should recognize the next hon. member for debate.

I will recognize the hon. member for Kamloops just one more time on this same point of order.

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. I do not want to leave this matter with these inaccuracies in the air. I would like to clarify one point.

Regardless of the discussions that have taken place earlier in the week, earlier today on a formal visit from the government House leader's office, the question came, "are you prepared to complete Bill C–93 today at second reading?" I indicated that I thought not. Again, one cannot predict the future in this place ever, as you well know, Mr. Speaker. I thought we had sufficient numbers of speakers that it likely would not conclude.

The official spokesperson from the House leader's office then indicated, "the government would like to pass C–81 today." I said that that was fine, we would agree to co–operate to facilitate that, because we felt that we had an obligation to seriously consider these two bills, which we did.

Bill C–81 was debated and passed. That is set aside. Let me go back to C–93. I then asked, "will the government extend hours," and was answered "absolutely not." I repeated the question because it is important that we know, particularly on a Friday afternoon when members are moving to their constituencies for the weekend. I asked them seriously, "Will the government extend hours today," and he said, "absolutely not." I assumed the government would not extend hours. All that transpired earlier today and the government has obviously decided to extend hours.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Debate on Bill C–93. The hon. member for Kamloops on debate.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, I have been looking forward to this debate for some time. We recognize that Bill C-93 is an important bill for a variety of reasons. It is one of the few opportunities we have in this House to discuss the role that Canada plays in international finance.

We recognize, as we enter into the global economy and enter into a shrinking world in terms of international trade, how important it is that Canada continue to play its expanded role. Perhaps we were not there physically, but certainly over the years a lot of us have recalled those beginning days with the creation of the IMF as a result of an agreement signed by the 44 nations at the International Monetary and Financial Conference of the United and Associated Nations held at Bretton Woods. Therefore the bill itself is often referred to simply as the Bretton Woods legislation.

On that day in July, 1944 it was recognized that the various countries had a role to play in ensuring countries an opportunity to participate in the development of international trade. At that time Canada's intentions were very honourable. But as my hon. friend who spoke recently indicated, the IMF participation in terms of international development in the last number of years has been suspect. The doctrine of the United States that has been transferred to the IMF has often visited upon Third World developing countries an agenda that was simply illogical for the tasks that they had to address.

We have a long list of Third World countries which, in order to receive support from the IMF, have been presented with an agenda of fiscal and monetary initiatives that they were required to take, to say nothing of other political, social and economic initiatives that were suggested in order for them to participate in any benefits that the IMF may in fact provide. That is really an imposition of a particular ideology, usually an ideology that reflects the world view of the United States, on a country that may be interested in pursuing a different economic approach or a modified economic approach to solve its particular problems.

When one looks at the details of the bill, again in recognizing we are at second reading stage—and it is at this point where we talk about the principle of the bill—I must say we have serious concerns regarding the principle of the bill, to say nothing of some of the issues that are indirectly related to Canada's participation in the IMF.

I think we all recall in the news just recently when a number of Central and Latin American countries asked questions of the International Monetary Fund about whether or not, in terms of the overwhelming amount of foreign debt that they had accrued, they could continue on in terms of introducing the various so-called reforms that the IMF was making of them. I think any of us who have any knowledge at all of many of these countries recognize that the introduction of these particular IMF agenda items was virtually an impossibility if it was not going to cause even more undue hardship to the peoples of these various nations.

At that time the discussion started in Canada about our participation in the IMF, to what extent were we associating ourselves with the ideological initiatives being presented by the IMF, particularly on developing Third World countries.

That debate has been raging across the country for many months, and as we have an opportunity now to culminate that debate as we begin the processing of this legislation, may I suggest it is going to take a long time to move this legislation through the appropriate phases.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** It being two o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—BILLS

[*English*]

### CENTENNIAL FLAME RESEARCH AWARD ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-258, an act respecting the establishment of the Centennial Flame Research Award to publicize the contributions to Canadian public life of persons with disabilities, as reported (without amendment) from a legislative committee.

**Mr. Patrick Boyer (Etobicoke—Lakeshore)** moved the bill be concurred in.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**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):** Because it is Friday, there is an automatic deferral and, pursuant to Standing Order 45(6), the recorded division stands deferred until 7 p.m. on Monday, December 10, 1990.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### BRETTON WOODS AND RELATED AGREEMENTS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre) that Bill C–93, an act to amend the Bretton Woods and Related Agreements Act, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee, and the motion of Mr. Reid (p. 16458).

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the comments which I just made regarding Bill C–93.

First, I want to set this discussion today into some context. Sometime back, the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade submitted a report to the House on the international debt crisis. The government's response was simply to discount every, single recommendation made by the unanimous all–party report. I find it rather odd that a report that got the unanimous consent of all parties, which happens only infrequently, one that looked at and studied the debt crisis faced by nations that were facing serious indebtedness, that the government would choose simply to ignore all the work done by the committee. This puts into some context, I suppose, how serious the government is in terms of actually cleaning up its effort at helping countries out in terms of managing their foreign debt.

One of the items of Bill C–93, the conditionality of financing from international financial institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund is, of course, a reality. To put it more simply, before indebted nations can receive further funds from the IFIs, they must agree to the imposition of harsh, internal austerity measures. These conditions often lead to massive cuts in social programs, privatization programs, the devaluation of currency, and other market–oriented policies which are supposed to lead to an improvement in the worthiness of a country when it comes to credit.

While such structural adjustment measures may be strongly endorsed by the Minister of Finance, they have caused very strong and serious reaction in many countries around the world, particularly in the developing world. There have been riots in Zambia and Venezuela which resulted in the deaths of literally hundreds of people. Most Canadians who look at these policies demanded by these international monetary funds of one kind or another recognize that this is, in some ways, a rather indirect form of colonialism. The western countries, including Canada, which control the IMF and the World Bank are dictating economic policy to the less developed nations. Once again, in terms of allowing self–determination and self–realization and, in a sense, the self–government openness of Third World developing countries, we are imposing our view of what is right on them.

When I say "our view", I am of course referring to the government's view. A lot of us would have serious questions about the government's view of how to conduct the economy in terms of federal government measures, even as it occurs here in our own country of Canada. We have a monetary policy. Is it right for Canada? We have a fiscal policy. Is that right for Canada? We have a water policy. No, we do not have a water policy for Canada. Do we have a policy, in terms of regional economic development? No, we have not. We have a couple of slush funds which are operating in Atlantic Canada and in western Canada, but in terms of meaningfully assisting the development of serious economic infrastructure, particularly new economic infra-

structure in western, northern, or Atlantic Canada, such is not the case.

Even in our own country, the overwhelming majority of Canadians are saying that the government's policy in terms of economic development is haywire. It just does not make any sense anymore. On top of that, the government is going to impose a whole new set of taxes now called the goods and services tax.

I just returned from a visit to Japan and looking at its government's recent imposition of its version of the GST. The Japanese government decided that it was in its best interest to impose a GST of only 3 per cent. What did the people of Japan do at the first opportunity they had to indicate what they thought about that? They turfed out the government. I anticipate that at the first opportunity that Canadians have to show this government what they think of its economic policies, they will do the same and turf out this government.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Milliken:** And elect a Liberal government in its place.

**Mr. Riis:** There is some noise from the Liberal benches about their future. I suspect that, if we look at their future—where could we look? We could look, I suppose, at what is going on in the province of Ontario. That would be one place to look. But will set that aside, Mr. Speaker. It is not worthy of even a response, quite frankly.

• (1410)

I should clarify the point. The point is that the government's view of appropriate economic policies to develop Canada's economy are wrongly placed. That is the same mentality that now is being visited upon Third World countries. There are governments such as our own here in Canada saying to Zambia and a whole set of other countries: "We know what is best. We are the big brother. Our country may be in a shambles economically, but our ideological view of what is best ought now to be imposed upon you. You have no choice, because if you expect support, indirectly and directly, from organizations such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, you have got to do what we are telling you to do."

That is not the way the world ought to operate. I do not think Canada, the United States, or anyone else has the right to impose a particular ideological view on another country. That is not what the global community ought to be made up of, the imposition of certain views by some on others. That is why we have some concern in terms of the way the International Monetary Fund is progressing.

We recognize that the purpose of this bill is to provide for an increase in Canada's International Monetary Fund subscription by $906 million special drawing rights, about $1.2 billion. Another purpose, under section 1, is to provide for the proposed amendment regarding the suspension of members voting and relating rights. Relating to that are sections 2, 3, 4 and 5, as you well know, Mr. Speaker.

As I say, we have grave concerns of the implications of this particular legislation. I probably do not have to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that in the 1970s and 1980s the IFIs told the developing world to focus on exports to provide their balance of payments situation. Instead of growing food for internal consumption, these debtor nations grew cash crops such as coffee to finance their debt and to draw hard currency for imports. The subsequent glut on the commodity market has worsened the debt situation and left many of these nations unable to feed themselves.

In other words, they were following the dictates of countries such as our own in terms of saying: "We know what is best for you. Rather than develop sound food crops, you should be developing coffee, bananas, sugar, and so on for export." That is fine, as long as these things can be sold.

We know what it is like to be a farmer in western Canada or any place in the country now in terms of being able to compete in the international marketplace. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, what it is like to be a food producer in a developing country, without the hundreds of millions of dollars in support systems, or may I say billions of dollars, that our producers receive.

We think we are being treated unfairly. You can imagine the concerns that the people in the developing countries have at the near collapse of the GATT discussions that have just recently occurred.

I simply point out that our direction in the past has been demonstrated to be the wrong and inappropriate direction, and it has caused even further indebtedness of

the developing countries that we were so–called attempting to assist. By following the direction of western countries and the advice of western economists at the IMF, the developing world, in fact, has sunk further into its debt mire. Now, the IMF and the World Bank are telling the debtor nations to tighten their belts to make up for earlier bad decisions made by the United States primarily and the IFI.

It is appropriate that we recognize that the impact of this payment on condition is disproportionately filled at the lowest end of the economic scale: women, children, the dispossessed. We are talking about the unbelievably poor here and they bear the burden of this type of restructuring.

The impact of structural adjustment policies in countries such as Peru, Zambia and Guyana are really worth noting. In Zambia, the devaluation of currency has spurred inflation into triple digits. Here in our own country, when inflation reaches 5, 6, and 7 per cent, we start becoming seriously concerned. Tough policies are brought in to dampen down those inflationary fires. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, what it must be like to be in a country where, in fact, it is in three figures when it comes to inflation and what that requires in terms of combating that incredible problem in terms of economic development? As a result of these restructurings in Zambia, we have also seen rising infant mortality, increasing unemployment, significant increase in illiteracy, and on and on.

Structural adjustment has now been applied in over 70 countries and has only contributed to stagnation and increased poverty. I must say that the IFIs are undermining the developing world and Canada, and Michael Wilson at the chair of the interim committee of the IMF—sort of the P&P committee of the IMF—is a key contributor to this policy. As a government we have to assume full responsibility for the types of policies now being imposed upon so many of these developing countries.

I want to go back to the point I made about the standing committee's recommendation that Canada has an obligation to work toward reforming the IFIs. I must admit I have not studied every single clause of this bill. That will come later in committee work. But from what I can gather, this bill does absolutely nothing, in spite of our pathetic performance in terms of advice that we have been giving developing countries, to change the *status quo*. I do not know how my hon. friend, the parliamentary secretary, is able to stand in the House today and say that this is a good Canadian initiative, because it does not change a single thing that Canada has been doing and what Canada has been doing is not good for the developing world. We say that we have missed an opportunity here.

I know the government and the Liberals do not want to discuss this any longer, and I can understand why. If this was our legislation and we were doing absolutely nothing in light of the increasing debt build–up in developing countries, I would not want to be caught debating it publicly either. I chastise my Liberal friends for muzzling the debate in the House of Commons and wanting to get out of the discussion. I do not blame them. I recall their policies when they were in government. They were no different. Did they care about the developing world? There were some individuals, yes, but as a political party they never ever committed sufficient funds, in spite of years and years of promise, to economic development. Now the Tories really do no different. That is why I think Canadians are realizing that whether this policy, Bill C–93, is called Liberal policy or Conservative policy, there is no difference.

I listened carefully earlier and I asked: "Will we hear a different voice between my Conservative friends and my Liberal friends on this issue?" Mr. Speaker, I could not tell which side was talking.

The opportunity came, and I might say one of the very few opportunities members of the House of Commons have an opportunity to speak on international debt refinancing and restructuring, and do the Liberals want to speak? No. They do not want to speak. They want to curtail this debate and I say that is wrong.

**Mr. Milliken:** We agreed to extend hours so that you could speak.

**Mr. Riis:** I know why they decided to extend hours—to muzzle debate. They know it is Friday. They know there are *x* number of members here and that is the easiest way to curtail debate. Do not try to fool and mislead the people of Canada. I will simply say mislead the people of Canada.

It is despicable, it is disheartening, it is sad, and it is a black day for Canada when it comes to the role it could play in terms of international development and assisting Third World countries.

I would like to close my comments by saying a very important Canadian was quoted recently in the news by saying: "The patient is very sick, but the medicine will only hasten the death." This was an outstanding Canadian talking about the plight and the challenges of many Third World countries as they struggle to survive, not even necessarily to advance, but simply to survive under unbelievable challenges.

What does the government do? It makes it worse, just as it is making it worse for the people of Canada. This ought to come as no surprise. This is an ongoing thesis now. It has developed almost monthly for the last two years.

Canadians, small business people are struggling to survive; farmers right across the country, struggling to survive; small manufacturers, struggling to survive; families, struggling to survive. What are the figures as a result of this policy which the Minister of Finance says is a policy of pain? It is going to be a scorched-earth policy because he says we want to inflict pain on the people of Canada in order to dampen down the inflationary fires.

• (1420 )

They have done it admirably. They have killed off initiatives. They have killed off both so that there is an increasing sense of despair.

So I plead with my hon. friend across the aisle who is responsible for this particular initiative at this stage to rethink what the government is doing. While it is too late now, there has been pain that has been inflicted upon the people of Canada as a result of this federal government's policy. Let us not repeat that same pain and suffering for those people who are living in the developing countries.

**Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South):** Mr. Speaker, I listened very closely to what the House leader for the New Democratic Party had to say. I was hoping that with the events in Ontario that he referred to earlier this year, when an NDP government was elected, and perhaps with the success that they are temporarily enjoying in the polls, the NDP would come forward with something substantive and serious; something that would give us a clue to what they might do, if it ever befell us, that we had an NDP government in this country.

I could only conclude from having listened to him that either he has not given any serious thought to Canada's role in world institutions, or that he thinks that we should withdraw from the International Monetary Fund. That is the only reasonable conclusion to draw from his remarks.

The bill before us provides for two things. It provides for an increase in the amount of the deposits, the quotas, that are held by the International Monetary Fund to reflect the increased size of world trade and it provides for a means for the IMF to collect amounts owing from debtor nations, or to provide that they should pay them.

As I pointed out earlier today, many of us agree with the comments in the parliamentary report. Many of us agree with the sentiments which the House leader for the NDP is expressing in terms of what the IMF does in the context of granting its loans.

As I said earlier as well, many of us, including myself, have urged the Minister of Finance to take into account the emerging understanding of development issues in loans that are being granted by the IMF, for example in Brazil.

For the leader of the NDP to get up and say that the bill before us distinguishes parties, his and ours, for example, on those issues simply because this bill provides for the ongoing function of the IMF, is totally ridiculous. Why can he not get up and say specifically what he thinks Canada's role should be with respect to this quota system and to the collection of debts on an ongoing future basis?

Does he think that loans from the IMF should be without recourse against better nations? Should they be just simply gifts? In that case, why do we need an international clearing house like the IMF? What is it that the NDP has for a policy? In fact, do they have one at all?

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, to answer my friend, there is much to say on this issue. That is why we wanted to debate this issue. I do not understand why the Liberals want to curtail this debate.

This is the one opportunity we have for all members from the Liberal Party, the New Democratic Party and the Conservative Party, to express their party views. It is an opportunity for members of Parliament to speak on

what has to be one of the world's most important issues, the increasing indebtedness of the developing countries.

My hon. friend knows that what this legislation does. When I say that it maintains the status quo, it worsens the *status quo*, Mr. Speaker. He knows full well that it imposes additional sanctions on countries that are unable to repay their loans.

In other words, if you are so poor that you are simply unable to pay, they are going to impose heavier sanctions and make it impossible for you to even hope of paying it in the future. This is not good legislation.

**Mr. Manley:** What's your proposal. Give it away?

**Mr. Riis:** There are many proposals. The Liberals want the little catch phrase. The Liberals want some of these television quotable quotes. Their leader, Jean Chrétien, has not said a single thing in the entire byelection. Try and find out where they stand on anything.

For example, we look to economic development as a role for the IMF to play. But the role is not to impose Conservative or Liberal—same thing—ideologies on developing countries. Absolutely not.

Look at international assistance and ask yourself the question: "Where does the most appropriate international assistance occur?" You have to say it occurs at the NGO level.

I realize that this is not exactly what this bill is about, but it is the only opportunity we have to discuss Canada's role overseas in terms of assisting economically or in other ways. These are the kinds of proposals we ought to have an opportunity to discuss. But, since we do not seem to be having that, I would like to propose a motion. Therefore, I move:

That this House do now adjourn.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I must say to the hon. member, and I know he has been around here for a long time, that Standing Order 25 states, and I quote:

When it is provided in any Standing or Special Order of this House that any business specified by such Order shall be continued, forthwith disposed of, or concluded in any sitting, the House shall not be adjourned before such proceedings have been completed except pursuant to a motion to adjourn proposed by a Minister of the Crown.

The hon. member realizes that. The motion is out of order.

**Mr. David Barrett (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca):** Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few comments to the discussion that has already taken place on this very important bill.

As the House Leader of the New Democratic Party has clearly pointed out, there are serious questions about the increased debt on Third World countries. How much do we pile up? When do we say enough is enough? When do we stop imposing on the threat of that Third World debt our goals for an economy and our solutions for economic problems? How much austerity can we suffer in Canada and how much are we demanding that we impose on the Third World countries that are subject to the debt? Are we indeed the harbingers of some kind of Milton Friedman hard right wing policies that suggest that the IMF's role is to be a debt collector rather than some imaginative development of programs in the jurisdictions in which we are loaning the money?

If the government and opposition members argue that this should be a collecting agency, is there not a moral responsibility in the initiation of the loans to do some planning with the people who are borrowing the money? Are we making surrogate economies based on what we think is right? Or, are we focusing on what should be the force coming out of an indigenous need of those countries? Does the IMF take any time, as the Liberal Party raises the question about our policy, to express a desire that the indigenous economy was what should be supported and enhanced rather than impose some kind of unproven economic theories that are pursued in this country as the model?

It is very interesting to casually talk about what we hope to do and what we want to do. But, we always end up in effect imposing our views on the Third World countries and then expect, because we have loaned them the money, that they should be successful based on our views. We have done more to harm Central American and South American countries because of that attitude than we have to help them.

Sometimes it is best to have people help themselves, let them define what they need in terms of help rather than impose a regime that we think because it may or may not be appropriate for us, it certainly has to be appropriate for them. We have not been a good model, and if anybody wants any evidence of that, just examine what is happening in this country today. It is very

interesting to hear the Liberals and Conservatives squabble over who is responsible for the mess. I do not understand the basis of that squabbling. They both believe in the same policies anyway. The difference is between tweedledum and tweedledee. One is in and the other is out.

• (1430)

**Mr. Milliken:** And you're tweedledummer.

**Mr. Barrett:** Mr. Member, I want to thank you for your very intelligent interruption. It is most appreciated. If you had anything positive to demonstrate, you would first of all explain why you have been such a failure across this country.

What are the options? The options are to understand that people in their own jurisdictions have the right and the responsibility to determine for themselves the direction in which they would like to go. If you examine the kind of pressures that have been created by multinational corporations through government instruments and through the IMF, to dictate to some of these smaller countries what they should do, you can understand why the policies have been so ruinous.

When does a debt come to an end? What are the consequences of the kind of policies we have been pursuing? Yes, there should be an all-party consensus in asking those questions. Certainly, we are not going to have that by extending the hours of debate and trying to ram the bill through. There is no thoughtful analysis of the mistakes we have made in this country and helping those people avoid them. I suppose the government's response, in terms of enhancing the view of the IMF, is to loan some of those countries John Crow. What an asset. We could send Crow down there. He just took a 27 per cent increase in his salary in a two-year period. Then, he tells the Canadian people that they have to cut to the bone and we have to fight inflation. His method of fighting inflation as a reflection of this government is take that whopping salary increase, and then deign to come into committee and say: "That is really not a committee matter."

I find it hypocritical, if I am allowed to use that word. I do not address that word to any single member. It is a collective admonition, particularly on the Conservatives. The admonition is that if this kind of debate—

**Mr. Boyer:** The committee looked into it.

**Mr. Barrett:** It is a rather pious comment from my good friend over there. Yes, the committee has pondered about this and yes, we have to make these moves.

It is still the agenda that is dominated by the multinational corporations and this government is a reflection of the policies of those large corporations to the detriment of small business in Canada and certainly to the detriment of the indigenous economy of many of the countries that we allegedly are trying to help by burdening them with these massive debts. These massive debts have not been dealt with in a frugal and fiscally responsible manner. We are imposing the same kind of thing and the corporations go on their merry way.

Sure the terms are going to be modified and sure, there is going to be a touch of patent humanitarian approach. The reality is you are imposing a fiscal regime that is essentially outmoded and would make Milton Friedman very happy. This government has been a failure with the same policies here in Canada and the same approach they are taking with the IMF.

**Mr. Boyer:** We've converted our loans to grants.

**Mr. Barrett:** You have done some of it.

**Mr. Boyer:** We've done it entirely and we've forgiven loans.

**Mr. Barrett:** I appreciate the interruptions because it makes for an unintelligible debate.

In pursuing that particular course of unintelligible debate in response to that particular interruption, even the head of Imperial Oil of Canada, who is not known to be a New Democratic Party supporter, has announced that grants such as my friend is talking about are foolish. He particularly mentioned what this government has done with Hibernia. He did that just yesterday.

He is talking about grants and the grants toward what kinds of programs and forgiving debts on the basis of a Milton Friedman right-wing kind of mentality and encouraging the Third World countries to mirror the kind of economic decisions made by this government. A grant is a grant is a grant, my friend. When Imperial Oil says Mobil should not get a grant, they are being converted

either to an understanding of basic economic theory or they are envious that they did not get the grant. Far be it from me to be suspicious of Imperial Oil. Imperial and other oil companies are in the Third World.

**Mr. Boyer:** We're talking about overseas assistance.

**Mr. Barrett:** Overseas assistance. That is the way you treat Newfoundland. You think they are overseas and you gave them that kind of overseas assistance on a forgivable grant to the oil companies. Newfoundland is not overseas, it is part of Canada. Get that straight.

Let us understand, when they talk about these kinds of grants to the oil companies, and they give us examples of the Third World countries, that they are denying them the opportunity to enhance what is the indigenous economy, the kind of economy that enhances the jurisdiction within which it should flourish and develop based on their own internal needs and their own sovereign goals, not an imposition by another multinational funded government, such as the one that we have here in Canada.

**Mr. Boyer:** Nonsense. Absolute nonsense.

**Mr. Barrett:** Nonsense, absolute nonsense, my friend says.

Let us take a look at the United Fruit Company in Third World countries and what they have done, along with the IMF loans. The United Fruit Company has monopolized the growing, the ownership, and the distribution from Third World countries of products such as bananas.

**Mr. Boyer:** This is a Canadian Parliament. Why don't you talk about Canadian companies?

**Mr. Barrett:** It is a Canadian Parliament and we are dealing with Canadian taxpayers' money that ultimately will have to pay for these grants.

The United Fruit Company, which is a beneficiary of the kind of policies sponsored by the IMF, has a monopoly over the growing of such products as bananas. Does the IMF ask to support the continuation of corrupt governments and massive debts and still sponsor programs that benefit such corporations as United Fruit? If one thinks that these things are unconnected, one is wrong. They are connected.

International corporations have influenced those governments. Look at the overthrow of the Arbenz government in 1954 in Guatemala and you can see the direct connection between the thrust of IMF loans, the kind of forgiveness in terms of grants, and the continuation of the control of those governments and the internal policies by the outside multinational corporations.

There has to be a separation before the grants have any meaning. There has to be a separation between the IMF, and the international corporations' agenda, and right-wing governments' agenda, and an understanding that all the money loaned should be going toward the construction of the indigenous economy of the countries that receive money.

There is nothing wrong with that philosophy. I am proud to belong to a party that espouses the philosophy of supporting the indigenous economy. But to continue to pour money into programs that have no bottom, only to support the international corporations that are usually exploiting the resources of those Third World countries makes one question the whole idea.

What is the response of the IMF in terms of collecting debts? Squeeze the local people more. The multinational corporations just squeeze the campucinos more, not ask more from the resources. The peasants will cough up the money. It is absurd. We should have a debate on what this money is being loaned for, and ultimately the direction we hope that people will decide for themselves, not do what we tell them to do.

I agree completely with my colleague, the member for Kamloops. He made an outstanding statement here today, an outstanding position. Frankly, if I were a government member, I would have listened and probably come to the conclusion that the Tory government should resign. Since they do not seem to agree I just wanted to make these few comments in support of the admonitions of my good friend from Kamloops and the wisdom with which he gave his remarks to this House.

**Mr. Dave Worthy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs) and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I have heard from the last couple of speakers the concern that they could not tell the difference between the Liberals and the Conservatives.

I would like to express one way that you can tell the difference. The hon. member for Ottawa South said that he was surprised that the NDP discussions have been bereft of any positive ideas that had any substance to add to this bill or to the discussion today. The difference between him and myself is that I am not the least bit surprised. This is something I think people from across the country are going to become more and more used to.

The discussion has referred to the International Monetary Fund many times today and the World Bank has also come into it. I wonder if the hon. members in the NDP understand the difference between the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and a food bank.

• (1440 )

I hope they would not go to a food bank asking for a mortgage or financing for one of their businesses, or any economic development.

For the information of those members, we have different kinds of banks for different functions. When it comes to trying to help the developing countries to develop their economies in the most positive and effective manner as possible, the International Monetary Fund has done an outstanding job.

I am really confused by what the members from the New Democratic Party are saying. I have to draw the conclusion that they feel that the International Monetary Fund is not doing an effective job and I assume they are prepared to withdraw their support from it.

I really ask the hon. member who has just spoken: does he not feel that the best thing that we can do, especially in these developing countries, is to try to provide them with the economy and the sustenance they require to provide the long–range economic support that the people of those countries need?

I guess the simplest way of saying it is we all know the best social program is a job. In that respect, I do not see any difference between the Third World countries and Canada. Providing all kinds of assistance, although very necessary and very noble does not necessarily go very far in providing them with a good economy that provides jobs.

The International Monetary Fund does that, and I would hope that the hon. member would support that.

**Mr. Barrett:** Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to allude to my good friend's comments on the number of food banks, and the difference between food banks and other banks.

I think we should put it into perspective, relative to my criticisms of this government. Right now in Canada there are more food banks than there are McDonald's restaurants. That is really a hallmark of the success of the Tory policy.

It was this government that bailed out the Canadian Commercial Bank to the tune of $800 million, while the food banks continue. The hon. member has the nerve to stand up and talk about giving jobs so people can self–sustain.

The government pays off the banks when they go broke. Eight hundred million dollars. People out there in food banks went bankrupt. What is the government doing for them, giving them another hill of beans and promises?

Because of the wisdom of my comments, I call a quorum. There are not enough people in here.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I will count the members present.

*And the count having been taken:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I now see a quorum.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I could point out to the House that the member who was speaking has demonstrated his blindness twice already today. Maybe he would like to try for three. He cannot even see the quorum when it exists.

**Mr. Barrett:** Mr. Speaker, I take the admonition from the member for Calgary West, and I realize that the Liberals saved the Tories again.

If anybody wants proof of a coalition, just watch the Liberals come in and save the government again. There is the evidence, but far be it from me to make a political comment in a Chamber like this.

If we bring politics into this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, there will be no holds barred, so I will refrain from making any political observation about the Liberals saving the Tories again. But could I say that, I would have.

I want to continue my remarks on questions raised by my good friend, the member for Cariboo. He wanted to make the analogy, as he said, about the various institutions that are available for loaning money. One of the institutions that I pointed out that exist in this country to

help banks when they go broke is the Canadian taxpayer by way of the Conservative government.

If my friend is serious about the admonition of this House that the best way to create a better economy is indeed to have jobs, then what is the justification for bailing out the Canadian Commercial Bank? Why take $800 million of taxpayers' money and give it to the people who have the God-given right to go broke? I thought free enterprise meant taking a risk. The only people who take a risk in this system, in this way of loaning money, are the ordinary men and women of this country who end up at food banks, while the big banks are bailed out. I wanted to deal with that because he raised it.

As to the question of the options of the money, of course there are options for money. There are always conditions no matter what the options are, whether it is the International Monetary Fund or anywhere else. It is the conditions we are talking about.

The conditions are onerous when there is dictation down to the recipient, rather than listening to the request from the recipient and going along with their own indigenous economic needs, rather than imposing our own ideas that do not work too well for us.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions and comments are now terminated.

Is the House ready for the question?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The first question is on the motion of Mr. Reid. 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. Paproski):** Therefore the question is on the main motion. 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 referred to a legislative committee.

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Shall I call it three o'clock?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** It being three o'clock, this House stands adjourned until Monday next at one o'clock, pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

At 2.49 p.m. the House adjourned.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Monday, December 10, 1990**

The House met at 1 p.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS (BILLS)

[*English*]

### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Thursday, November 8, consideration of the motion of Mr. Young (Beaches—Woodbine) that Bill C-225, an act to amend the Public Service Employment Act (staff of members of the House of Commons), be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

And on the amendment of Mr. Funk:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following therefor:

"Bill C-225, an act to amend the Public Service Employment Act (staff of members of the House of Commons), be not now read a second time but that the Order be discharged, the bill withdrawn and the subject-matter referred to the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations."

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have an opportunity to speak to the House today on this item of Private Members' Business, a bill put forward by the hon. member for Beaches—Woodbine in relation to the Public Service Employment Act.

The thrust of the bill is one which most people would be content with, that is, it attempts to provide some degree of security of employment for individuals who are employed or become employed with members of Parliament and it provides a mechanism whereby, under certain conditions, employees in the year after they work for members of Parliament, can find their way into Public Service employment.

It is worth pointing out that other employees of members, who happen to be ministers in the government or the Leader of the Opposition, now, under the Public Service Employment Act, can be hired and taken into the Public Service, with priority over others, upon their termination.

• (1310 )

The difficulty, and it is a significant difficulty, that I and my colleagues have with this bill is that it sets up a very obvious distinction between employees of members of Parliament, who are themselves competent, and everyone else in the country who would be, who wants to be or who wishes to apply for a position in the Public Service.

What the bill actually does is to wedge or shoehorn into the Public Service those individuals who for whatever reason find themselves unemployed, including because of their member with whom they are employed not being re-elected. It shoehorns them or wedges them into the Public Service.

We in Canada take great pride in our Public Service. We have a a very professional, competent Public Service right across this country which prides itself on being non-political, very specialized and dedicated. The stream of new recruits into the Public Service stays the healthiest if that stream of new blood comes from the public at large.

What this bill does is take a competent group of individuals, the staff people of members of Parliament, and provides them with a privilege to continue on in the employment of the Public Service.

We have three conditions stated under which that could occur. The three conditions are that the staff member has worked with a member of Parliament for three years, that he or she qualified while working with him or her to be a public servant and finally, that he or she enter the Public Service within a year after the termination of employment.

We do not have a problem with individuals who are a part of the Public Service who leave it to work with a member of Parliament or a minister's office and to take a

leave of absence for that purpose and then go back to the Public Service. That happens now. I think it functions reasonably well.

I do not know whether there are practical problems that exist in that field, but that particular mechanism appears to serve public servants well now. It serves MPs, ministers and other functionaries in the House of Commons, but this bill goes much further than that.

It provides an additional privilege to employees of MPs in the House of Commons to seek secure employment with the Public Service immediately following their employment with an MP.

I want to address one context in which this bill should be seen. That is the attempt by the government now to radically change and update the Public Service. It flies by the name Public Service 2000. In that process, there has been shown clearly to be a real need on the part of the government to consult more broadly with the Public Service. It has failed to do that.

I am of the view that we in the House of Commons, while desiring very much to be fair to our employees and to be fair to the Public Service, should not be undertaking a wedge mechanism such as this bill without consulting extensively with the Public Service Commission and and the employee associations and unions that operate there.

That is one significant omission in terms of this bill and within the context of reform within the Public Service. It is a shame that that has not occurred. I know there are some who would say: "Let us send this bill to committee and work with it from there", but I believe very firmly that the bill should have started with a base of consultation and then moved into the House of Commons. The New Democratic Party member who proposed this amendment has failed to do so, oddly enough, with the Public Service sector and the union sector. It is an unfortunate omission.

As a result, we commend positive consultative initiatives in Public Service 2000. Perhaps some day in the future this might be addressed. This is a mechanism which perhaps should be addressed in the future, but we on this side of the House feel that we cannot support it at this time.

**Mr. Dennis Mills (Broadview—Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, I am a little concerned about my party's position on this bill. I can remember when we were in power from 1980 to 1984. I can also remember many good, hard working and loyal people. They did not work for ministers. I was fortunate. I worked for a Prime Minister. However, there were many good people who worked for members of Parliament. When we were not returned to office, naturally many of these assistants to members of Parliament were out on the street.

When a new government takes power and you go and knock on the door of the member of Parliament, first you are asked for your c.v. If you said "I am Dennis Mills. I worked in the Langevin Block for four years and would like to work in your office, Mr. Paproski"—I should say you would be one of the exceptions, Mr. Speaker—I can tell you right now you would be out of business.

This bill is a good one in that it encourages people to work for members of Parliament. It is almost an incentive. I would like to see people have experience with members of Parliament before they even qualify to enter the Public Service. That is the real test as to whether or not a person has the endurance, the courage, the passion, and the commitment to put up with what is required to do the work that we have to do in this House, in committees, and in other places.

I am nervous that reverse discrimination will develop if we do not support this bill. In 1984 many of my friends were good, hard working public servants who happened to work in members' offices, providing secretarial, support services, et cetera. However, because they were with the Liberal government at that time they were not given the opportunity to work on the government side. There is a natural element of trust involved here. If Chrysler advertising uses one firm, Ford does not tend to use the same one. That is just a basic, practical fact of life.

• (1320)

This bill, as I understand it, relates to persons who have served members of Parliament well. Obviously members of Parliament would not keep the person around for three years if they were not doing a good job. Working for a member of Parliament, especially in opposition, is certainly not nine to five, Monday to Friday. It is a tough job. We can never thank members of our support staff enough for the extra time and hours they put in.

If I lost my seat I would hate to think that people had no other opportunity in this city after working their guts out for me for three or four years because they happened to work for a Liberal. I think they are a natural for the Public Service of Canada. It should almost be a prerequisite. I do not see it as any special wedge.

When we talk about a stream of new blood, I think the Public Service should welcome the new blood that would come into the Public Service after working in an office of a member of Parliament. When one goes to work in the Public Service, one might go to work for the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, the Department of Communications or the Department of Employment and Immigration and ones work tends to be singular; but when one works for a member of Parliament, one never knows from one hour to the next what issue one has to face. Assistants to members of Parliament should be supported if after an election they opt for a Public Service job. I for one think that they should be given that opportunity, so I support this bill.

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the amendment since I have already spoken on the principal motion. I want to make it absolutely clear that there is certainly some misunderstanding in some people's minds about what this amendment is all about.

It refers the subject matter of the bill to committee for further study and essentially withdraws the bill. I am not sure it is entirely proper to withdraw a bill we are debating, to withdraw every single word of it and still assume that we have the bill before us for debate. Nonetheless, that is the motion, and I presume it has been ruled in order.

It is important to point out to my colleague who has just spoken what the bill does. The subject matter that he endorses is not to give staff of members of Parliament a chance at being employed in the Public Service but to give them priority over all others being employed in the Public Service.

It is important to recognize that the amendment to this bill asks that it be referred to committee. It has been brought forward with no consultations with the unions. We as a party have taken a very strong stand against the whole process of PS 2000, reform of the Public Service, because there has been no involvement of the unions and of the front line workers in developing the recommendations of the PS 2000 amendments to legislation and amendments to administrative procedures, which will substantially affect the working lives of a quarter of a million Canadians. It would be inconsistent for us to endorse, even in principle, this bill. We are now being asked to refer it to a committee so that it can be brought forward, possibly, as a somewhat amended piece of legislation.

I appreciate the difficult situation in which people are placed to work for members of Parliament, the immeasurable skills, both personal and technical, that they bring to that kind of employment, and the immense learning that they go through in a variety of fields. That would be helpful to the Public Service if they were there as employees.

However, many of those people are hired on the basis of their political affiliation with us, the right to be appointed to the public service on a priority basis, rather than on any objective assessment of merit. I do not think a bill which gives people priority in hiring over others within the Public Service who may be looking for a promotion to a position is a just bill. It is not something that is based on liberal principles of a federal Public Service based on opportunities for hiring, for promotion, and for transfers founded on one's ability, not on who one happens to know.

The member has said that it is important that people who have come to work for us have an opportunity to be employed in this city. It is evident from that comment that he still believes that most job opportunities in this region are in the Public Service. That is not true and has not been for many decades now. Less than 20 per cent of the employment in the Ottawa–Carleton region is in the Public Service.

It is vital to recognize that in the last few years, as a result of the downsizing program of the federal government and as a result of assuming that it can make scapegoats out of the Public Service, thousands of people have lost their jobs. Some 25,000 people have been affected by downsizing. Many of those people have worked for the Public Service, not for two or three years but for 10, 20, or 30 years. They find themselves unemployed at a time when seeking a new job is extremely difficult.

If anybody deserves priority over others to be put into a vacant position in the Public Service, it is somebody who has shown that kind of loyalty over decades, not someone who has come to work in the excitement and the political environment of Parliament Hill. They often come here as a political friend of a member and have not, with all respect, demonstrated the long-term commitment of many people who are now losing their jobs.

The government likes to say about people who lose their jobs that everybody has been accommodated and that mostly it has been through attrition. That is not the case at all. There are well over 20,000 people who have been disrupted, dislocated from their jobs, forced to accept a lesser job at a lesser salary, or left without a job. This is at a time when they are still paying a mortgage and they have two or three children in university. Their opportunities for re-employment are very slim, simply because of their age and their level of experience which makes them a more expensive person to employ for any other firm or for any Crown corporation, for that matter.

In light of all that, a bill that gives priority to our staff over all others is badly timed, to say the least, and is probably inappropriate at any time. We would be prepared to look at other options for providing some measure of security to parliamentary staff working in members' offices but not to disrupt career public servants, many of whom are now without a job, to accommodate our own staff.

• (1330 )

**Mr. Neil Young (Beaches—Woodbine):** Mr.Speaker, I have spoken on the bill, obviously, since it is my bill and I introduced it. I also encouraged another colleague of mine to move an amendment to the bill which would refer the subject matter to a committee. The reason I did this was for many of the reasons put forward by the previous speaker.

When this bill was first debated in 1984, it was introduced by a then Liberal member of Parliament who also happened to be the parliamentary secretary to a minister. The government at that time was not adverse to doing something about employees of members of Parliament.

Contrary to what the hon. member says, all people who work for members of Parliament are not necessarily political friends of the MP. I never met the people who work in my office before I hired them. If you take a look at the people on the Hill, there are many who have worked for many different members of Parliament for many, many years.

The question I want to address, in just a minute or two, is the very one that the previous speaker addressed. Everyone recognizes that staff who work for members of Parliament have absolutely no rights at all. They do not have the same rights as any other employee in this country, and that is to join a union of their choice. There is no legislation to prevent them from doing that, and that is not what the bill argues. But what I would argue is that members of Parliament who have participated in this debate have all expressed a view that they are sympathetic to the position in which staff of members of Parliament very often find themselves.

What I am saying is that the House should do with this bill what it agreed to do in 1984, that is, refer the subject matter to a committee to allow members of Parliament to have a fuller discussion on the merits of the problem. It would allow staff members of MPs to have a say and to express their concerns and it would allow any pertinent union to come before a committee to look at the matter.

The principle we are trying to address concerns the rights of staff who happen to work for a member of Parliament. They should have the same rights as every other Canadian employee; that is, the right to have some say about the working conditions while they are on the Hill working for an MP. That right should be recognized by members of Parliament, and Parliament should accord to those employees the same rights as every other Canadian who works off the Hill. I do not think that is unreasonable or too much to demand. I only find it regrettable that one or two members in the House during this debate tried to raise the issue as a partisan political question. I can quote the hon. member who spoke before me in *The Hill Times*.

I find it strange that I have never, as long as I have been in this House, found a Private Members' Bill attacked in such a way that even the motivation of the hon. member who put forward the Private Members' Bill has been questioned in the way in which it has been. I find that regrettable and I do not think it adds to either this debate or to the relationships between MPs in this House.

**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 the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** All those in favour of the amendment 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.

*During the ringing of the bells:*

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the division stands deferred until seven o'clock p.m. later this day. Therefore, I will suspend the sitting of the House until two o'clock this day.

The sitting of the House was suspended at 1.40 p.m.

---

### SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*Translation*]

### COMMUNITY RADIO

**Mr. Réginald Bélair (Cochrane—Superior):** Mr. Speaker, it seems that every time there is a budget cut, social and cultural programs are the first to suffer. What is happening to the subsidy program for community radio stations is no exception.



The Department of the Secretary of State's community radio stations assistance program, designed to establish French-language community stations in minority and Acadian communities, is the only source of federal funding on which these stations can draw for capital investment. This year's funds have been exhausted, which means that community radio stations in my riding *la radio de l'Épinette noire* and *la radio communautaire Kapnord Inc.* will not be able to develop at the same rate or may have to close down altogether.

Acadian and French-language minority communities are increasingly threatened by assimilation. The people in my riding feel that community radio is the best way for these communities to counter this threat. Community radio stations have made it their objective to reduce assimilation by giving French-speaking communities in Northern Ontario a chance to hear programs that reflect their local values.

* * *

[*English*]

### INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

**Mr. Ian Waddell (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate International Human Rights Day, the 42nd anniversary of the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

As a Canadian, I am proud of this country's past record on human rights issues. We are all proud. However, recently this record has fallen into some disrepute. In October, the UN human rights committee unanimously condemned Canada for failing to live up to the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Our record with respect to native peoples and refugee claimants came under particular fire from the UN.

The Mulroney government has failed to introduce long promised changes to the Human Rights Act here at home to protect gays and lesbians and disabled people against discrimination.

The government cut off funding without explanation for an independent human rights conference of equality seeking groups held each November for the past three years under the Court Challenges Program. Instead, it has organized a conference that is going on here in Ottawa at the moment by invitation only.

Surely, the present government should spend more energy preparing its long promised human rights legislation and less time on public relations exercises such as this week's conference.

* * *

## AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Walter Van De Walle (St. Albert):** Mr. Speaker, Canada's embargo on grain shipments to Iraq has eliminated our fifth largest export market. Canadians support the sanctions and rightly so. However, it is costing farmers hundreds of millions of dollars in lost grain sales. Farmers are paying the price.

Farm fuel prices are rapidly climbing as a result of the situation in the Middle East. This, combined with high mortgage costs, dwindling markets and low grain prices, is placing a severe economic burden on the agricultural community.

The uncertainty of the outcome of the GATT negotiations begs the question: How long will the United States and the European Common Market continue their subsidy wars? While Canadians enjoy an inexpensive food policy, farmers are paying the price.

I urge the federal and provincial governments to jointly announce at an early date new initiatives to address the plight of the farmers.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## TRIBUTE TO NATHALIE GIGUÈRE

**Mrs. Monique Tardif (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Supply and Services):** Mr. Speaker, swimmer Nathalie Giguère and her coach, Benoît Lebrun, were in the spotlight at the 1990 Athlete of the Year Gala in Quebec City. For her performance, Nathalie received the *Memoris d'or*, while her coach was named Coach of the Year.

At 17, this extraordinary swimmer from Charlesbourg won the gold medal for the 200 meter breast stroke in 1990 at the Commonwealth Games. At the present time, Nathalie is doing high-altitude training at Los Alamos, New Mexico, in preparation for the world championships in Perth, Australia.

A talented and disciplined athlete and a hard worker, Nathalie has always been thankful to those who over the years, helped her to develop this talent: her parents, her team and her coach.

Nathalie: Charlesbourg, Quebec City, the province of Quebec and Canada are proud of you and the *Memoris d'or* 1990 award which you truly deserved. Congratulations and the best of luck at the next world championships!

* * *

[*English*]

## BILL C-21

**Mr. Bob Wood (Nipissing):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about Bill C-21, the government's unemployment insurance bill.

It seems that the government did have the last laugh on Canadians after all. I refer specifically to the free trade debate. How many times did we hear that social programs, in Canada, were a sacred trust that would not be sacrificed? How many times did we hear that they would not be included in the negotiations? Did not the Prime Minister himself publicly make reference to his mother and say he would do nothing to infringe upon our social programs?

Let us look at the government's unemployment insurance bill. With this measure the government has withdrawn all together from contributing to the UI fund. This means that it is now up to the employee and employer to make up the difference. In these times of rising unemployment, millions of Canadians who genuinely need help will have a tougher time getting it. Moreover, how long does the government think it will take the business community to claim that it is at a disadvantage because companies in the U.S. do not shoulder the same costs? Perhaps our pension funds and Old Age Security program will be the next items up for bids. If the price is right, this government has shown that it will sell anything.

* * *

## INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS COUNCIL FOR THE GREEN CROSS

**Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that an important step in protecting the environment will be taken when the

International Business Council for the Green Cross meets in Moscow on January 16, 1991.

This council was created by the Global Forum of Spiritual and Parliamentary Leaders on Human Survival. The Green Cross was established in response to a challenge proposed by President Gorbachev to involve the business community in the forum's activities. It is designed to offer help to countries suffering from ecological troubles. The creation of such a body is important since it provides forward-looking businessmen a forum in which they can share ideas for a greener future.

This forthcoming meeting in Moscow will bring together prominent businessmen. It will be co-chaired by Mr. A. W. Klausen, former head of the World Bank, and leading Canadian businessman, Mr. Albert Reichman.

* * *

## THE LATE SENATOR HENRY HICKS

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, early this morning we received the very sad news that former senator and Nova Scotia Premier, Henry Hicks, along with his wife, Rosalie, died in an automobile accident.

Senator Hicks was a Nova Scotian of genuine passion and great intellect, who enjoyed a long and distinguished career in the arts and in the public service of his province and the country he loved so much.

Mr. Speaker, he was a Liberal early in his life and started campaigning for Liberal causes in his teens. A Rhodes scholar, Senator Hicks was first elected to the Nova Scotia House of Assembly at the age of 30. He was a cabinet minister at the age of 34 and premier of this great province at the age of 39, in 1954.

Upon leaving active political life, he later served as Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science at Dalhousie University and, thereafter became president of this very prestigious university.

In 1972, he was appointed to the Senate of Canada and retired earlier this year.

The measure of this man was enhanced by his warmth and by his personal approach toward the people and the province he loved so much.

Mr. Speaker, I extend on behalf of our party our sincere sympathy to his family and all those who mourn the untimely death of both Mr. and Mrs. Hicks.

* * *

## AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Ken Hughes (Macleod):** Mr. Speaker, last week in Brussels delegations from more than 100 nations witnessed the apparent inflexibility of the European Community on the question of agriculture. EC politicians appear to fear the fact that they need to change their common agricultural policy, or the CAP. The CAP continues to wreak havoc with producers around the world in countries like Canada, Australia, Argentina, all countries of the Cairns Group, as well as many very poor Third World nations.

• (1410 )

Let us hope this near collapse of the GATT talks will give EC leadership pause for reflection. Can they really afford to thumb their noses at the rest of the world over an issue of such relatively minor economic importance in their own nation states?

* * *

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville):** Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Finance first came to power, he promised to make the tax system fair. Instead, he has padded the pockets of his rich friends and picked the pockets of the poor.

Six years later he still claims he has made the tax system more fair in this country. Is it fair that those making over $250,000 a year pay less income tax while those making under $15,000 pay more income tax now?

The Minister of Finance must have a funny notion of what is fair because over 80 per cent of Canadians say he has failed in the most recent Gallup poll. Even most supporters of the Conservative Party said in the Gallup poll he has failed to make the tax system more fair.

The height of unfairness is the government's GST which will increase the burden on all Canadians, particularly those who are poor in our country. When will the Minister of Finance wake up from his dream world which is a nightmare to ordinary Canadians, stop playing

Scrooge, withdraw the GST and give ordinary Canadians something to celebrate during this Christmas season?

* * *

## INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

**Mr. J. W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury):** Mr. Speaker, today we are privileged to be joining people from around the world in celebrating International Human Rights Day, as well as marking the 42nd anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

This year, our commemoration coincides with the National Conference on Human Rights and Canadian Solidarity being held in Ottawa at this very time. The conference is being hosted by the Minister for Multiculturalism and Citizenship and is focusing on the importance of human rights in the nation-building process. Representatives from every sector of Canadian society, in every field of human rights, are taking part.

Canada has long been considered a world leader in the area of human rights. In 1986 we became the first nation to be presented with the Nansen Medal by the United Nations in recognition of our efforts to provide refugee relief.

The present government is keenly aware that human rights continues to be a vitally important issue for Canadians. Here at home there are many issues to address; literacy, the environment, the rights of women. For example, it was in recognition of the rights of children that Canadian signed the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child last May.

Prime Minister Mulroney also co-sponsored the first World Summit for Children at the United Nations in September.

Canadians have indeed made significant strides in ensuring that human rights and freedoms are the foundation stone of our citizenship.

* * *

## NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, my constituents want me to debunk three myths being perpetrated by the NDP and their friends in the media.

The first is that there are only two sides to an issue, the right side and the wrong side, and that they are never wrong. The more we look, the less we see there.

The second is that they have all the answers on the environment. Premier Bob Rae stood at the Keele Valley landfill site and said: "No more expansion". Now, his minister says expansion could take place and without an environmental assessment.

The third is that the NDP has the only leader in the House with a smile on her face. Well, Mr. Speaker, that myth will be history tonight when the electors of Beauséjour have made their choice. When Jean Chrétien enters this House, the smiles on this side of the House are going to stretch all the way from here to 24 Sussex Drive.

* * *

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Dave Worthy (Cariboo-Chilcotin):** Mr. Speaker, the recent lack of balance in television news coverage of the CBC reorganization is of concern to me and should be of concern to more Canadians. Biased reporting can harm Canadian unity by fanning the fires of regional anger. There are those in television who asked the questions: Why were the following issues not addressed and the following questions not asked.

Radio covers all communities, both urban and rural, and is an effective way of serving the regional interests. Yet I heard no mention of the conscious decision by CBC to retain these radio regional routes.

No one asked on behalf of the thousands of communities which do not have community TV service why they are less deserving. Why should the people who live in these communities be picking up the tab? Why was no one asking the representatives of the communities who do enjoy local service why they were not suggesting ways that they could pick up the tab? Too many predicted that the loss of service to these 11 communities could damage national unity. Why? How? It is not obvious to me. Why was it so easily accepted by the journalists?

Unfortunately we live in tough times, and tough times mean tough choices. I commend the CBC management for facing its responsibility and making those decisions.

### THE SENATE

**Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Mr. Speaker, once again the Senate has brought disrepute upon itself and the Upper House has hit a new low.

Last week Liberal Senator George van Roggen attempted to entertain his fellow senators by telling sexist jokes. It is disgusting that an allegedly respectable individual, a privileged man, could use his privilege to demean all women by reinforcing sexual stereotypes. Once again we have men who should know better contributing to the inequality in our society.

Sexist jokes are part of the control mechanism to keep women in their place, to reinforce the view that women are here for men's use and abuse. We are not. The women of Canada see nothing funny in this locker-room mentality. It is always offensive, but it is inexcusable coming from a Liberal senator in the Parliament of Canada.

For him to make these remarks the day after the memorial services marking the Montreal massacre demonstrates the depth of his insensitivity.

New Democrats have called on the justice minister to have mandatory gender sensitivity training for the judiciary. It is obvious that these sensitivity sessions should also be extended to the Senate. What Senator van Roggen should consider today is an apology.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has exceeded her time.

* * *

[*Translation*]

### HOUSEHOLD MAILERS

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1990, after Canada's Minister of Finance brought down his Budget, I decided to do my bit and take the advice given to Canadians: tighten your belts. I believe I have made a contribution towards improving the state of the economy, especially by reducing my household mailers from four to one, and by no longer mailing 2,000 Christmas cards to my constituents.



Mr. Speaker, the cheapest way to send those greetings today is to speak directly to the people of Abitibi and wish them a Merry Christmas and a Happy and prosperous New Year.

---

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

### THE GREEN PLAN

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

We understand that tomorrow, after months and months of broken promises and more and more delays, the government will finally be announcing its so-called green plan on the environment. I predict and I know that Canadians will be disappointed once again.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister admit today that rather than the $5 billion comprehensive plan originally promised, the plan will be for billions of dollars less and it will not even begin to be implemented until months and months from Toronto—months and months from tomorrow.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Gray (Windsor West):** I guess politics is something on the minds of all of us, Mr. Speaker.

Isn't this so-called green plan really to improve the political environment for this government and not the real environment for Canadians?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition will have to wait just one more day. I hope that he will be patient, because I am sure the green plan that will be announced by my colleague, the Minister of the Environment, will be very well worth waiting for.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, first this government began dismantling VIA Rail, then the post office, then Air Canada, and last week the CBC. Now it is clear the government is starting to wimp out on its commitments on the environment.

Why won't the Deputy Prime Minister admit that this green plan has nothing in it on the subject of municipal

infrastructure, the need of cities and towns across this country to have funding from the federal government to help them fight pollution by improving their water and sewage systems?

Why won't the government listen to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and recognize that this has to be in its green plan and that we need a national program to deal with what is a national problem that needs help for solution from this government?

• (1420)

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition was a member of a government that had been in office for 20 to 25 years. It had every opportunity in the world to put in place an infrastructure program, and all it did was reduce spending to the provinces and to the municipalities.

We are not going to get into a debate on the green plan. The hon. member will have ample opportunity to examine and comment on it tomorrow, and I am sure he will not be disappointed.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the government has already misled the Canadian people about its policies on the environment. Funding for the Green Plan will be far below the $5 billion originally committed. I want to ask the Deputy Prime Minister why his government refuses to upgrade municipal infrastructures and deal responsibly with the people of Quebec. And will he tell Canadians when his government will finally realize that the environment is important to the well-being of the entire country?

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, the supplementary is identical to the second question, and therefore my answer is the same as that given by the Deputy Prime Minister.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister.

The Deputy Prime Minister will know that every Canadian municipality across this country has called upon the Government of Canada to cost share in a $15 billion program. Last night I saw and I read the green plan, and there is nothing in that plan which addresses that fundamental problem.

Why is the Government of Canada wimping out with regard to supporting our municipalities concerning water and sewer? Is that not a fundamental program of fighting for the environment?

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I would think that members of the opposition should join with Canadians everywhere in applauding this government for putting into place a program which will be announced tomorrow. It is a long-term environmental action plan, the first such program ever announced in this country, the sort of program that does not exist in very many countries in the world.

Furthermore, what is so important about this program is that it has been put together as a result of consultation with Canadians from coast to coast. It will be the kind of program tomorrow which responsible Canadians, wherever they may be—and maybe even the opposition will join in—will applaud this government for putting in place, the kind of long-term plan we have long needed.

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister.

In view of that answer and in view of the fact that the parliamentary secretary has now admitted that there is no money for municipal infrastructure, I want to ask the Deputy Prime Minister why the green plan has nothing with regard to a 20 per cent reduction by the year 2005 of national 1988 $CO_2$ emission levels, why it fails to have a Canadian environmental bill of rights, why it fails to have a national carbon tax, why it fails to bring western provinces into a national acid rain reduction program, and why the Government of Canada has reduced the moneys for the green plan from $5 billion to $3 billion, a 40 per cent reduction? Why?

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, one of the things that seems to happen around here on Monday when it has been a quiet weekend is that the opposition parties do the same thing that our friends in the gallery do: they write speculative stories about what will come tomorrow because they cannot wait in anticipation.

I would suggest, therefore, that the hon. member show some patience. We will be addressing this issue tomorrow when a specific program will be put in place. I know the hon. member will be pleased by what he sees.

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister.

This is the government that last week offered special briefings on the green plan to select members of the media but offers members of Parliament a lockup tomorrow morning. Tomorrow is going to be a public relations exercise to try to cover up the possible election of Jean Chrétien later today. We know what is going on.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Fulton:** Mr. Speaker, I am the one who had a tooth pulled this morning. It looks like the Liberals are a little nervous.

My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister because the legacy of this government is business profits first, environment last. Across this country our forests are falling to clear-cuts and they are not being replanted. Our air, water, and land are becoming increasingly polluted. Since the process began $5 billion of new money was promised, a promise we now know will be broken tomorrow because of the briefings given to the press last week. But some promises must be kept, and I would like to ask the Deputy Prime Minister if they will be kept.

Would he confirm the dates for the implementation of specific targets and timetables for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and acid precipitation. While he is at it, would he confirm the dates for implementation of a natural resources inventory on the state of our environment and on the state of pollution of our environment?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is getting carried away with his presumptions. I would suggest to him that he wait until tomorrow when the document is presented. He will have a chance to have looked at it, and then he can comment on it in a knowledgeable fashion.

Certainly it would be premature and totally disregarding of the institution of Parliament to have the debate on the green plan one day before it is officially unveiled.

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, that answer would have some value and some validity if the government had not pre-briefed certain select media last week before letting members of the House know what is in the plan.

My supplementary question is for the Deputy Prime Minister as well.

[*Translation*]

Even if the Plan doesn't have the money that was promised and in fact confirmed—

[*English*]

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Fulton:** Oh, I am not allowed to speak French now.

[*Translation*]

As I was saying, at a briefing session given last week to a select group of journalists, the minister can still table a bill to protect the environment. Could the minister give the House the assurance that an environmental charter of rights will be included in the Green Plan he will table tomorrow?

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I think all members will have to wait until tomorrow.

[*English*]

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. He knows, because everyone who has studied the issue of national parks in this country knows it, that if we do not complete the national parks system by the year 2000 our opportunity to do so will have been forgone.

Would the Deputy Prime Minister confirm what has been confirmed prior to today and prior to tomorrow, that the national parks system will be completed by the year 2000 and that two new national parks per year will be created between now and the year 2000?

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that this government has made a commitment to the preservation of Canada's environment in the form of national parks, a

commitment which exceeds that of any other administration in Canadian history.

I can furthermore confirm that that commitment will be kept.

* * *

## GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Skeena and the NDP for their confidence in the candidacy of Mr. Jean Chrétien today.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Foster:** It is nice to see them on side.

I want to put a question to the Deputy Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture who knows that Canadian farmers are the big losers in the GATT negotiations and the suspension of those negotiations last Friday. For instance, U.S. farmers are largely insulated from the impact of these by the U.S. farm bill, whereas Canadian farmers, especially those grain producers in western Canada, have had their support programs cut by 50 per cent during the last two years.

What is the Deputy Prime Minister going to do for western producers and other producers across this country in the face of the collapse of the GATT negotiations and the suspension?

• (1430 )

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear to the hon. member and to all hon. members that this round of Uruguay negotiations have not been suspended. In fact they are continuing and will continue into the first part of the new year in the hope and expectation that there can be some resolution to the very difficult agricultural file. To suggest that the talks have been suspended or that they have collapsed is certainly premature.

We, as a nation, led by the Minister for International Trade, and our very competent and able negotiators, will be there to contribute to that process in every way, shape or form. We did indicate, and I have indicated before, that even if we were to succeed in all aspects of the GATT round, there still would be the need to put in place some long-term solutions, particularly in the area of safety nets.

I did have the opportunity to meet with the provincial ministers of agriculture to advance the negotiations on the GRIP and NISA proposal, which is the long-term safety net and stabilization program. I am satisfied that progress is being made and I hope that we will be able to achieve a conclusion of all the outstanding details within the next week or 10 days.

**Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Last year the government agreed to give the United States access to the Canadian market for ice-cream and yogurt after the GATT negotiations this fall. Now that the negotiations have been suspended, or at least put in limbo for the next several weeks, I want to know if the government plans to allow access for processed dairy products from the United States, like ice-cream and yogurt. If the government is going to do this, how is it going to see that Canadian producers survive because they do not have access to the U.S. market?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is wrong in his assumption. We did not agree to give the United States access to the ice-cream and yogurt market. We did say that we would be prepared to sit down and negotiate, but it would have to be within the terms of the over-all objectives achieved through the MTN.

After all, we did lose a GATT panel on the issues. The hon. member is a great fan of the GATT in this particular case and I can assure him that we will not negotiate any access with the Americans until such time as the MTN is concluded. The hon. member knows as well that the position we advanced with regard to the Canadian agriculture position at the MTN was fully consistent with his goals and objectives and the goals and objectives of Canadian agriculture. It would be commensurate, and reciprocal with us getting access to the American market under their removal of the section 22 waiver.

* * *

## NORTHERN TAX BENEFITS

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. Last Friday, when he hoped that no one would notice, the Minister of Finance announced tax changes that have the effect of denying tax benefits worth $50

million to 100,000 residents of northern and isolated communities in Canada. Fifty thousand of those citizens of northern and isolated communities live in 572 communities on the island of Newfoundland. They have lost tax benefits worth thousands of dollars per family.

My question for the Deputy Prime Minister is the following. How can the Government of Canada justify a northern and isolated tax regime that pays benefits to a Newfoundlander employed in Fort McMurray but denies benefits to a Newfoundlander unemployed in an isolated community like Harbour Deep that can only be reached during the winter months by helicopter? What kind of isolated and northern benefit regime is that?

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, the task force made a report in late 1989 with a recommendation of a single zone across Canada for tax benefits in northern and isolated communities.

At that time, tremendous consultation went on between the Minister of Finance and the affected communities from coast to coast.

The evidence presented to the task force and to the minister in his consultations which took place with various communities affected, was that the only way in which it was fair to give these benefits was, in fact, to do it in a zone and not community by community. Community by community was completely inequitable. It did not work.

In the case of Newfoundland itself, the only way it could possibly be given isolated benefits is on a community by community basis, which was recommended against by most people who appeared before the commission.

Therefore, the island of Newfoundland itself will not receive those benefits. Labrador will.

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte):** Mr. Speaker, what the member fails to say is that when the minister set up this commission and review, he said that its recommendations should be revenue neutral.

What he does not say is that the Government of Canada is saving $50 million on the backs of some of the poorest, most isolated people who live in this country.

I ask the question again, and I want the minister to consider it in the name of tax fairness. How is it fair to pay a northern tax benefit, supposedly predicated on the notion that it costs more to live in certain areas, to people who live in a low unemployment region like Fort McMurray that has an airport, hospital, educational facilities, regularly scheduled flights in and out, government facilities, and not pay a benefit to isolated communities that can only be reached by helicopter where unemployment is high and where services are non-existent?

How is that tax fairness? Fifty per cent of all the cuts nationally are in one province, the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Explain that.

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, the people who he is talking about do not pay taxes. If you don't pay taxes, you don't get a tax benefit from this system. A person has to be earning money and it has to be taxable income before he or she receives it.

The hon. member is just caterwauling at somebody else. He is not even listening to the answer. He is showboating again.

* * *

## GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Agriculture.

In the meeting that he referred to in Brussels last week, he promised that he would bring in the third line of defence, cash grants and other income supports since GATT had been suspended.

The prairie pools had indicated at one point that there was a $1 billion shortfall in grain income for this year on the prairies alone. Does the minister agree with that assessment of income shortfall? Does he plan on an early payout, or will he continue to allow grain farmers to be driven out of business?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I repeat once again, this GATT round has not been suspended. It continues. Work will continue, particularly on the agricultural negotiations. It is hoped that eventually there will be a successful conclusion achieved. I say that to the hon. member, recognizing and I am sure appreciating his frustration over the fact that there was not more progress.

I indicated as well in answer to an earlier question that we are moving ahead with the establishment of a safety net and stabilization program which will provide for a gross revenue insurance protection plan as well as a net income stabilization plan. We are very close to putting that agreement in place.

It will be in place for the 1991–92 crop year. I have also indicated, and I repeat here to the hon. member, that when that is done, we will trigger the third line of defence, which will analyze the depth of moneys that are required to look at the debt situation and whatever restructuring may be required to look at inputs and a whole host of things.

• (1440 )

But there is a mechanism for that which involves the provincial governments, the federal government and the industry itself. We will use that mechanism to determine the level of assistance that may be required to supplement the GRIP and NISA proposal.

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** The minister knows full well that Canadian grain farmers require assistance right now. The minister has indicated that he intends to bring in plans soon to begin the implementation of the farm safety needs program.

Will an immediate cash payment to grain farmers be part of that implementation program?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that this spring we provided $500 million worth of emergency cash assistance which was supplemented by the provinces.

We provided a cash flow enrichment program which provided interest–free loans on farm stored grain, which cost the federal government something in the order of $95 to $100 million.

We are putting in place the long–term GRIP and NISA program. We are triggering the third line of defence to see whatever assistance may be necessary to supplement that. I think that is a pretty full agenda. It demonstrates clearly that we are working with the provinces and with the producers to try to find the best programs that will not only meet the immediate need, but will, as well, provide a long–term solution, which I am sure the hon. member would welcome very much.

* * *

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of multiculturalism and citizenship. Today is Human Rights Day. This government's record on human rights is abysmal. Just ask aboriginals, the disabled, visible minorities and others. Yet this government callously ignored the recommendations from both the Standing Committee on Human Rights and those of the human rights commissioner.

On this Human Rights Day, will this government agree to reconsider and adopt the recommendations contained in the standing committee report on human rights and the status of disabled persons?

**Hon. Gerry Weiner (Secretary of State of Canada and Minister of State (Multiculturalism and Citizenship)):** Mr. Speaker, we are very pleased to receive the standing committee report. We did respond positively to the recommendations that were brought forward.

We have already begun a complete review of legislation. At least 12 pieces of legislation will have to be examined carefully and important amendments brought forward. We have already started that process.

We announced at the same time a post–censal survey for disabled, a very important process to help in our understanding of the gravity of the situation.

We immediately put forward a senior committee of deputy ministers chaired by the Under–Secretary of State to bring forward a strong cross–government commitment. I have a feeling that the standing committee may be saying something today. I will await their report with interest. We will respond in the appropriate way.

**Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that the chair of that standing committee will probably be reporting that the standing committee would like the minister to review the report, Sir.

The minister is presently co–chairing a human rights conference in Ottawa this very weekend. Human rights is about people who do not have a voice and yet this conference was by invitation only.

Given that many groups and individuals were denied access to this conference, will the minister explain whether this was censorship by mistake or by design?

**Hon. Gerry Weiner (Secretary of State of Canada and Minister of State (Multiculturalism and Citizenship)):** Mr. Speaker, the doors were open; tickets or passes were not asked for. Indeed, there were many seats available for those who wanted to come and join us.

We did send out over 500 invitations across the country. We wanted to get a cross section of NGOs, academics, business leaders and people from the labour movement. We believe that we can do better. That is why we came together. We have important challenges facing us. They are new and emerging challenges. We are trying to build a partnership, a coalition. We are trying to build Canadian solidarity. I believe the member will recognize that, at least, today is the beginning. This opportunity to examine human rights in a very open manner will certainly mean that more people have a better understanding of what actually is taking place and what takes place around the world, as well.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## EMPLOYMENT

**Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint–Léonard):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. Quebec has lost 80,000 jobs in the past six months. According to the economists, there will be further job losses next year, including at least 40,000 in Quebec, for a total of 127,000. Could the Deputy Prime Minister tell the House today what measures he intends to take to find jobs for 127,000 Quebecers who will be jobless in 1991?

[*English*]

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, the full range of our job programs are available to Quebec. I am very proud to say that under Bill C–21, on which we will have some announcements to make in the next month or so, I am sure that the hon. member will be pleased to see the kinds of things we will be doing. For example, we have a number of programs for older workers, for social assistance recipients, and so on. I hope that he will applaud what we will be able to do.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint–Léonard):** The following is a supplementary question, and it is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. Does she realize that in the Montreal region, some schools have not given exams in the past two weeks because some students don't have anything to eat, as a result of the policies concerning poor families which this government has created in the past six years? Exactly what does she intend to do, not through Bill C–21, but specifically for poor families in the Montreal area who can't feed their children? What does she intend to do?

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, we have many programs that deal with poverty. The program designed for poor people under Bill C–21, the Canadian training strategy, will help fight poverty in Montreal and other Canadian cities.

* * *

[*English*]

## THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. About 20 minutes ago, British Columbia's Minister of the Environment, John Reynolds, resigned as a result of some statements he made when he appeared before a parliamentary standing committee here, last Tuesday. He indicated, before the standing committee, that there would be full public hearings into Alcan's Kemano II project. When he returned to British Columbia, he attempted to reverse himself and has now subsequently resigned.

Could the Deputy Prime Minister advise the House whether or not he is aware of the circumstances that led to Mr. Reynolds' resignation, and whether or not he is now prepared to announce that the Government of Canada will conduct full, public hearings into Alcan's Kemano II project?

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the differences which occurred in the committee last week between the hon. member and the minister, and which have subsequently been debated throughout the press in British Columbia, have nothing whatsoever to do with this House.

With respect to Kemano, itself, I can remind the hon. member, as was indicated on earlier occasions, that the project itself was studied. There was a panel which examined it very thoroughly and the public had an opportunity to participate in that process. It is the opinion of the government and the opinion of the relevant authorities in the province of British Columbia that the agreement that was signed with Alcan was consistent with the spirit of the EARP guidelines order.

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. I hope the government does not dig a hole any deeper than it already has. Five Ministers of Fisheries in a row promised full public hearings into Alcan's Kemano II project. The present Prime Minister, in writing, promised that there would be full public hearings into the Kemano II project.

On October 12, this government exempted the Kemano II project from full public hearings, the only project in Canadian history ever exempted.

Having learned from Rafferty–Alameda, having learned from the Oldman, and hopefully having learned in relation to the James Bay II and Point Aconi, would the Deputy Prime Minister show some justice and show some leadership on the day before the Green Plan and announce there will be full public hearings into the largest hydro project presently under way in Canada?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

• (1450 )

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, this project has been the subject of a detailed examination of fish, fish habitat, and other environmental issues.

I remember, as a member of Parliament, sitting in the House and seeing that member congratulate the then Minister of Fisheries and Oceans when he introduced the Kemano measures that were announced when the agreement was signed with the province of British Columbia. It is nice today for this NDPer to sit on both sides of the fence, but he should come clean with Canada and tell the people that he approved of that a couple of years ago.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## POVERTY

**Mr. David Walker (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

The minister knows that the new reality in Canada is that 1.4 million people are using food banks and 40 per cent of those people are children. The minister, when asked about this in the House in the past, has given a lecture on federal–provincial relations, but the Canada Assistance Plan, which the federal government operates, has guaranteed adequate assistance to those in need. That is a guarantee made by the Parliament of Canada.

Can the minister tell us today what his government means by adequate assistance when so many people cannot feed themselves, clothe themselves, or house themselves?

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** I am pleased to do precisely that, Mr. Speaker. The commitment of the government is to do everything it can to eliminate poverty in Canada.

During the tenure of this government important progress has been made in terms of lifting Canadians out of poverty and, as long as any Canadian remains in poverty, it will not be satisfied. The government wants to see continued measures being taken to give poor people the ability to support themselves. It will continue as well

to have in place a social safety net which will provide for those people who are most in need.

**Mr. David Walker (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Labour.

As the minister knows, one of the major contributors to poverty in Canada is the low minimum wage. If a single mother with one child in my constituency in Winnipeg worked for the federal government at $4 an hour minimum wage, she would have to work 87.5 hours a week just to reach the poverty level as defined by the government.

The minister has not changed the rate of minimum wage for the federal government since 1986. What is the government waiting for? When will we hear about a new minimum wage for the poor of Canada?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Labour and Minister of State (Transport)):** Mr. Speaker, the question of the federal minimum wage has been a focus for concern for quite some time, but we must remember that the number of Canadians effected by federal minimum wage regulations is between 1 and 1.5 per cent. We are considering the circumstances under which the minimum wage, which now applies almost exclusively to part-time employees, might have the effect of eliminating those positions instead of improving the situation of Canadians, thus making matters worse instead of better.

* * *

## GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State (Agriculture). The GATT talks in the Uruguay Round are deadlocked. The Europeans don't seem to want to budge from their position on farm subsidies, and the Americans' strategy to isolate the EEC was not successful. My question is this: Considering what is at stake in these negotiations for the economy of this country, and especially agriculture in Quebec and in Abitibi-Témiscamingue, does Canada intend to take the necessary steps to again try and break this deadlock?

**Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture)):** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is aware of the fact that the Canadian government made every effort last week to have a favourable conclusion to the Uruguay Round. Negotiations are continuing. They have not stopped. They will continue in January and February.

I would like to point out that Canadian farm producers from all parts of the country, west, centre and east, have remained united behind the Canadian position. Furthermore, the Premiers and Ministers of Agriculture and International Trade of all the provinces have remained solidly behind the Canadian position, and I believe this should help us while we are waiting for future developments in early January and February, when further progress can be made. Mr. Speaker, all this is thanks to the fact that this government has always consultated with farm producers and Agriculture ministers in this country. That is how we govern and that is how we will continue to govern.

* * *

[*English*]

## POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

**Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Indian Affairs. The minister will know that one way to break out of the poverty cycle is through improved education. In spite of that, the minister and his department are withholding funds for post-secondary education for the Inuit communities of northern Labrador.

My question very simply is: Why? Why now, when unemployment is one the rise? Why now, when education could be a passport to a new future? Why is the minister withholding funds under a legally binding agreement with the Inuit of Labrador that would help those Labrador Inuit young people?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member raised this question. I want to assure him that the government is not withholding funds. In fact, we are committed and I am delighted to say the enrolment in our post-secondary program is exceeding all expectations. This is a piece of very good news across Canada. Aboriginal young people are going on to university and seeking higher education. Our funding proposals for the coming year were not adequate to deal with the demand. At the same time, we had to have the enrolment reports

completed and submitted as a basis for setting the budgets.

I am assured by my officials that adequate funding will be made available to the Labrador Inuit Association and all other first nations in Canada who require adequate assistance for post-secondary education.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador):** Mr. Speaker, the problem is the question of timing. Unless the funding is available now, those students will not be able to be guaranteed their seats in this coming semester. It is a question of timing. The funds have to be there now.

Will the minister commit today to ensure that funding is there for those Labrador Inuit young people who want to enrol in this coming semester after Christmas? Will he guarantee that?

**Hon. Thomas Siddon (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, indeed, I can do that.

In fact, the enrolment of Inuit post-graduate students and the university students from the Labrador area has doubled from 85 to over 160 in the present year. We have made commitments confirmed in the last day or two to the effect that funding to the end of January is fully committed and the balance will be available before the end of the school term.

* * *

## FORESTRY

**Mr. J. W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question directed to the Minister of Forestry.

The Commons sub-committee on forestry has recently presented its report to Parliament, entitled *The Forests of Canada—The Federal Role*. The main thrust of that report calls for a national planning vision for Canada's forests, in both economic and environmental perspectives, to be convened through the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers in a partnership approach between federal and provincial governments. I understand that the federal Minister of Forestry is chairman-designate of the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers for the coming year. My question to him is two-fold.

Does the minister subscribe to and support the proposal from the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers to lead in developing such a vision plan for sustainable forestry development in Canada, and what steps will he be taking in the coming months as chairman of the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers to initiate such a long-term planning process for both economic and environmental goals in Canada's forests?

**Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of Forestry):** Mr. Speaker, yes, indeed, I can report to the House that we have just completed a very successful meeting with the council of ministers in Halifax.

I can report an excellent spirit of co-operation and a very sincere commitment to the long-term plans and strategies and the principles of sustainable development. Naturally, we would want to focus our attention on the collection and building of a better data base.

As well, I can report to the hon. member that we have committed ourselves to a program last year of holding five regional forums that will lead to a new forest sector strategy by 1992.

In this connection, I would like to congratulate the hon. member and his colleagues for a report that they have just published which will be very helpful in the pursuit of these objectives.

* * *

## HEALTH CARE

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. The Quebec government announced on Friday that it wants to levy deterrence or user fees despite clear evidence that such fees serve only to keep the poor from seeking medical treatment.

Under the Canada Health Act, the federal government can withhold federal medicare payments in an amount equal to that collected by user fees.

• (1500 )

My question to the minister is this. Will the minister say that he is prepared to uphold the Canada Health Act and say no to deterrent fees anywhere in Canada, whether that be B.C., Alberta or Quebec?

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member will know the Canada Health Act specifically forbids extra billing.

I have asked that my officials get in touch with the Government of Quebec to seek information with regard to the proposals made last Friday by the minister of health of Quebec. We will be looking at those closely. We will be also drawing to the attention of the Quebec our determination to ensure that the principles underlying the Canada Health Act are fully respected.

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to hear that the minister intends to uphold the Canada Health Act. However, the minister knows that his power to enforce national standards become weaker each day as the federal share of medicare costs decline. At the present rate, all federal cash payments to Ontario will cease by the mid-1990s.

Will the minister tell the House how he will enforce national standards when all federal moneys to the provinces cease and he is left with no means of enforcement?

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member is dealing with is simply conjecture. For a good deal of time yet to come there will be significant cash payments made to the provinces of Canada in order to help fund their expenses under Canada's medical care system. There is no program in Canada which has broader support from Canadians than Canada's medicare system.

It is a system that this government is determined to see remain and enhanced. We are determined to ensure as well that the principles that underlie Canada's medicare system, principles of ensuring that Canadians receive the best possible health care in Canada, continue to be enforced.



## PRESENCE IN GALLERY

**Mr. Speaker:** I wish to draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of a number of members of a delegation visiting our country from Kuwait.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## PRIVILEGE

### STATUS OF INDEPENDENT MEMBER

**Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants):** Mr. Speaker, I have a point of privilege or a point of order. Without getting into a dispute as to what it is, I have given notice to the Chair with a copy to my friend on the opposite side, the Government Whip. I will try to be short and also try to exercise common sense, which sometimes is in short supply here, Mr. Speaker.

Very briefly, the point of order/privilege is the question of the status of an independent member. I want to say right at the start that this has nothing to do with the status of parties in this House and/or their status as far as the Elections Act is concerned. I know and members know that under the present Elections Act, we have to run in an election as a member of a designated official party or as an independent.

The history of this Chamber is full of parliamentary precedents, with members who, having been elected under one label, made a decision, for whatever reason, to have themselves declared another affiliation. I am not going to go through the hundred or so more who go back into interesting history. I am going to quote some.

The one I am going to quote is a fellow called Gordon Churchill. This brings back memories. I was here when Gordon Churchill stood in this House as a Conservative and made a very succinct statement to the House, and one perhaps that I should have followed, and explained why he had to in a most regretful way to dissociate himself with his then party and sit as an independent and as an independent Conservative. There have been so many that we do not have to take too much time.

Some members in this House, I would venture to say, with respect, do not appreciate that there was no such thing as a party label on a ballot until 1970. I rest my case first on the fact that when I was elected in 1965 there was no party affiliation. I was elected as a person, an

individual, and that is my first point. Mr. Speaker, you know and I know and the government Whip should know, that the political system in this country is based on election of individuals who happen to have a party name, and only a party name since 1970.

I say for me at least, and I am not talking about other members who may want their own declarations for whatever reasons, I was elected here without a party label. I have been associated with a party for a good number of years and enjoyed that interesting experience. For other reasons, which I have mentioned here before, I earlier made a declaration that I want to be known as an Independent Conservative. Mr. Speaker, you could not tag me with a label when I came here. Even the government Whip in his earlier statements in this House on September 26 in talking about some of my friends to the left, the Bloc quebecois, started to say that it is clear parliamentary precedent, although he doesn't give any, that members themselves will decide the designation they want to be called or to withdraw the designation they were first elected under, and I totally agree with him.

First, Mr. Speaker, the premise of the political system is that we elect individuals and boy-oh-boy, I can tell you with the malaise out there, you make sure you elect individuals because people are getting pretty fed up with the political system where we all have to do and say the same thing day in and day out.

Anyway, you elect individuals, Mr. Speaker. That is the political system. Let us come to the parliamentary system. The parliamentary system, you know, Mr. Speaker, and I know does not officially recognize parties. It does not recognize parties. We have interesting groupings that have been done through an accommodation over a period of time, but officially, under in the Standing Orders and the Elections Act, you do not see political parties. You do not see any.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the parliamentary system, as distinct from the political system, what you have here are 295 members who for a multitude of reasons. For a multitude of reasons and for obvious reasons in most cases, they have associated themselves with a political party. That is fine. I take no exception to that.

But when a member wants to make a declaration and sit in another capacity and name himself, I say, Mr. Speaker, that is up to the member and he or she will be confronted with that at the next election.

Some of us were here when the member from the province of my friend the government Whip, a fellow called Jack Horner, stood in this House and said he wanted to be known as a Liberal. Did anyone one on the Liberal side stand up and say: "Hey, Jack, you can't come over here because you were elected as a Tory, and therefore you have to stay over there". This is how stupid it is and that is why I am not going to take the time to really over-debate this.

In addition to Jack Horner, you have Ralph Stewart, that peripatetic traveller. When he made the great declaration that he wanted to leave the Liberal Party and come to the Conservative Party without an election, did our government Whip stand up and say: "Hey, Ralph, you had better go back and talk to your people. You can't come with us because you were elected as a Liberal".

John Reid is a little different. He campaigned as a Labour Liberal. I talked to Jean Marc Hamel and on the ballot—and this is why it is irrelevant about the Elections Act—he ran as a Liberal. I understand that I can call myself anything in terms of an election campaign—and I have been called many things—but in terms of when the name goes on the ballot—and that is the way the law is now and I am not debating that at the moment—in terms of the ballot it has to go either in a designated party or as an independent.

Let us take Paul Hellyer and his perambulations between Liberal, Independent and Independent Conservative. Or let us take one who used to be in the cabinet of my friends opposite, the member for Joliette, a fellow called Roch LaSalle who stood up while he was a Conservative under Bob Stanfield and because of problems of language policy, made a declaration from his seat on this side that he wanted to sit as an independent. He went over there where my good friend from Pembina is at the moment, and sat there as an independent. Later he made a statement from over there, saying that he wanted to come back and join the Conservative Party. He was switching around like a yo-yo. Did any government Whip or opposition Whip say: "Hey, Rocco, you can't come over here because you got a label on your back that

is embedded into your tissue like a tattoo". These things are not tattoos, Mr. Speaker.

But let me come to the conclusion because I do not want to overtake the system by saying there is no official status for parties in this House. The political system is on the basis of individuals. You are elected as an individual. I know there is a lot of pressure. We could get computerized. We could all be ciphers in the old computer game, and forget even the names. I understand the attraction of members to a party and leaders, but the fact is we still run as the hon. member. I do not want to name my friends over there, but when they put their name on the ballot, not the party, it is because of the Elections Act of 1970 and accounting purposes that we have to put the affiliation. That is just an incidental fact and it should not be the dominant fact.

Our political system is for individuals, Mr. Speaker. Our parliamentary system is not for a block of government members of 170 or whatever. It is for 295 members. Why do we have an index in the back of the book?

• (1510)

I conclude with what I think is the best message of all, something which some members may remember. I do. It was during the financial crisis in the Bob Stanfield era when Mr. Pearson over an Easter break was in Bermuda and got caught in an ambush on a finance bill. There were many of us here in a caucus who thought the government had come to a halt. We thought since the government of the day had been defeated on a tax bill, in effect the government stopped, there was a loss of confidence and Parliament would not even open.

This was years before we started thinking of ringing the bells. I was in the Conservative caucus then and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, there were vibrant discussions in caucus. That day, we met in Room 112-N at least once, if not after in the Railway Committee Room, but usually down there because the thing was so topical.

I can remember Gordon Churchill, Jack Horner and others who took a certain stand on one side and Mike Starr who as the House leader was trying to decide whether we would even come into the House.

Our point was that a tax bill was a vote of confidence and was dead. In actual fact, Mr. Stanfield then or later admitted that he got a call from the governor of the bank and was told if we did not meet, there would be a run on the dollar because it was a minority Parliament. A run on the dollar would have been disastrous for Canada.

Therefore, with a sense of public duty, Mr. Stanfield had to take the caucus into the House and have a debate on the question of privilege that the House did not really exist. That debate lasted two days, but the House got going.

That is the time I realized the House really could be a charade. After the leading speeches of Mr. Stanfield, Mr. Pearson and Mr. Lewis of the NDP, the three main speeches on the most important constitutional question that had hit us for many a year, the whole debate was carried out in the halls. After two days of that, Mr. Pearson won the day because the public said: "Of course, this House has to sit and debate things."

Mr. Churchill, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, said, and I will conclude with this. I want to read the whole thing, because this is the state Parliament has come to.

When the statesman Mr. Churchill stood and gave a little statement on his position, there was not a person who would have dared rise and say: "Mr. Churchill, you are not allowed to call yourself that, or do what you think is right."

This is what he said at that time in the House of Commons on February 27, 1968, at page 7019, and I quote:

> Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege to announce that it is my intention to sit in the house as an independent Conservative.

That, of course, is what I want to do here.

> I am taking this step after careful—

**Ms. Copps:** There is no such thing as an independent Conservative.

**Mr. Nowlan:** What are you trying to say here? She sounds the same from here as she sounded from over there. It is disconcerting on either side.

I continue:

> I am taking this step—

I must say this is the type of statement that I should have said rather than abuse the Chair the other day.

> I am taking this step after careful and long consideration, and with deep regret. The issue before the house is so fundamental to our parliamentary system and so dangerous to our freedom that I cannot justify to my conscience to surrender now of part of our freedom in the hope that it may be regained at some uncertain time in the future. That runs counter to my experience of life and to my understanding of mankind's long and painful struggle for freedom. The decision of the Progressive Conservative party to capitulate at this time is so contrary

to the principles of the party, as I understand them, that I prefer to have complete freedom to express my views in the debate without embarrassment to my colleagues.

At the earliest convenient opportunity I will meet with the members of the executive of the Progressive Conservative party of Winnipeg South Centre and in consultation with them take whatever action is considered appropriate.

I shall continue to maintain a friendly and sympathetic interest in the Conservative party, in the hope that at some time in the future it will once again command my steadfast and unwavering support.

I rest my case with a man of the stature of Gordon Churchill who wanted to be an independent Conservative for a fundamental break with the party and was so recognized.

I can go through some 90–some names where again they were not open to challenge. That shows what state Parliament has got to when an individual member with a lot of consideration and a difficult decision makes a public declaration and lo and behold, out of the cobwebs of procedure we get someone standing and saying: "You cannot do that."

Mr. Speaker, I ran and I will be running again, whenever Elections Canada says. Right now, in this House of Commons, I want to clear up my status for the record so that the elementary political eunuch in terms of appellation can be clarified and to do what is the fact of life, that is, to be known in the records officially as an independent Conservative.

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if we are in a debate, on a point of order, or a question of privilege. Certainly it was at some length.

I have no quarrel with my colleague across the way in terms of his willingness and ability to call himself whatever he wants to and to indicate what in his own mind is any political affiliation.

What we are dealing with is my intervention of some couple of weeks ago when I rose in terms of our printed record, *Hansard*, which is a publication that governs what we do in committees.

At the back of every Wednesday's *Hansard* is a section that carries the names of members, the constituency they represent, and their political affiliation. To this point in the life of this Parliament and preceding Parliaments, and I suggest going back to the adoption of the current election law in Canada which flows from the Constitution of Canada, we have designated people in this part of our written record according to the political affiliation under which they ran during an election and therefore were elected to represent the New Democratic Party or the Progressive Conservative Party. In one case in our current records, it is the Reform Party or the Liberal Party of Canada. That is the affiliation.

People have been expelled from caucus without being required to change that affiliation because their voters voted for them as an individual in a constituency with a political affiliation. What we have allowed members to do is to withdraw that affiliation. If they were no longer happy with what they were elected to do, which is to affiliate with other members with a similar label, we have allowed them to withdraw and to put the word "Independent" in our written record. The truth is they no longer affiliate with any political group.

The member opposite raises another situation where an hon. member moves from one political group to another recognized political party. Yes, there have been cases of people moving from the Progressive Conservative Party to the Liberal Party or to the New Democratic Party. In fact, we had one member in the last Parliament who I think visited every party. He was elected as a Progressive Conservative and sat with each of the other parties, and ended up finally sitting as an Independent.

If you were to accept the arguments by my hon. friend across the way, then you would have the absurdity, Mr. Speaker, and the potential in theory of 295 separate political affiliations the blue party, the pink party, the yellow party, the green party, the up party, the down party, the inside out party, et cetera.

What this is intended to be is a serious historical record that can be consulted and will help scholars and others in the future to determine the political dynamics of the place at a given point in time. If you allow people to designate their own political affiliation after they have been through an electoral process, would we have accepted, for instance, the hon. member's request, having run as a Progressive Conservative, having sought the concurrence of his voters, and having been elected that way, to emerge on the opening day of this Parliament and to stand up in his place and say: "I want to be recorded in the back of this book as a communist"? Would we have accepted that the designation of political

affiliation is entirely in the member's hands, in the hands of the electors?

Perhaps we can turn our attention east to India. Its system is such that you run under a political affiliation and when, for one reason or another, you tire of that political affiliation and are not willing to support the majority consensus that is reached, then your seat is declared vacant and you have the right to run as an Independent or an independent Conservative, or whatever you will, and to seek re-election.

Perhaps this Parliament would be well served if people were to take that step and to seek their voters' approval under a different kind of label. I think none of us in this Chamber who believe in democracy would have any difficulty with that. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that to invent a political affiliation which does not exist under the Canada Elections Act and to request the Parliament of Canada to approve the designation of that political affiliation in its written records, when it does not exist as a label one can use in running for election in this country, would be a serious mistake. It could lead to all kinds of abuses over time where people deliberately run under one affiliation with the intention of emerging at a later time under a different one.

• (1520 )

There are those of us in western Canada who have faced that reality, going back to the late 1970s. Some of those who presently form the core of the Reform Party sought nomination in the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada. There was one in my riding back in 1977 who sought the nomination to represent the Conservative Party with the intention of winning election as a Progressive Conservative and emerging in this Chamber as a member of another political group, devoted to western separatism.

That is not very democratic. It is not something that this House should allow. If people get elected under a banner, that is one thing. If they no longer like the banner under which they got elected and they can join another party in the Chamber that was legitimately elected, then that is another thing. But if neither of those two situations exist for the member, then I think we have no choice but to list them in the back of our book as an Independent.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with care to the remarks of the hon. member for Annapolis Valley—Hants and also to the government Whip's intervention.

First of all, I would like to correct what I believe to be an error in the first hon. member's submission to the House concerning the fact that parties do not appear in the standing orders. I draw his attention to Standing Order 33, wherein parties are specifically mentioned. I am sure I could find others had I the time to go right through the order book.

Parties are mentioned in Standing Order 33 and they are referred to as existing in the House of Commons, and so parties do crop up in there. There are many references to parties in the Canada Elections Act, as I am sure he knows. I did not want him to create the wrong impression that parties were not in fact part of our electoral structure. There has been a significant change in the electoral structure since the 1960s, the time period of which he was speaking.

I recognize that members are free to run with a party label now in an election and that the label can be put on the ballot, but it is up to the candidate who is seeking election to choose whether he or she wishes to have a party designation attached to his or her name.

The hon. member should remember that. In other words, we are not compelled by the Elections Act to run as representatives of a party or with a party label attached. We have the option of refusing and just leaving no affiliation following the name on the ballot.

The hon. member in choosing his own designation here as a member of this House is free to make the choice that he suggests he is entitled to make, notwithstanding what the government Whip says.

I well recall the incident he referred to with Mr. Churchill, the former member for Winnipeg South Centre. I also recall the hon. member for Kenora—Rainy River, Mr. Benidickson, who for many years was a Lib-Lab member of Parliament. He would not take a straight Liberal appellation, although he sat with the Liberals in the House. He insisted on Liberal-Labour appearing as his party affiliation in the Wednesday editions of *Hansard*. He ran as such, but of course he

could not put that on the ballot because he was elected, for many years at least, before the party designation could be put on the ballot. It was his choice as to what he wanted to be.

I recall there were independent Liberals. I recall there were independent Conservatives in the 1960s. I am sure that the changes in the Elections Act which have allowed a designation to be attached to a candidate's name have not changed the procedures or rules of this House in respect to a member's right to designate his or her party status.

I think what the government Whip is suggesting is that because there have been these changes in the Elections Act, somehow we cannot have anything independent except Independents in this House. In other words, if you are going to withdraw from a party, you must therefore become an Independent or a member of another recognized party. I do not think that is so. The member who makes the change and withdraws has his or her choice as to how he or she wishes to be called or designated in this House.

While designation as an Independent may result in the loss of certain privileges and obligations of being a member of a designated party, it does not mean that the person cannot designate himself as an independent Conservative, an independent Liberal or an independent New Democratic, and make that perfectly proper in terms of the listing in Wednesday's *Hansard*. There is nothing terribly official about it, but I think the member is entitled to make that choice. I submit that the government Whip is seeking to alter the rules under which we have operated here by reference to the changes in the Elections Act made in the seventies. I am not sure it is necessary.

If Your Honour has any doubt on the matter, I think it would be an appropriate case for a referral to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections where the matter could be considered in detail. But I submit, on the precedents that have been established in this House for many years, that it would entirely proper for the hon. member to choose his designation, insist that it be inserted in the Wednesday listing as an appendix to *Hansard*, and Your Honour could take cognizance of that designation for all purposes in this House.

I do not think that such a designation on his part would be contrary to the practices and traditions of this place. Indeed it would be fully in accordance with them, in so far as they have existed over the years. I submit they have not been changed, either by design or by accident, as a result of the amendments to the Canada Elections Act in the early 1970s whereby party designations could be placed on a ballot paper.

**Mr. Lee Richardson (Calgary Southeast):** Mr. Speaker, I wanted, at the earliest possible moment, to correct an inadvertent mistake by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley—Hants. In his reference to a western member crossing the floor, I think he referred to Jack Murta.

Of course Jack Murta was and is an hon. gentleman who was loyal to his party over the course of his tenure here. I think he was referring to Jack Horner who crossed the floor to join the Liberals and was soundly defeated in the subsequent election.

**Mr. Speaker:** I heard the hon. member for Calgary Southeast. understood that the discussion was in respect of our former colleague, the Hon. Jack Horner.

I want to put a question to the House. Can any member advise me as to what legal impediment there is against the hon. member calling himself an independent Conservative in this House?

I have listened to the hon. member for Annapolis Valley—Hants, the hon. member for Calgary West, the hon. member for Calgary Southeast, and the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands. I will consider the matter and I will come back with an reasoned response.

**Mr. Nowlan:** Mr. Speaker, not to rebut but I got more interested in the submission of my friend, the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, as he developed it. I am quite aware that if it is a question of political parties that name is in the Standing Orders, and obviously there is even more of a designation in the Elections Act. The name of parties does not appear in the Standing Orders.

**Mr. Speaker:** I thank hon. members. I will consider the matter. The hon. member who has raised it has been a member of this House for many years. His father was a member of this House for many years before that. In all those years he, his father, and his family were supporters of a particular political party. Certainly the hon. member receives a certain amount of sympathy in this Chamber on both sides of the House when he raises the matter.

I will try to come back with an answer which is appropriate for the internal management of the House.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### BILL C-58—TABLING OF REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

**Mr. Guy Ricard (Laval-Ouest):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Report of the Legislative Committee on Bill C-58, an Act to amend the Young Offenders Act and the Criminal Code, with amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all members who took part in the committee's proceedings, the support staff, and especially the Clerk of the Committee, Ms. Santosh Sirpaul, who worked tirelessly, sometimes through the weekend, to prepare reports and comments for the committee.

• (1530 )

[*English*]

#### HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE STATUS OF DISABLED PERSONS—FOURTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, I take special pleasure, since today is International Human Rights Day, in presenting the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons. Our fourth report is in both official languages and is entitled *Unanswered Questions*.

I believe it is one of the rare times, if not the first, that a standing committee of the House of Commons has used its power to analyze a government response to a previous committee report and to request further information. This fourth report is an analysis of the recent government response to our second report, which called on the government to develop a comprehensive national strategy for the integration of disabled persons into Canadian economic life.

The committee's unanimous view is that the government response, while it contains worth-while initiatives, is not a truly comprehensive response. We are therefore calling on the government for a further contribution to the dialogue which our second report initiated. Clear and complete answers to the questions raised by our second report are important so that Canadians, including those with disabilities, will know what to expect from their government. More broadly, they are needed because committees of this House can only be effective if their work is addressed substantively by the government.

Therefore, pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests a comprehensive response to this report within 150 days. We believe this response is already overdue, because it relates entirely to our second report and we are requesting the government to provide its response as soon as possible.

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

* * *

### PETITIONS

#### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to present a petition signed by numerous residents of Amherstview, Napanee and other areas near Kingston and the Islands.

These petitioners reside in the riding of Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, which is represented in this House by a Conservative member who, apparently, will not present these kinds of petitions in the House. However, I am pleased to present it on their behalf, because these people are opposed to the goods and services tax and particularly in so far as the tax applies to books and newspapers.

The petitioners recite that the uninhibited dissemination of the printed word is a cornerstone of our democratic traditions. Accordingly they feel that our democratic structure is threatened as a result of the imposition of this wicked tax on the printed word, and they call upon Parliament to reject the goods and services tax.

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the privilege to lay upon the table three petitions signed by individuals, primarily from the province of Ontario, but also from the province of Quebec, mainly in the area of Ottawa and surrounding communities, who express their sincere opposition to the goods and services tax and in

particular, that it applies to magazines, books and newspapers.

The petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to withdraw the goods and services tax. They further call upon the Government of Canada, that in view of the Canadian-made recession, it not proceed at this time with the goods and services tax which will have a very negative effect on the Canadian economy, especially Canadian consumers as well as small businesses all across this country.

GASOLINE ADDITIVES

**Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex):** Mr. Speaker, I have a series of petitions signed by almost 600 people from the constituency of Lambton—Middlesex asking this government to phase out the use of MMT in gasoline.

On December 1 this government officially phased out the use of lead as an octane enhancer in automotive fuels, but it still continues to allow methylcyclopentadlenyl manganese tricarbonyl to be used, which is another neuro-toxic substance that has been banned in the United States since 1978.

These petitioners ask this government to act now, ban MMT and replace it with environmentally friendly ethanol. This would provide a market for millions of tonnes of Canadian grown grain.

Mr. Speaker, I also have petitions opposing the GST, opposing the closing of local post offices and petitions opposing cuts to our veterans services.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise under Standing Order 36 to present two petitions from residents of metropolitan Toronto.

They call upon the government to withdraw its plans to tax books and periodicals. The printed word is a cornerstone of our economic prosperity and our freedom of expression. These residents of Canada call upon the government to not tax these books and periodicals.

VIA RAIL

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, my first petition on behalf of a number of residents of Kamloops, British Columbia, points out that the government's cutback on passenger rail service is not environmentally sensible. They point out that the most environmentally friendly way of large passenger travel is by train.

They are asking the government to reconsider its decision to curtail certain routes and to invest more appropriately in the movement of Canadians via passenger rail.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from people in Kingston and Belleville.

They point out their concern at the government's decision to proceed with the goods and services tax. They feel that this is a regressive tax which permits benefits to certain Canadians in certain regions of the country. It is particularly punitive against northerners and people living in more remote areas of Canada. They are asking the government to reconsider their decision, back off, and introduce real, fair, tax reform instead.

**Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to present two petitions.

The first one is from small business people in my riding of New Westminster—Burnaby. They call on this government not to implement the goods and services tax. They say it is an unfair form of taxation because it forces small business people to carry a disproportionate share of the tax burden and that it will prove to be an implementation nightmare for their small businesses.

They also say that the tax does not address the concerns of small business with regard to the MST. Instead, it increases the tax burden for the small business community. They ask this government to reject the proposed goods and services tax, to consult with business, labour and with consumer groups to reach a broad consensus on tax reform.

ABORTION

**Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition is signed by petitioners in the provinces of Ontario, Alberta, British Columbia as well as the Vancouver area.

This petition says that the choice to bear children or not to bear children is a matter of personal choice and not one of criminal law. The Canadian Medical Association already has guidelines and regulations in place concerning abortion. They say that criminal sanctions do nothing to address the reasons why women seek abor-

tions, and do nothing to reduce the numbers of unwanted pregnancies.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to refrain from imposing any criminal sanctions against abortions.

* * *

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall all questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

## SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S. O. 81—POVERTY

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East)** moved:

That this House regrets that almost one million Canadian children are living in poverty, that 1.4 million Canadians each year must rely on food banks and that the current recession and the proposed Goods and Services Tax will make this situation worse; and

That the House, desiring the elimination of poverty in Canada by the year 2000, demands immediate programs to ameliorate the plight of the working poor, including a review of the minimum wage, discriminatory employment practices, current available children's benefits and other income support programs.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Since today is the final allotted day for the supply period ending December 10, 1990 the House will move through the usual procedures to consider and dispose of the supply bill. In view of the recent practice, do hon. members agree that the bill be distributed now?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

• (1540)

**Mr. Dingwall:** Mr. Speaker, there have been some discussions. I am not sure whether there is agreement, but I would ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons as well as the House leader for the New Democratic Party whether or not there there would be a disposition in the House for the time allotted to the parties in the speaking order in which they are recognized by the Speaker that that individual party have the right to divide the time as it sees fit, namely, for our first speaker, instead of having



the 20 plus 10, we would have ten and five and ten and five.

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, I want to signal our usual co-operation on this matter and as we are such fine people on this side, we will co-operate in any way we can.

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, I do not appreciate the implications in those last comments but I have to say that since this is the final allotted day and the fact that we are not beginning debate until well after the usual time, I would like to make a slight change to that proposal. I think in the interest of equity and fairness that we consider the proposal but that we simply rotate in the usual fashion, not on the basis of 20 and 10, but on the basis of ten and five. If that is the interest of the House, we are certainly willing to co-operate.

**Mr. Dingwall:** Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting proposal which comes from the House leader of the New Democratic Party. It is a major deviation from the practice of what we have been doing in this House for quite some time of course, but in view of the circumstances quite appropriate.

I would have thought that the hon. member would want to co-operate, in view of the fact that the subject matter is put forward by the hon. member for Hamilton East, and have more members of his party and my party enter the debate. But on the proposal which is being put forward, in view of the fact that it is unprecedented to have that kind of an arrangement, we will have to go back to the 20 and 10.

**Mr. Beatty:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether we can simply ask that our hon. friend from the New Democratic Party consider the proposal made by the Liberal Party earlier. My hesitation in accepting the proposal that he made is quite simple. The issue we are dealing with today is of such fundamental importance that many of us have laboured long and hard to compose remarks which deal in considerable length with a very important issue and one which was dealt with previously by his previous leader.

By giving to the parties themselves the ability to decide how to divide up their time, we would have a system that is equitable and fair and would enable the Liberal Party to make proposals and to organize themselves in the way that they felt was most effective but would not derogate from the ability of members to deal with this important subject in a more extensive way if they felt it was constructive to do so. I think it is consistent with the traditions of this place and if we are prepared to show

sufficient flexibility, it would meet the needs of members on all sides of the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** There has not been agreement. Do we go for 20 and 10 and if the respective parties would like to designate their own party as ten and five when they get up to speak, that would be fine. I am at the disposal of the House.

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, again, I like the idea although I have noticed when you calculate the times you have managed to freeze out the last two New Democrat speakers because we are starting late.

I am quite prepared to undertake to maximize the number of participants in this important debate. I cannot do anything but agree with the minister that this is an important debate, particularly in light of the fact that it was initiated a year ago by the then leader of the New Democratic Party.

I would agree with my colleague's proposals to have the parties decide whether they want to break their sections into ten and fives, with the undertaking to my two colleagues that prior to completing this debate there would be ample time after the first round to have two speakers from the New Democratic Party. If not, I do not see any advantage in agreeing to this.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I think we should just start off with 20 and 10, as proposed. Debate.

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that 15 days before Christmas, we take this opportunity in the House today to pause and reflect for a moment on what it is that we are really here for.

Frankly, I, myself, in reviewing the package of government actions since 1984, was shocked to examine the extent to which the Tory knife has cut deep into the hearts of poor children and poor families in the country.

I moved this particular motion, not as the end to the problem of poverty, but rather as one opportunity for the House in a full and frank way to discuss a number of issues which touch Canadians living in poverty. Over the next several hours, Mr. Speaker, you will hear from members of our caucus who will address very specific concerns bringing to bear their expertise in the area.

One of the things that shocked me—and I think it probably shocks a lot of Canadians—is that not only do we know that almost 1 million Canadian children live in poverty, but that 1.4 million Canadians must rely on food banks to supplement their daily bread.

Forty per cent of those people are children who, by virtue of the fact that they do not have enough to eat, are not able to excel in school, are 1.7 times more likely to have psychiatric disorders, are 1.8 times more likely to perform poorly in school, and are twice as likely to have conduct disorders. Poor children are the kind of children left to repeat grades more often than children from families who are not poor. Twice as many poor children fall behind in educational achievement by the age of 15. They become the drop–outs whom millions of government dollars are hopefully trying to encourage to stay in school.

We have to deal, as a government and as a political party, with how we intend to wipe out poverty. The first thing we have to do is examine what has happened over the past six years.

Mr. Speaker, I think you will agree with me that the last six years have dealt a real blow to families and children in the country. I was shocked myself to learn of the kinds of deep cuts that have been brought about by the government to programs that are directed towards helping the poor and, in particular, helping children.

The very specific major cutbacks in EPF transfer payments will cut approximately $22 billion from medicare over the next 10 years. If you set aside the EPF transfer payments, and look at other federal government programs, Mr. Speaker, directed towards poor families, what you will find as a result of Tory policies is $20 billion in spending has been cut from families, children, and elderly people who most need the resources.

In constant dollars, the cutbacks of the child benefit system beginning with the family allowance in 1986 cut $1.6 billion from the pockets of Canadian families to help children. The deindexation of child benefits in the tax structure cut $3.5 billion from the program between 1986 and 1991. The clawback of the family allowance and the old age security will cut $215 million in spending this

year alone, and $618 million a year by the end of the three-year phase-in period.

The Mulroney government has cut back on EPF transfers, as I have already mentioned. In fact, the cumulative effect of the cut in transfer payments to provincial governments for health, social services, and education—the kinds of programs needed to provide support to working poor families—represent a cut of $31 billion for medicare and post-secondary education. Approximately $22 billion of this will be taken out of the heart of medicare.

• (1550)

In 1990, the Mulroney government announced a plan to cut transfers in CAP to Ontario, British Columbia, and Alberta, claiming these provinces were too wealthy. This cut represents $75 million in 1990 and $80 million in 1991-1992.

The Mulroney government has also cut its proposal to spend $4 billion on increasing the number of child care spaces. That, combined with the fact that the government spending under CAP amounts to $2.6 billion, means that the government's savings of $200 million annually again is being carried out on the backs of working and working-poor families.

We have heard time and again in the House how Bill C-21 is going to do so much for the working poor. Well, we are getting the tally. In municipalities across the country as a result of Bill C-21 the welfare rolls are rising. Bill C-21 was not a measure to create jobs or to assist those thousands of workers who have gotten their walking papers over the last number of months as a result of the government's monetary and fiscal policies. In fact, Bill C-21 will see a $1.3 billion annual cut in benefits to the unemployed. These are real people who are lacking hope and the federal government's $1.3 billion cut is going to reach deeper into the pockets of those families who now currently cannot afford to support themselves.

The main impediments to families being caught in the cycle of poverty are the issues of food and housing. Can you believe, Mr. Speaker, that in 1989 the Conservative government of Brian Mulroney actually spent less on housing across the country than was spent in 1984? At a time when housing costs across the country are sky-rocketing and when the number of homeless has reached into the tens of thousands of homeless families across the country, the Mulroney government is spending less in real dollars in 1989 than it spent in 1984.

For the benefit of those on the other side of the House, I would like to table a copy of a list all of the cuts that have hit poor and working-poor families since 1984. Those cuts total over $20 billion, excluding the specific amounts relating to EPF transfers. That is $20 billion taken from the hands—in fact, from the mouths—of the children of Canada.

One of the reasons we wanted to launch this debate was not only so that we could wake up Canadians to the fact that we have a country which has an increasing gap between the rich and the poor. We do not have to go to the papers to see the evidence of it. We can go into our own constituencies and to the food banks. Only last month in the city of Montreal there was a line-up down the street of people trying to get second-hand clothing because they did not have enough money to clothe themselves. The federal government's response to the situation of families in real need is to cut, cut, cut to the bare bones.

Let us look for example at a very specific area. I was frankly shocked to hear the Minister of Labour in the House today, in response to my colleague from Winnipeg, claim that he was not immediately moving to increase the minimum wage because only a small percentage of Canadians would benefit from it. Mr. Speaker, the percentage may be small but I think the federal government and the Minister of Labour should hang their heads in shame that the federal government has the lowest minimum wage of any government in Canada. My colleague pointed out the fact that a single woman supporting a child would have to work 87 hours a week at the minimum wage merely to reach the established level of poverty. Frankly, you see the real need in provinces such as Newfoundland which has a higher minimum wage than the federal government. After I have tabled the analysis of the cuts of federal spending, I would like to take some time to read into the record.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Does the hon. member have permission to table the document? There has to be unanimous consent in order to have it tabled. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** No, I am sorry. There is no agreement.

**Ms. Copps:** I am sorry Mr. Speaker—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I am sorry. The hon. member has no agreement to have the document tabled. There was no agreement. Debate.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of National Health and Welfare is disagreeing, let him stand up and say so. The Speaker asked the question and everyone agreed. There was silence.

**Mr. Beatty:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member seeks to table, with unanimous consent, what is simply a partisan list of rhetoric. If the hon. member wants to do that, she can easily either include it in her speech or she can put out a press release.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret that the hon. member does not have unanimous consent. She is on debate.

**Ms. Copps:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry the Minister of National Health and Welfare does not think it is important for Canadians to have a sense of just how deeply his government has cut. I can understand why he does not want to because it is a shameful record.

I was the one who was shocked when I actually sat down and read in black and white the depths and level of cuts to social programs across the country over the last six years, to housing programs and to food programs. It is no wonder that the Minister of National Health and Welfare would not want to have that information on the record. It is a harbinger of more ills to come under his government. He certainly has done very little in his new capacity to try to alleviate the situation.

Given that he is unprepared to look at the facts that the opposition wants to lay before the House, would he consider the facts about the federal minimum wage? The federal wage has not been raised in the last four years. How many members of the House would like to go four years without a pay raise? How many would like to go four years without a raise? The federal government has gone since May 26, 1986, without a single increase to a pathetic and pitiful minimum wage of $4 an hour.

Alberta has a higher minimum wage of $4.50 an hour. British Columbia, which is not known for labour enlightenment, has a minimum wage of $5 an hour. Manitoba's is $4.70. New Brunswick's is $4.50. Newfoundland's is $4.25 and we know the difficult economic conditions in Newfoundland. In the province of Ontario, as of June 1, 1990, the minimum wage is $5.40 an hour. In Prince Edward Island it is $4.50 an hour. In Quebec it is $5.00 an hour. In Saskatchewan and the Northwest Territories it is $5. In Yukon territory it is $5.39.

When we asked the legitimate question in the House today of the Minister of Labour as to why the federal government had the lowest minimum wage in Canada, he actually had the gall to respond that it covered so very few people and since those people were part-time, he did not want to eliminate their jobs. That is the same kind of rationale that was originally used to buttress the rationale for slavery. The rationale was that minimum employment standards could not be introduced for fear of cutting out jobs in the cotton fields.

Even if the minimum wage covers only 1.3 per cent of the federal working population, at least the federal government should send a signal to provinces across the country that we are not followers, but rather we are leaders when it comes to providing support and, in particular, income support for the working poor.

One of the great fallacies of our generation is the fact that people who are living in circumstances of poverty are doing it because they do not want to pick themselves up by their bootstraps and work. The Macdonald royal commission on the economic condition of Canada discovered that over 50 per cent of people living in poverty in the country are in fact working.

• (1600 )

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the others who are not working outside the home are primarily women who are working inside the home and who are making a valuable and equal contribution to the state of not only the Canadian economy, but also to the psyche of Canada.

What we have on the government side is a deliberate decision to undercut the capacity of working Canadians to support themselves and their families, not only by specific cuts in programs, but also by a tax policy and a

tax strategy which is gradually killing off working families in this country.

Between 1984 and 1991, total income taxes for working poor families increased 60 per cent. Under the so-called Tory tax reform, total income taxes increased 60 per cent for working poor families, while high income families saw their income taxes fall by 6.4 per cent.

**Mr. Belsher:** How many families no longer pay any income tax?

**Ms. Copps:** It is no wonder that the Gallup poll published today shows that Canadians have no faith in this government's capacity to equalize the tax burden, because they have seen six years of gouging of working poor families and six years of increases to high income families.

Let us look at one specific Conservative initiative. I know the Minister of National Health and Welfare is going to have a chance very shortly to bring out another recycled version of his child care program. I think it will be the sixth or seventh version of the same promise that was made in 1984.

I would like to ask the government why in the context of its child care policy does it continue to support a tax deduction system which benefits high income Canadians to a much greater degree than low income Canadians?

Surely, Mr. Speaker, when you are talking about providing benefits to working families to pay for decent child care for their children, it should be important to target those finances, to target that care toward families who most need the help.

I do not understand a tax system that says if you earn $60,000 or $80,000 a year, you are entitled to more assistance to put your child in child care than a family that is earning $30,000 or $40,000. I hope that as part of the minister's new package of reforms, he will transfer tax deductions into tax credits so that those families who really need the help will get the help when it comes to child care funding. That is only part of the problem that we will be addressing more specifically in some of the presentations that have to come.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, before going into any details, I think we should recognize the fact that the minimum wage system is shocking. The answer given by the Minister of Labour in the House today is shocking, because it shows the federal government has the lowest minimum wage in this country. The minister explained that only 1.3 per cent of the population was affected. Mr. Speaker, whether one person, 1,000 people or 100,000 people are affected, this kind of injustice is entirely unacceptable!

Ten years ago, the federal government had a very progressive minimum wage policy. Today, we are even worse than British Columbia, Newfoundland and all the other provinces. Their minimum wage is higher than the federal government's, where the minimum wage has remained set at $4 since 1986.

Perhaps hon. members would like to consider the following: Can they afford to wait four years until their next raise? I don't think they would be prepared to wait four years. So I think we can hardly say this to people who are earning the minimum wage, whatever their numbers. I also think the Minister of Labour should clarify the comment he made in the House that this affected people who worked part-time and they did not want to eliminate part-time jobs. Do we want to make wage slaves out of women, Mr. Minister, because by forcing them to work for $4 an hour, this is practically—

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret the hon. member's time has expired. Questions or comments?

**Mr. Guy H. Arseneault (Restigouche—Chaleur):** Mr. Speaker, I have a comment and a question. I congratulate my colleague, the member for Hamilton East, on a fine speech. She made some comments with regard to minimum wage and the fact that the federal government should be leading rather than following. She was also mentioning when her time was finished that most of those persons on minimum wage salaries are women. I would ask her if maybe she could complete her statement, if she would do so, to continue enlightening us on her statement.

Also in her speech she referred to a document that she wished to table. Some members of the House preferred not to have it tabled. I was wondering whether she could divulge the contents of that document as well if she could find time.

**Mr. Beatty:** She already did. You may have slept through it though.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, the minister of health and welfare says: "She already did. You may have slept through it though". He may sleep through the fact that his government has cut $20 billion from the pockets of poor Canadians over the last six years. A lot of other Canadians are not sleeping, and a lot of Canadian children are not sleeping because they do not have adequate nutrition. He may think it is funny and he may sit there and smirk over the fact that 40 per cent of Canadians using food banks now are children. He may laugh over the fact that in the city of Montreal there are children who cannot write their school exams because they do not have enough food in their stomachs. We on this side of the House do not think that is a laughing matter and one of the reasons that we want to introduce at this stage, 15 days before Christmas, a sole debate on the wide range of economic and social policy issues, including the minimum wage, is because the absolute minimum level of federal support needed to maintain the loss of purchasing power that has occurred over the last six years of Tory power strictly related to the minimum wage would require an increase in the federal minimum wage up to $5.88 an hour.

We are hoping on this side of the House that the debate today will begin to evolve not only around the areas of cuts. Believe me they are not hard to find in "slash and cut" Toryland. They can find the money to sell the GST, but heaven forbid that they should put food in the mouths of Canadian children.

At the same time, we want to see a real government solution to the very specific problem of the working poor in this country who are having to work at wages that the federal government should be ashamed of, the fact that $4 an hour has not changed since 1986, the fact that the real purchasing power of the poorest of Canadians employed under the federal system has remained stagnant since that time and the fact that they have lost in real dollars, based on the annual minimum wage rate in 1979, $1.88 an hour in their purchasing power as Canadians.

We on this side of the House want to see the government bring real programs forward to provide support to those Canadians who are trying to make it in a very difficult economic period and we do not need smirks and rhetoric on the part of the government. What we need are very specific programs. We are asking the government for some specific commitment on the particular issue of minimum wage and on a revisiting of the children's benefits that have been butchered by this government over the last six years.

**Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie):** Mr. Speaker, I too congratulate my colleague from Hamilton East for touching on a whole series of points that affect average Canadians and people who are suffering through this government.

We have something in common with Hamilton and Sault Ste. Marie as to the steel mills, and I am making reference to the Unemployment Insurance Act. I ask the hon. member to comment on the 85 per cent ruling which people who have been involved in a labour dispute for, in our case 16 weeks, and even after the 16 weeks people are not automatically entitled to unemployment insurance after having lived on $100 or less for all of those 16 weeks. These are families and it is particularly difficult at this time of year.

I would ask the hon. member about the 85 per cent ruling. It seems strange to me and I am sure it must seem just totally unjust to people who are involved in this kind of dispute that the government would take a ruling that has been struck down by everyone, including the Federal Court of Canada, to the Supreme Court of the land to ensure that this 85 per cent ruling remains intact, to the detriment of the workers of this country.

• (1610 )

I am just wondering if she has any comment to that effect. Why would the government persist in such an unjust ruling?

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, obviously the federal government should have allowed the law of the land to remain the law of the land when in fact the court struck down the 85 per cent ruling back in July 1989.

The fact that it did not seems to be further indication of the fact that it wants to squeeze workers off unemployment insurance. When you look at the net result of Bill C-21, which is cutting billions of dollars from unemployment insurance, the 85 per cent rule is a further nail in the coffin of a lot of steelworkers.

What makes it really difficult, Mr. Speaker, is if you look at the lengthy labour disputes both in Hamilton and in Sault Ste. Marie as they related to the steel industry, they came at the head of a very difficult recession. The fact is that in our own community of Hamilton, thousands of workers who are ready, willing and able to work are going to spend a very bleak Christmas not being able to work because the jobs simply are not there.

The jobs are not there because of the strike, and I think this is the point of the 85 per cent rule, and why it should be struck down. The jobs are not there because we are in an economic downturn caused by the high interest rate policies of this government.

Having concluded the steel dispute, both in Hamilton and in Algoma, at the same time as the recession hit us right between the eyes right across the country, the workers at Algoma are being hamstrung or strangled effectively by this 85 per cent rule. While in Hamilton they did have a sufficient number of recalls because we raised the issue in the House, it did in fact result in a positive—at least from the perspective of collecting unemployment insurance—result for some of the workers.

The same has not been said for Sault Ste. Marie, and many of those workers will continue through the Christmas season on welfare just like the thousands of other workers who have been cut off as a result of Bill C–21.

I continue to be shocked when the Minister of Employment and Immigration constantly during Question Period in the House points to Bill C–21 as a great reform for Canadian workers.

What it is is a chance for the federal government to get out of the business of unemployment insurance and to hang a lot of workers out to dry. That is why we are seeing the welfare roles across this country swell as a result of the Bill C–21 government legislation.

**Mr. Bill Kempling (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, on the matter of Bill C–21, the hon. member should know that Bill C–21 only came into effect three weeks ago.

Any person who was collecting UI was collecting it on the old rules. She is way out to lunch on that.

The Bill C–21 changes have not the slightest thing to do with what she is talking about.

She made another comment that I noted here, that $1.3 billion had been cut from the system. There has not been a penny cut from the system. It has been readjusted within the system. She does not know what she is talking about.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the member is so out of touch that he has not been in touch with the Burlington welfare office.

If he went home once in a while and found out what the Tridon workers know, he would know that in fact the welfare roles in Burlington, Hamilton and in the area are increasing as a result of the government's decision to cut back on women.

I was in Hamilton just this weekend. I will be there next weekend and the weekend after. I am listening to the workers. The workers at Tridon in Burlington are calling me because they call their member of Parliament, and he hides behind the minister.

Here you have a community in Burlington, his own Tridon employees being told to take a hike, their jobs are being exported to Smyrna in the United States and what does this member of Parliament do? He has the nerve to stand up and defend a government program on unemployment insurance that is going to see thousands of working Canadians, in particular women, part-time workers, the working poor, cut their unemployment insurance as a result of Bill C–21. Those are the facts.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions and comments are now terminated. Debate.

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of any issue before Parliament that is of greater importance than the issue of poverty, and particularly poverty as it relates to Canada's children. I think those Canadians who find themselves in low income across Canada have a right to expect from their members of Parliament a debate that was meaningful, one that stuck to the facts, and one that simply did not try to obscure the situation with partisan rhetoric.

As a consequence, I know that many Canadians will be disappointed in the presentation that was made by the hon. member for Hamilton East in that in the place of hard facts what she presented was bitter partisan rhetoric, which did not do anything in terms of painting a picture of the problems of poverty in Canada. Nor, as

members will note, did she make proposals on what could be done to improve the situation. Instead, she was more interested simply in partisan denunciations of the government.

Over the course of this debate, the House will be showered by statistics of all sorts from all sides. Indeed, I will be relying on some of those myself. Statistics can be very helpful in terms of setting a context which will help us to understand the nature of poverty in Canada and what can be done by the government to deal with it. But statistics can also do damage because they can obscure the true human face of poverty. It can cause us to forget about the millions of different stories of Canadians who find themselves living in poverty in circumstances which are as different as the people themselves.

When I was preparing for my intervention today, my thoughts went to a young woman whom I met in Ottawa a few weeks ago. Though she looked much older, she was only in her late twenties. She was a single mother of one daughter and had moved here hoping to find greater opportunity, hoping to find work which would enable her to support herself and her daughter.

She received no support at all from the child's father. Nor did she seek any. She had taken part-time work which meant that she could no longer get the sort of benefits that other people on welfare could get, but she wanted to be independent and to have the opportunity to support herself and her daughter.

Talking with her was both troubling and enormously heartening in that it showed both the human cost of poverty and something about the tremendous indomitable nature of the human spirit. What she asked from us here in this House was not charity or pity, but opportunity and respect. She richly deserved both of those from all of us.

During this debate we will hear a range of statistics. As I mentioned, I will be using some of them myself, but what we should not ever neglect is the human face of poverty, one which involves the young people from one coast to another, affects their hopes and their dreams, and affects the qualify of lives of Canadians who find themselves caught in poverty. It should be these people and not partisan advantage which should be the focus of our activities today.

I hope that in the time remaining to the House, what we will be doing is concentrating on constructive suggestions in terms of what we can do as members of Parliament and as concerned Canadians in order to deal with so important an issue.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that we are getting together and looking for solutions to the problem of child poverty. Although today's motion contains a number of partisan elements that members on this side of the House will not be able to support, and although we may not agree with the means proposed to achieve the end, I am convinced we are prepared to commit ourselves.

[*English*]

I have two children of my own. This starting point makes me particularly concerned about the issue of child poverty. It is difficult for me to accept, as it should be difficult for any parent in this Chamber to accept, that other children, like our own, should find themselves growing up in conditions of need and hunger without adequate food or shelter.

A few minutes ago the member for Hamilton East painted a picture of a government determined to increase poverty among Canadian children. The facts, however, present a very different picture.

Since the present government took office in 1984, considerable progress has been made on the issue of child poverty. The number of children living in low income circumstances has dropped from 1.1 million in 1984 to 837,000 in 1989. Nevertheless, it troubles me that despite these results there remain children growing up facing immediate hardship. It troubles me that poverty rates are as high as 50 per cent for native children and that low income affects as many as 59 per cent of children in female headed, lone-parent families. Quite simply, what these figures represent, in human terms, is a tremendous challenge for all Canadians.

• (1620)

The task of eliminating poverty, among children by the year 2000, is difficult and challenging. We must recognize

the complexity of the root causes of poverty. We need to understand what keeps Canadians on welfare, and we have to help them to break the cycle of poverty.

Let us first look more closely at the nature of child poverty in Canada. The problem is founded on a range of issues including lone parenthood, welfare dependency, family breakdown, poor education, and the health status of the family, to name just a few. Over the last couple of decades, the proportion of low income families fell gradually throughout the 1970s, shot up dramatically in the beginning of the 1980s, and has declined substantially since. The proportion of Canadians on low income has declined from about 23 per cent in 1969 to about 12 per cent in 1989, a significant change. However, low income still affects 3.1 million people annually in Canada, including 444,000 elderly and 837,000 children. Only now are rates as low as before the recession of the early eighties appearing.

For example, for two-parent families with children, the incidence of low income stood at 9 per cent in 1980, peaked at 12.4 per cent in 1984, and dropped to 8 per cent in 1989. For lone-parent families it stood at about 50 per cent in 1980, rose to about 56 per cent in 1984, and dropped to about 47.4 per cent in 1989. In broad terms, the data show important trends concerning child poverty, particularly since the mid-eighties. Rates have been falling steadily and, on the whole, have dropped considerably.

Let us look at these trends more closely with respect to children. In 1984, more than 1.1 million children lived in low income families. By 1989, that number had dropped to 837,000. In 1989, 300,000 fewer children lived in low income families than in 1984. The proportion of low income among children has declined from one child in five in 1984 to one child in seven in 1989. While this is still too many, it does represent an improvement of more than 25 per cent, and this is significant progress.

Those who say that the incidence of low incomes is increasing during the mandate of this government should check their facts. I am also encouraged by the heightened public interest and attention to issues relating to children. Of course many of the references are not good news items, including child abuse, child poverty, and unmet child care needs, but this interest has sparked a wide variety of individuals, voluntary agencies and businesses as well as governments to concentrate anew on the needs of children.

The recent World Summit for Children has ignited some of this interest. The summit served as a source of reflection on the plight of children, not just inside Canada but outside our country as well. Around the world, we have learned how pervasive a problem child poverty remains. Moreover, in Canada poverty has many associated dimensions, all of which serve to complicate the response. Child poverty tends to reflect family circumstances and parents' abilities to provide for their children. Single parent families headed by women are particularly vulnerable to poverty, with almost one-half of these families living below the low income measures. Lone parents are disadvantaged by having the double burden of raising their children on their own, as well as having to provide the basic economic supports, essentially one parent performing the responsibilities of two.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I am also concerned about the large number of single-parent families that depend on provincial welfare systems. The economic and social costs are considerable when a person cannot participate fully in society. It also worries me how children will grow up in this kind of situation. It is clear we must give serious thought to ways of breaking the vicious circle that prevents Canadians from being self-sufficient and forces them to depend on welfare, and we must speak very frankly about this.

[*English*]

I would like to move from the statistical examination of the child poverty problem to the root causes of poverty: illiteracy, disability, lack of education, corrosive family conditions, and family break-up.

These conditions can put in train a cycle of poverty which continues through generations of families. I am talking about problems faced by children from lower income families such as higher rates of high school drop out.

Studies have shown that poorer kids tend to do substantially worse in a number of measures of school performance, like failed grades, conduct problems, hyperactivity and learning disorders. Probably as a result of this weak performance, poor kids are twice as likely to drop out of high school as other kids are.

As a consequence, many children who have grown up in poverty find themselves without sufficient education and engaged in a life-long struggle to get and to keep a

job. This is just one example of how the cycle of poverty manifests itself.

The link between poverty and education is incontrovertible. Eighty per cent of the heads of poor households receiving welfare have not completed high school. With the national drop-out rate in the neighbourhood of 30 per cent, we clearly have a problem of serious proportions and one which the government has taken initiatives to address.

Poverty is also associated with a number of other social and health problems. For example, poverty tends to become one of the factors which contributes to crime. As well, although Canada's rate of infant mortality is enviable by any international standards, Canadian children born in poor neighbourhoods face an infant mortality rate almost double that of their wealthier counterparts.

I would like to move now to set out the approach taken by the federal government since 1984 in addressing this problem. As I stated earlier, the years since 1984 have seen significant improvements, with 956,000 fewer Canadians, including about 300,000 children, in low income situations.

The government's approach has recognized both the need for a healthy, well managed economy, which will provide opportunities for families to support themselves, and a variety of programs and policies for people in need.

The government has worked to develop a climate in which job creation can prosper. Families want to be self-sufficient. They want to control their own resources, their own lives, and the lives of their children. They do not want to be dependent on others. Canadians have created over 1.6 million new jobs since 1984, more than 80 per cent of which were full time and about 60 per cent of which have gone to women.

A healthy economy also helps to supports and maintain much needed social programs. Since 1984 the government has taken many steps toward these goals. We have removed 850,000 low income Canadians from the tax roles; increased the value of the child tax credit by over 50 per cent; introduced a new child tax credit for pre-schoolers, a supplement now valued at $203; doubled the allowable limit of the child care expense deduction for pre-school aged children from $2,000 to $4,000; and increased maternity leave to 15 weeks for the mother, with an additional 10 weeks for either parent under unemployment insurance.

It is easy for the opposition simply to demand further programs. On this side we do not have that luxury. We are also forced to consider the mounting burden of debt; a burden of debt that today amounts to a debt in the name of each and every Canadian, man, woman and child from one coast to another of over $13,000. To spend uncontrollably today and to leave our children to pay the bills later would be the cruelest, most inhumane thing that we could do to them. This must be an issue that is kept before this House as this debate proceeds.

Members opposite simply propose to spend more money and to increase the debt load on our children. It steals from our children. It steals from generations yet to come. Our children have a right to expect that they will inherit a government, an economy, and a country which is well financed and which provides opportunities for them, and not a mountainous burden of debt.

We have made tough decisions but, when we did so, the most needy were protected. That is why when the 1990 budget introduced the family allowances benefit recovery, we made the threshold $50,000 on an individual income basis, a figure that was high enough that lower income recipients of family allowances would not be affected.

• (1630 )

When the 1990 budget introduced the 5 per cent limit on the growth of Canada Assistance Plan expenditures, we made sure that only the wealthiest provinces were affected. This measure does not cut social assistance nor does it prevent increases in provincial improvements to social assistance or social services. Federal contributions under CAP will continue to increase for all provinces. They are only limited for a two-year period to 5 per cent in three provinces in the strongest fiscal position.

Provincial governments will continue to be responsible for administering assistance programs, deciding priorities and allocating resources in these areas.

The Canada Assistance Plan provides approximately $6 billion to support these programs. And over the past four years, we have worked with provinces towards more innovative uses of CAP funding. For example, we have developed the employability agreements which help

social assistance recipients in their transition to the work force.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, hon. members are also aware of the government's efforts in dealing with other causes of poverty: initiatives have been launched to promote literacy, to prevent and treat drug addiction and alcoholism, to provide better pensions and tax benefits for the disabled, and to help enforce child support orders.

[*English*]

Other urgent problems face Canadian children. For example, our family violence and child sexual abuse initiatives are well under way. As you know, Rix Rogers, my special adviser on child sexual abuse, recently completed a report entitled "Reaching for Solutions". In the near future, I intend to introduce a new strategy for dealing with family violence, including child sexual abuse.

One of the recommendations of the Rogers report, and of other earlier reports, was the creation of a children's responsibility centre within the federal government. As a follow-up to the world summit, the Prime Minister assigned me the responsibility for bringing to cabinet recommendations on the declaration and plan of action agreed to at that summit.

The Prime Minister also requested that I create a new mechanism, a children's bureau, within my department to ensure co-ordination and consistency in areas which address children's issues. We are moving ahead quickly on that, Mr. Speaker, and hope to make considerable progress in the months ahead.

This year the federal government will spend about $1 billion on child care. Additionally, as the Prime Minister has indicated, we will put in place a new child care program during the life of this Parliament. It will better help families manage work and child rearing. In particular, we will help those most in need of assistance, such as single mothers who require child care in order to enter the job market and to help break the cycle of welfare dependency.

I have talked at length about the situation with respect to child poverty and the government record to date. We have made good progress in Canada, but I believe that we can do more. This House cannot magically produce programs called for in the motion before us which would bring immediate solutions. I believe the government is on the right course and we are taking the kinds of decisions that have to be made in order to get at the roots of the problem.

If the remarks of the hon. member for Hamilton East are any indication, we will be hearing plenty of partisan rhetoric designed to do more to improve the status of the opposition than that of the poor today. But let us not forget the people who are supposed to be our primary concern here. They require and they deserve our full attention.

As I have pointed out, there are no easy solutions or quick fixes for poverty. No one knows that better than the poor themselves, because they know how complex and how varied the causes and the effects of poverty can be. Most important of all, we have to ensure that the economic foundations that support the social programs that we cherish must remain solid. But if fighting poverty will require well planned, long-term solutions, there can be no excuse for callous complacency based on the belief that because the poor have always been with us, they must always be with us in the future.

To those who say that Canada cannot afford to fight poverty, I say that we cannot afford not to fight it. For sustaining people in poverty can cost much more than giving them the tools to lift themselves out of it. Acting today to break the cycle of poverty can prevent generation after generation from being caught in a costly trap that inflicts its damage in both economic and human terms.

Let me conclude this way. At the World Summit on Children, the nations of the world committed themselves to giving children our highest possible priority. That is exactly what we must do here today at home as well, to give them our priority, to give them and their families the tools that they need to lift themselves from poverty and to ensure that they can share with the rest of us in the benefits of a rich and a compassionate society. That has to be our goal as a people. There is no challenge more worthy of us as members of this House of Commons.

**Mr. Dennis Mills (Broadview—Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, I noted the minister made some remarks at the beginning which stated that maybe our line over here is

only going to be partisan. He challenged us to put forward ideas to help this situation.

First of all, I do not think there is a member of Parliament in this House who has not had some personal experience with real poverty in his riding. In my own riding alone, 25 per cent of the children who go to all the schools have single parents. We all know what is going on in this country. I do not want to play with any of the statistics.

As I listened to the minister, I recalled what happened this summer when all of a sudden the Prime Minister, through Order in Council, sent the ships off to the Persian Gulf. All of a sudden, moneys were found and away they went.

I am also very respectful of the deficit. I would like to ask the minister, because sometimes when one is in health and welfare, one does not think of some of the various resources. However, the minister, having been a former Minister of National Defence, is well aware of the 500 to 600 armouries that exist across this country, especially in the major urban centres. Most of the time these amouries are sitting idle. There are many good men and women in the militia who make a great contribution to our community.

During this very special period of Christmas and the new year, when times are tough and the economy is extraordinarily tough, there is an extraordinary burden on the Minister of Finance, why could we not take a page out of the organization in Toronto which organizes the food bank day? It is only for one day at the CNE but the volunteers manage to gather enough food to feed people for a couple of weeks. Why couldn't the minister co-ordinate this sort of thing with the Minister of National Defence and not just sort of quote that "things are getting better and there are fewer people on the poverty line". Let us make a real two month or three month action plan and put the kind of will behind it, not unlike the kind of will that we put behind sending men and women to the Persian Gulf.

I would ask the minister what he would think of that as a possible suggestion. I am not suggesting it is long term, but it may bridge things and help ease some of the pain and create some hope.

**Mr. Beatty:** Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest and great attention to the hon. member's suggestion. I want to give his suggestion the seriousness that it deserves. I have some difficulty understanding exactly what it was he was proposing that we should be doing.

He made reference first of all to the Prime Minister sending troops to the Middle East by Order in Council during the summer and then went from that to some reference to armouries in Canada without specifying what he had in mind to do with the armouries.

**Mr. Mills:** Using the armouries to act as food banks, et cetera and support systems for the poor.

**Mr. Beatty:** Mr. Speaker, members of Canada's Armed Forces and certainly members of our reserve forces are involved on a continuing basis in contributing to their communities and to doing anything that they can to be helpful. In cases where there are programs that they can put in place using armouries, they are glad to do so, using the resources that they have available.

If there is one thing that certainly characterizes the spirit of the men and women whom I was privileged to serve with when I was Minister of National Defence, it was a very deep sense of commitment to the community in which they served. I know that their approach in every single instance when it is possible for them to make a contribution was to do everything they could to do so.

• (1640)

The hon. member also made a juxtaposition—and I hope he will forgive me if I pick up on that as well—between the money we are spending on the armed forces, perhaps to send troops to the Middle East, and money we are spending in other areas.

I am in this House uniquely positioned to make a comment on that as a former Minister of National Defence who is now Minister of National Health and Welfare. We in this society benefit enormously, and my children are an example, from growing up in a society in freedom and in tolerance. The men and women who serve in Canada's Armed Forces do so in order to ensure that all Canadians, particularly all Canadian children, will live in freedom from fear and that they will be protected against threats which could take away the freedom that we enjoy and consider part of our birthright as Canadians.

The legacy of freedom, the tradition of freedom we have in this country allows us to deal with that other side, the human side of ensuring we are also a society which is compassionate. I do not believe it is a choice between either defending our country from abroad or contributing to international affairs, or doing what we need to do here at home.

**Mr. Mills:** I never said that.

**Mr. Beatty:** My hon. friend said that he was not making that suggestion and I take him at his word, but when he made reference to the Prime Minister sending troops off to the Middle East I was concerned that he was suggesting, as some others previously have, that we should have been holding back and not spending money in the defence of freedom on the grounds that somehow we could not afford to do it.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to ignore either the cause of freedom, or the cause of fighting poverty. Both must be a priority for us. Both deserve the attention of this House.

**Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, I think most Canadians understand and certainly everyone in this House understands that children are poor because they live in poor families. They live in a family where the parents are poor. In many of those homes it is a single mother who is trying to raise her family. Of all of the poor children in Canada, almost 65 per cent of those poor children are in homes led by a single mother.

We have to look at what this government has done over the last six years. The things that this government has done have made it more difficult for that single mother, or that poor working family to try to bring their children up. What have we seen? We have seen a government that brings in a GST which will impact more heavily on the working poor and the poorer people of this country. We have seen a government that has brought in UI cuts which will impact very negatively on women in the workforce because we all know, Mr. Speaker, that women are in and out of the workforce more frequently than men and this bill will have an even more severe impact on women.

We have seen a government that has deindexed family allowance which has increased the child poverty rate. We have seen a government that brings in a "now you see it, now you don't" kind of child care policy, a minimum wage that is miserly, and I guess the final crashing blow in my province of British Columbia, in Ontario, and in Alberta, is this government putting a cap on the Canada Assistance Plan. It makes it impossible for those provinces, they say, to raise welfare rates. It makes it impossible or much more difficult for shelters to be built for battered women, for child care spaces to be made.

I would ask the minister what is it he is really saying to the mothers of children in this country, particularly the single women who are trying to raise their children at poverty levels. What are you really saying to them with the actions you have taken, in particular the capping of the Canada Assistance Plan?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. minister has one minute to answer all those questions.

**Mr. Beatty:** Mr. Speaker, what we are saying to those families is that it is vital, first of all, that we ensure that those children inherit an economy that is soundly managed, that the sort of policy advocated by the hon. member opposite of stealing from our children by simply spending money, running up the national debt higher and higher, year after year, would put a crippling burden upon them and threaten the very existence of the social programs that are so important.

The hon. member refers to the GST. If she were candid with the House she would concede the fact that families earning under $30,000 a year are better off because of the GST tax credit. The hon. member refers to unemployment insurance. If she were candid with the House or with the poor of Canada she would note the fact that what we are doing is providing for better assistance to families to train to give them secure, decent jobs to be able to get themselves out of poverty.

She talks about the cap on CAP. If she did so, she would recognize the fact that what we have done is continue to increase spending. On child care, it has increased under CAP at the rate of about 20 per cent per annum.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret the hon. minister's time has expired.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Debate. The hon. member for Oshawa.

**Mr. Mike Breaugh (Oshawa):** Mr. Speaker, I wanted to join in this debate, but I confess to you I am uncomfortable, as all of us should be when we are well-clothed,

well-fed, and well-housed and we have gall to talk about poverty.

In my opinion, if you want to have a discussion in the middle of a Canadian winter about poverty, first of all you should have to do it outdoors, and you should have to stand around for a while in the afternoon and feel the cold. You should not be allowed to eat that day. You should not be allowed to wear warm clothing. Most importantly, you should have to do it surrounded by the poor. I would defy any of the members who have made an intervention in here this afternoon to make the same kind of a speech to those people as they have made to us. The Speaker would not be there to intervene on their behalf. The language certainly would not be parliamentary, but perhaps the message might get across.

I listened, for example, to the minister make a very finely prepared speech this afternoon. I did not hear him mention, though, that the numbers that he used are from 1989, the last year, of course, for which those numbers have been gathered. They have absolutely nothing to do with life in Canada right now in the middle of a recession.

I am as uncomfortable with the use of statistics in this kind of a discussion as I am about us having it, because the truth is in this country if one child goes to bed hungry tonight, we should all be ashamed. There is no reason for poverty in this country.

One of the things that I know is a problem for members of this Chamber is that in this town, it is pretty tough to get much of an assessment of poor people and what they are like. You really have to search them out because they are not obvious. Driving into Ottawa off Highway 416 and coming in on what is known as the South River Road, there are the kind of mansions that are rare in Canada, but they are there, and they are all around this community. There does not appear to be much poverty here, but I will put some money out that says tonight it could be found within a spitting distance of this building.

If you want to find somebody who is cold tonight, and they do not have a place to live, they will find a warm grate, I will bet within the Chambers of this building somewhere. They will find a parking garage. They will find a hallway. They will find a hotel that left the door open. They will find somewhere where there is a delivery door that is open.

In any of our major metropolitan cities the irony is that among the luxury condominiums somebody found a way to get into a nice warm garage for the night. At our major international airports, they are not flying off to Jamaica, they are finding a hole in the wall where at least it is warm and they are there.

I will bet that within 100 yards of this building now, there is somebody who has no job and who is begging for money on the street. Tonight, they will split a bottle of wine with somebody and sleep over a heating grate. We will not see them because we probably will not get out of cars long enough to go looking for them, but someone will.

There is a great controversy in my part of Canada about where there ought to be food banks. People are saying: "Well, we want to do away with them." Yes, we do in the long run, but the problem is how do we feed people who need emergency assistance now? Our traditional ideas of who might actually use a food bank are changing immensely.

There are parts of southern Ontario that look affluent to somebody driving by, but where people have got virtually their entire income invested in a place to live and do not have any money left to feed the kids. They get to make the choice: "Do I feed the kids or do I pay the mortgage? Which do I do?" It is something that grabs you—or it ought to grab you—that in the middle of this kind of a society, in the middle of this kind of wealth, we cannot afford to feed the poor and we cannot afford to provide them with opportunities.

There are many things about government that I do not understand. I am trying to explain at the moment to a 65-year-old woman why she has to get divorced to get a pension. What makes me even more angry is that this stupid rule is not new. This is not the first time this has cropped up. When we got looking into how could such a stupid rule exist, we found that this stupid rule has been around for a while. It has been looked at and studied by bureaucrats. Recommendations have been made and laws have to be changed. How can that be? Can our society be so dumb that it does not understand the stupidity and the cruelty of a rule like that? Is our society so stupid that it does not understand what happens when a kid does not have a proper place to live? Is this some great mystery? Do we not know what happens to a poor child in an urban centre or a rural centre, when he does

not have enough food in his belly or a proper place to live? Do we not know who breaks your windows? Do we not know who steals your hub-caps? Do we not know who causes crime?

• (1650)

A young guy, 26 years old, came into my office a couple of years ago. He had been in jail since he was 16. He sat across from me and he said: "I can't handle it outside, Mike. I got to go back into the slammer. That is where I have grown up. At least there, I know what it is like in a prison. I can't live on the outside." I spent some time with Randy and said: "Well, Randy, here is a support group. Here is some social assistance. Here is how you get a telephone and how you use a telephone and how to budget your weekly allowance."

He came back a week later and he said: "I can't do it. I just can't cope with this." So, I called my local cops and asked: "What can we do for this guy?" They said: "Mike, we can't do anything for him. He has not broken any laws." But Randy knew the system in Canada. He knew that if he went out the next day and robbed the Bank of Montreal, we would not be worried about money. We would know exactly what to do with Randy. And that is exactly what Randy did. He went out the next day and held a young woman hostage in a bank.

We knew right away how to handle this. The Durham Regional Police Force arrived with their 12-gauge shotguns on the dashboard. The legal system clicked into place, and there was no problem with that. If we had tried the day before to get a little counselling for Randy, there was not enough time, there was not enough budget, and no one cared enough. But the moment he knew how to hold up a bank, we knew how to deal with that situation. That is the great tragedy in this country.

One of the things that makes me very angry about Canadians is that they do not know their country very well. There are many people to whom I have talked who have said: "Well, there is no problem with child poverty in Canada. I mean, maybe there is the odd, isolated incident here and there." We should take all those people down to an inner-city school for an afternoon and put them into a roomful of 30 little kids, five and six years old, who have not been fed properly that day. We should just leave them there for an afternoon and see how they cope with children who are hungry. They ought to try that for a while. It is not nearly as comfortable nor as easy as anybody would like it to be but it is there and it is real.

Maybe it would be a great asset to the House this afternoon if there was a single mother in here who was able to say: "I have to make some decisions about whether I go to work or not. Because, if I go to work this week, then I have to withdraw all the benefits that I get from social assistance, all the little medical cards and all of the subsidized housing. I am disqualified for one group of benefits the moment I earn a certain amount of money." How would any one of us like to make that decision? Do you want a little dignity and go to work, or do you want to rob your children of some benefits?

Well, many of our provinces are trying to work their way through some great change in the social assistance system which seems to be hide-bound into little rules and regulations and has absolutely no common sense to it. That is a challenge because there are lots of people who are extremely well paid and extremely intelligent who are there to defend the system as it is. They do not want any change because it alters their life-styles. It makes them change, instead of their clientele.

One of the good things, to be positive if I can for a moment, is that at least this House on a couple of occasions has taken part of an afternoon to talk about poverty, but it has not done a heck of a lot in the interim. I want to make some arguments that we do know how to alleviate some of these problems.

We do know, for example, that we will make the choice, as people who are participants in governments, as to whether or not we want just to hand people money—and there is nothing wrong with that—or whether we want to do something substantive such as raising the minimum wage and, in the long run, how we spend our tax money. That is really what the argument is. The argument is not about whether or not the Government of Canada gets involved in the long run in the financial impact of poverty. It does. Whether it wants to or not, sooner or later, it will pay the price. It simply is a question of when we pay the price.

Do you want to pay it up front? Do you think that the public and the private sector should both share some responsibility in that? If you do, then it would seem to me that you would simply advocate one thing and that is that there should be an increase in the minimum wage, that it should happen on a regular basis, and that it ought be something like 60 per cent of the average industrial wage in Canada. This is not rocket science. This is just basic economics about how people look after their own needs.

I know that there are many members who have participated in this kind of debate and have said: "Well, look at our employment statistics in Canada." This is where I have a problem with statistics. It may well be true that there are a whole lot of people who have jobs. That is really not pertinent. What is pertinent is what kind of a job it is. Is it a short-term job? Is it a long-term job? Does it pay a decent wage? Does it have a benefit package with it?

One of the things that you have to look at when looking at the whole Canadian system of how we provide a safety net for people is that the system has all these little loopholes in it. People do learn after a while how to play the game. If the bureaucrats think they are smart about setting the rules and regulations, they should be forewarned: "Wait a minute, there is another group of people out there who are just as smart as you are. They may not have university degrees, but whether they eat or not tomorrow depends on whether they can figure out a way around your little rule."

I will bet you they will get you 99 per cent of the time. You can set up any set of rules that you want. If somebody out there is poor, starving, and will not eat next week, that is one heck of an incentive to find a way around a stupid rule. I will bet they will most of the time.

I have watched several American programs lately. In particular, *60 Minutes* has been going around to different American cities analyzing poverty in America, the kind of stuff which it does particularly well. It is making the argument that the rich are going to get hurt by poverty just about as much as the poor, because sooner or later the balance will shift. At a moment in time when there are a whole lot of poor people and a small number of rich people, that is when some kind of a revolution takes place. There are a lot of people sitting around saying: "This is not just unfair. There is no way out of this poverty trap for me except some kind of totally irresponsible social movement that nobody else likes."

In many American cities now, particularly among black groups, there are people who are becoming very militant because they have been waiting a long time for the American system to work. It is not working. They are just as poor as they ever were, and they do not have a house the same as it always was. When they once had jobs in the inner part of most American cities, those jobs have gone somewhere else.

We are seeing that in Canada. Most of us do not want to see it. In my riding in the last year, we have had about 13 of our smaller plants go down. Many of these plants were places, for example, where for the first time in their lives women were working in an industrialized trade union situation making a really good wage and they thought they had it made. They thought they finally had gotten a good, long-term job that paid well and that had a good benefit package. Now that whole job is gone.

We will argue whether that is cause and effect of free trade, recessionary period, only temporary, or whatever, but for the individual who finally thought she had her place in the system—she had stuck with the system, had gotten herself a good job, and supporting herself and her family—now the job is gone. There is going to be bitterness there. There is going to be a rancour there that we are all going to have to contend with.

I have noticed just since being a member here, having observed a lot of different chambers at work, that there is a rancour in this place that I do not like and that all of us sense. Maybe it is Parliament doing what a parliament is supposed to do. Parliament is not a gathering of the wise, and the most experienced and talented people in the nation. Look around this room. We are told this is a parliament. Parliament is just a representative group of people. If a nation is angry at a moment, its parliament is going to be angry. This place certainly is. This is a nasty place to be at the moment.

Part of what we must realize is that it is our job sometimes to set aside the partisan stuff and to deal with the real issues of the day. On an issue like this, we have some very serious problems ahead of us.

Part of it is not just that we can isolate the poor any more. We cannot. There is a whole raft of people out there who are now being called the working poor. They are going to be extremely nasty. They are unused to being poor. They do not like it, and they will not take it very long. Some of them have come to me.

One of the things that I noticed is that in things like the collection of new taxes, most people in small business do not want to collect taxes. They make no bones about that. Some of them are simply adopting the obvious. They are saying: "Why should I bother keeping records for the Government of Canada, the Government of Ontario, or anybody else? Give me some money. I will fix your plumbing. Game over." I think that is going to become a national trend as it is in many jurisdictions. When people think that a tax process is unfair, when people decide that they do not want to play that sport any more, they simply do not keep the records. The government does get the tax money. They pocket $10 less. Away we go. We will see that in more and more businesses now. Today I have seen notices on the wall: "If you want to pay by cheque, by credit card or if you want a receipt, the cost of this service is $30 or $20 cash". Then the taxation process becomes self-defeating. As more and more people are hit by poverty, as more and more people get crushed in that process, they will seek whatever means of redress they can to escape it.

• (1700)

The alternative will be for the Government of Canada, the government of each province, and the governments of all of our municipalities to say: "Wait a minute. We cannot afford in the long run to allow this to continue in that way". We know how to build non-profit housing. We know how to provide people with useful, productive work, we know how to get people so that they can sustain themselves with some dignity. We are very proud in this country. Sometimes I get very angry when people say: "No country in the world has a social assistance program like Canada". Baloney, lots of countries to do. People are very proud of the fact that our senior citizens get pensions. Sure, they do, but all of our systems are straining and all of our systems are failing a larger and larger group of people.

One final thing ought to be put on the record this afternoon. I recall when I was a member of the Ontario legislature going to Moosonee. It was a legislative committee and the members were a little grumbly because we had to ride the train to Moosonee. It was not exactly first-class travel but they were amused that the train stopped, people came out of the bush, got on, loaded on canoes and all of that. Then we went to a motel in Moosonee and they were upset there was only one television per floor, it was black and white, they locked the doors at ten o'clock and there was not a great deal for members of the legislature to do after ten o'clock at night and so they were kind of snarly.

The next day we met with people who said things like this to us. "I know people who live in mud and stick huts, who do not have a television set, who do not have a job, who do not have a pension, who do not have an education, who do not have a future. If the future is anything it is probably a bottle of cheap wine". Most of us sat back a little bit at the end of that day because we had felt very put upon, very hard pressed that we were losing our creature comfort.

Part of what perhaps needs to happen to members of this House and people in this country is simply open our eyes a little bit and look around us and see the very real problems that other Canadians are having. Arguments between political parties, about different regions of the country, all of those arguments have to take place. They are a very necessary part of political life. However, just maybe once in a while we should set all of those things aside and get at the very real problems, the very real things for which Parliament can do things; attack poverty, talk about greater issues, about what this country is supposed to do. Do we have a plan in mind to kind of get us from a problem where we are now, to identify some solutions to see if we can resolve the problem. I think that needs to be done.

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the speech of my colleague from Oshawa. He said a lot of things that I think we, as parliamentarians, have come across and have been frustrated with. For example, rules. We all see these rules that we have to put up with in these various situations. No matter what system is set up, they set up a series of rules.

They do not set up the rules, however, for the people who need the help and who use the system properly. They set up the rules for those who abuse the system. That is the unfortunate part of the whole thing. Because some people abuse the system, all of a sudden we need to have rules to make sure that they do not abuse the system. If we did not have people who abused these systems that are set up, no matter what they are,

whether they are speeding limits or whatever, we would not need to have them.

I agree with the hon. member, it is a frustrating thing, especially when there are people who need help desperately, deserve help, and because of some rule or some regulation that government has brought in for whatever reason, we cannot help those individuals.

He talked about jobs, whether they are good jobs, meaningful jobs and so on, and 80 per cent of the jobs that have been created over the last five years have been full-time jobs. A good proportion of those have been very good jobs, long lasting jobs and so on. We are into a recession now and some people will be laid off within the work force, but of the jobs that have been created, they have been full-time, and that has been a change from the previous period. I want to comment on one final thing and ask if the hon. member had heard of it. It is time that we took a look at changing the methods of providing assistance to people. For example, in my region of Peel, the Social Affairs Department has provided a program for single parents, primarily women, who have found themselves all of a sudden without a spouse for support and with no training. They have not been in the work force for years, if ever, and find themselves on family allowance. The Social Affairs Department have a program where they give these women basic training and send them for job interviews. The department helps with finding a job. If they do get a job, the regional Peel social services pay for three-quarters of the day care. They pay for three weeks out of the four weeks for the day care which makes it better for these people to accept the job. That is what the member was talking about, that they had to make the decision of whether to get a job or to stay on social assistance.

Is the member aware of this program, and if so, would he not think that that is the type of program that they should be involved in more and more because the delivery of social services comes at the local level where people understand the problems probably a lot better than we do?

**Mr. Breaugh:** Mr. Speaker, in the province of Ontario, as one example, and I am aware that other provinces have done the same thing, the social assistance review committee studied all the forms of social assistance and pointed out a number of barriers to people actually breaking out of the poverty trap. A number of our municipalities have tried to provide more flexibility. The new government in Ontario is certainly aware of the cost of that and is also aware that there is great potential there.

I would make this comment, too. One of the real problems in Canada is that the structure of government is such that the level of government that comes up with this brilliant notion initially very often has nothing to do with the delivery of the service. Social assistance is one of these things. Some bright idea that someone in Ottawa thought about 30 years ago is being handled by someone in Burlington this week. The two may never have communicated and when the person in Burlington, Oshawa, or wherever, says that this is a stupid system and you have to change some of the rules, it only takes two or three decades to transmit that message because it has to go through so many levels of government.

One of the things the Thompson report talked about, and it is blatant common sense, is to try to identify the purpose of this exercise. It is not to put someone on a program for life. It is to get someone out of poverty. That is the name of the game. If there are things that must be done that hurt someone's feelings because the bureaucracy has to move around a little bit, then the bureaucracy should move around to try to identify what it is that a single mother needs to get her back into the workforce.

I bet all of the members here have done exactly what I have done. We have participated in setting up unemployment help centres, counselling and referral centres. We have all talked to people in the social service agencies who know that their system has some problems in it, who would very dearly like to bend some of those rules, and sometimes do.

The Thompson report in Ontario is one major step in trying to put some common sense into a very complicated system. In many centres it is beginning to work. The new government, I know, is very supportive of that and wants to extend it around the province. I think that needs to be done on a very broad scale all across Canada.

**Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for a very moving speech. His reference to real life situations in his riding was what made it such a strong appeal.

• (1710)

I would like to refer to just one situation that I had in my riding concerning children of refugee claimants which, of course, is a federal jurisdiction. A Polish–Canadian doctor came to me a couple of weeks ago about a group of children who had been here for over two, sometimes three, years, and whose families were going once again to be uprooted and sent back to Poland because they did not pass the test now. They did it when they first came but now the rules have changed and they will have to go back to more poverty and insecurity in Poland.

We talked about this. There are many other children from other ethnic groups who are here in the same situation. In fact across Canada there are many thousands of children of refugee claimants who are in that backlog.

In this year when there has been a UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Prime Minister headed a summit on children, does the member think it would be a good idea, very just and humanitarian for this government to have a waiver for all those children and their families, thus saving millions of dollars as well, which might go into school food programs or something similar for poor children who have come through trauma.

**Mr. Breaugh:** Mr. Speaker, I agree heartily with the idea that children should not become the object of some process that harms them. I am very grateful that when my ancestors came to this country, there was nowhere the immigration system that they have now or there is absolutely no chance I would be here.

When you identify for example a major problem, like the immigration problems we have now, there is a need to move dramatically on a large scale with things like an amnesty for children to alleviate all the illnesses in the system. Surely none of us would argue the point that a child should not become yet another problem to deal with.

The member and I have discussed this. It is quite possible that the ruling in the end will be somehow that the children will be allowed to stay and the parents will be sent back to Poland, or probably that the parents will be allowed to come here if the children go back home.

All we ask for in all of this is just a simple little bit of common sense that where you have identified the problem, when it is children who are affected most dramatically, surely a straightforward answer, if not necessarily a simple answer is what is required.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions and comments are now terminated.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if I could ask the consent of the House that for this next round, the round we are starting now, in other words the next 20 minutes, that it be shared by two Liberal speakers in succession, rather than one for 20 minutes. It would accommodate us as we have two members who would like to share the next round.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is there consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Ms. Black:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member for Winnipeg North has the floor.

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, do we have consent?

Mr. Speaker, child poverty is a major public health problem in Canada. We have one million infants and children who live below the poverty line. They are without adequate care, food, clothing and shelter. Their numbers are nearly equal to the total population of Manitoba. Each poor child is accompanied by the spectre of poor health, which follows him or her from the womb to the grave. That is what poverty means to the health of a poor child—the topic that I shall focus on during this debate.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that today is the 12th birthday of our youngest son, Christopher Justin. C.J., as we fondly call him, understands that I will miss this special day for him in Winnipeg. He understands the seriousness of the issue we are debating here today, and he understands that as a paediatrician and our party's critic for national health and welfare, I could and I should add a new dimension and perspective to the debate.

This member has lived through poverty during childhood and schooling. I know what it was to be poor. Hence I am pleased to debate this issue. I am pleased to be part of the Liberal Party of Canada, which is privileged today to do its duty on behalf of all poor Canadian

children whose survival depends on our fortitude and generosity, whose future we can help chart and whose future, when secure, shall determine the health and greatness of our nation.

Today we have before us the opposition day motion introduced by my colleague from Hamilton East, which I was honoured to second. This motion shall call once more to the consciousness of all Canadians, the plight of our poor children and asks that their needs be met with more than words.

Children are the innocent victims of economics. During the last recession of the 1980s, there was a jump in the number of children living below the poverty line. What will happen now, as we are once again in the grips of economic strife? I fear the worst for the children of the poor. As a father and a paediatrician, it greatly saddens me to see a child become ill. Tragically, poverty cannot pay for a clean bill of health.

On average seven Canadian babies in one thousand do not survive infancy. For the poor, that number is twice as high. For native Indian children, the death toll is not seven or eight or nine per thousand; it is 19. For Inuit, 28 in 1,000 babies do not live. Over all the life expectancy of a poor boy is five and a half years less than a rich boy, while a poor girl lives two fewer years. Poor children are involved in four times as many traffic accidents. They die two to ten times more often from fires, drowning, suicide, homicide, and respiratory infections. Cancers and substance abuse are much more likely to strike down poor children.

Why? Unsafe, crowded housing, inadequate access to medical care, poor compliance with therapy, and poor nutrition provide some explanations. Other answers are much more complex.

A high percentage of underweight babies are born to poverty stricken parents, suggesting less than adequate pre-natal care. These infants, if they survive, often suffer from brain dysfunction, cerebral palsy, major visual and hearing defects, and epilepsy. Underweight babies also tend to have a lower than average IQ. Poor mothers breast feed less often and for a shorter time than mothers from higher income families. Their babies often become anaemic, weighing half a kilogram less than average and measuring two centimetres less in height. Even their tiny heads are one centimetre less in circumference.

The health problems among poor children seem to be never ending, not only physical and nutritional but dental and psychological. Some hospitals have noticed a rise in meningitis and diarrhoea among them. Absenteeism at school increases. Dental records reveal more cavities, missing and filled teeth. Mental illness occurs one and a half to three times more frequently.

These Canadian child paupers are such a grave concern that in 1988 seven social service organizations banded together, forming the Child Poverty Coalition, in an effort to save them. The coalition's aim is to make child poverty a national priority.

All social conscious groups, like the National Council of Welfare and the social planning councils in many provinces, recognize the problem. So too do the Liberal Party, the soup kitchens, the media, child and health care workers, and anyone else with eyes that see reality.

Why is the government blind to the issue? Why has the government not made children a priority? Why does the government hide behind public relations ruses? I speak about the Prime Minister acting as co-chair of the recent United Nations World Summit for Children. Did his international posing help our own struggling children, or did it convince the world that a hungry child is not a Canadian child? Recently my hon. colleague, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, told the House about his government's record on reducing child poverty in Canada.

• (1720)

While I am pleased as well that there has been a drop in child poverty between 1984 and 1989, is it fair to compare a recession year to a non-recession year? If we compare the pre-recession year of 1980 to the year 1989, we must admit that there was no significant change in the rate of poverty among Canadian children. It was 14.8 per cent in 1980 and 14.6 per cent in 1989. The disturbing situation remains, and we still have one million poor children.

A poor child is usually a hungry child. In fact, 40 per cent of food bank dependents are children. Food, something we take for granted, is precious to the hungry and lack thereof translates into more social and health problems for the thousands who are strangers to regular,

balanced meals. A malnourished child cannot develop properly. Children need good nutrition to grow strong and healthy.

A disadvantaged child will often go to school with an empty stomach. Trying to concentrate with hunger gnawing at your insides is a difficult thing. These children fall behind. Is it any surprise, then, that twice as many high school dropouts are youths living in poverty?

Even education, the thing that could help break the cycle of poverty for a poor child, is denied. As the child bred of poverty becomes an under-educated adult, what are his or her chances of finding a good job and of marrying and raising children to a better world? The chances are very slim, very slim indeed.

Instead he or she perpetuates the cycle of poverty with low paying jobs, social assistance or more frequent and longer bouts of unemployment, with more health problems and a shorter life expectancy.

These children of which I speak are not of a war-torn or struggling Third World country. These are Canadian children, 15 of every 100, who are strangers to daily balanced meals, cheated out of a proper education, and fated at birth for a hopeless life of poverty. They do not even have their health to rely on.

Why must this government perpetuate a cycle of poverty and neglect, which will forever shackle poor families, their children and children's children?

Where is the evidence for my indictment of this government? Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to read from an article that appeared in the March issue of this year's *Policy Options Politiques*. It entitled "Social Policy by Stealth", authored by Grattan Gray, a retired journalist and a long-time observer of the Ottawa scene who has written for *Maclean's* and *Quest*.

To indicate the basis for my indictment of this government, I quote:

> I have been studying the development of social policy in this country for a number of years, from public documents, House of Commons debates and academic papers, but I have never seen the sort of development that has taken place in recent years, and which seems to have slipped by many of the professionals and academics. In brief, the Tory style of restraint has become what can only be characterised as "social policy by stealth".

I underscore "social policy by stealth". Why is that? I continue:

> It relies heavily on technical amendments to taxes and transfers that are as difficult to explain as they are to understand and thus largely escape media scrutiny and public attention. It camouflages regressive changes in the rhetoric of equity in an attempt to convince Canadians that tax increase are tax cuts and that benefit cuts are benefit increases—confuses the electorate and so insulates itself from criticism.

This is telling evidence of the performance of this government. Let me quote another paragraph:

> It also abolished universal old age pensions and family allowances in one fell swoop by means of a devious mechanism known as the "clawback" which is the crowning achievement to date of social policy by stealth.

I could continue to quote much more from this article but time will not permit me to do so. Let me just say in terms of federal and provincial income taxes that families earning $20,000 have an increase from 1984 to 1991 of 386 per cent, compared to a 4 per cent increase in taxes for those who earn $100,000.

Let us look at federal child benefits. For those earning $20,000 to $50,000 there is a drop of as much as 2 per cent to 25 per cent in child benefits. People earning $20,000, near the poverty line, still had to suffer cuts in child benefits.

I ask this House this simple question: Which cost would be lower, the cost of helping poor children now or paying to let the cycle of poverty spin? Just imagine the cost of health care alone and add to that the cost of criminal justice and lost productivity. It is indeed appalling because we realize that we are truly dealing with a government that has no heart. How can we measure the social cost of broken dreams, want, and lives lived under a cloud of hopelessness? The beginnings of an answer could be as simple as a national school lunch program, ensuring every child has one meal a day.

However, I submit that the most important government policy would be one of full employment, which policy my leader challenged this government to declare but which this government refuses to declare. Instead, this government insists that unemployment is an instrument of economic policy. For parents to be working and bringing home pay which is above a poverty line existence is the best guarantee for the healthy future of sons and daughters.

Our present social welfare system discourages the will to work. Take for example the case of a single mother. Her chances of finding proper child care are almost hopeless. If she takes a job and loses her social assistance, gone too is state funded help toward the costs of

dental care, special medications, and health related equipment. Offspring of low wage earners may be forced to go without these things if the need arises, simply because parents cannot afford such "luxuries".

The life of one single mother came to light, not long ago during a court case in Winnipeg. The court heard how the woman was reduced to pawning furniture to buy food and to stealing milk and diaper ointment. Is it not tragic when furniture is swapped for food and mothers are forced to steal? Is now not the time for the government to act and provide greater support? Witness after witness who has appeared before the subcommittee on poverty of the standing committee on health and welfare in the last two years has singled out unemployment as the primary cause of poverty. Since child poverty mirrors unemployment, the Minister of National Health and Welfare now has a unique opportunity to take up the cause of child poverty. We are now in the midst of a recession. It is not the time to blame individuals for unemployment. The government's economic polices must not bankrupt its citizens, especially its children.

• (1730)

I therefore challenge the Minister of National Health and Welfare to declare poverty our most serious public health problem. All children by definition are entitled to the average life span, to good health and to excellent education to ensure life, liberty and happiness.

I dare the minister to table in Parliament at once a plan of action, short term and long term, to lend credibility to his ministry. I dare the minister to announce soon his long overdue child care program. I dare him to convince his colleagues in cabinet to pursue a full employment policy as the chief and long-term assault on poverty, to tell them children are not small adults warranting only small budgets.

As one subcommittee witness said: "A country which is not committed to a full employment policy cannot expect employment to be the vehicle for eradicating poverty."

I agree we should spend for national defence, but should the nation not also defend our most obvious future, our children? There are two ways to protect future generations, and this one, declaring war on poverty, should not go unrecognized.

Let the next generation of children never know the want and pain of poverty. On behalf of poor Canadian children, I challenge the minister to make a better future more than a dream for children. I dare the minister and his government to increase the minimum wage in areas of federal jurisdiction and to require that all federally funded and cost-shared programs meet the federal minimum wage as a condition of funding.

I dare the minister and his government to revisit the newly amended Unemployment Insurance Act and to restore federal financial support for this program.

I dare the minister to institute fair taxation. Canadians are asking not only what is adequate, but also what is enough. It does not make sense that a full-time child care worker should only earn $10,000 a year, while a chief executive officer of a big corporation would be earning $600,000 a year.

I dare the minister to look into establishing a national nutrition policy to reflect the real priorities of our Canadian poor. The minister of health, towards the end of his speech said: "We cannot afford not to fight poverty." I agree.

I therefore dare the minister to move now for a better and bright tomorrow for our poor Canadian children.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Guy Ricard (Laval-Ouest):** Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the debate this afternoon I have listened to the comments made by various speakers, and I would like to put a question to the hon. member for Winnipeg North.

I have here a document which says "Canadian Job Strategy—Estimated expenditures for the Quebec region". Unfortunately, I don't have the figures for Canada as a whole. I only have those for Quebec. I have a number of data here which I will not quote at length because it would take too much time.

I listened to the speeches, Everybody said that we were cutting government subsidies, established programming, budgets, and so forth. I see here: "Job Development"; for the Quebec region, the budget for youth in 1989-90 was $34 million. In 1990-91, it will be $44 million. I see another one here: "Skill Shortages", a program to

upgrade the skills of people on the labour market; $12 million in 1989–90 and $13.3 million in 1990–91. And "Community Futures", $8.5 million in 1989–90 and $11.8 million in 1990–91. Total spending was $112 million in 1989–90 and will be $121 million in 1990–91.

I don't know whether the hon. member for Winnipeg North has these figures but I wish he would explain how he can talk about cuts, when these figures tell us the exact opposite, Mr. Speaker. Does he have an explanation?

[*English*]

**Mr. Pagtakhan:** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to reply. When one looks at a set of figures and finds that one has spent a certain amount, it has to be related to the amount that is required for the given activity, in this instance child poverty. I am glad that the government had to spend this money. I would be doubly aghast if it had not.

My submission is that this government has not spent enough. The fact remains, it is very clear, it does not need any complex analysis. We still have one million poor Canadian children. How do we explain to these children that the government has spent enough?

The hon. member commented on retraining programs. They are good too. However, if there is no job to be found after the training, what is the training for? We just heard in the news last Friday that some 60,000 jobs were lost during the month of November, over and above the job loss in October. Do we say that this government has good fiscal and monetary policy? No.

The Minister of Finance in his last budget said we could expect a rise in unemployment, indicating that unemployment is government economic policy. I am really perplexed. Unemployment immediately translates into poverty. Witness after witness who appeared before the subcommittee on poverty of the standing committee on health and welfare have said so.

Is the hon. member telling me now and telling this House that those witnesses who work for poor children, who work for the poor of our country, are wrong? I submit that the government is wrong and those people are right. The children of Canada are lucky that we have these people who advocate for them because children cannot vote, but still also have hearts and minds to be protected.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with attention to the remarks of our colleague. I know he is a paediatrician and professor of medicine. He certainly knows what he is talking about when he speaks of children.

**Mr. Lewis:** Which is remarkable for members on that side of the House.

**Mr. Boudria:** "Which is remarkable in a similar way to other speeches of members of the opposition", I believe is what the Minister of Transport said. I am paraphrasing here so that it can be on the record.

I want to ask our colleague, who is obviously very knowledgeable in this area, if he recalls, as I do, that just prior to the last election campaign the government produced a program of child care, not a perfect one. It was certainly faulty. The government produced that program, brought it to the attention of the House and then when the program was actually before the Senate, it called the election prior to the bill being approved by the Senate and then failed to reintroduce the same legislation after the election was over.

I wonder if my colleague recalls that, and given that he probably does, will he tell us in his opinion if he agrees with me that this government was not sincere when it said it wanted to have a national child care strategy, that it was all empty rhetoric and it was attempting to find some way of scuttling its own bill, which eventually it succeeded in by calling the election at a time when the bill was before the Senate, thereby allowing it to die on the Order Paper.

**Mr. Pagtakhan:** Mr. Speaker, as usual my colleague is always keen in picking up on very important issues and certainly child care is one.

**Mr. Lewis:** I know it is Christmas, but this is a bit much.

• (1740 )

**Mr. Pagtakhan:** Mr. Speaker, it is the essence of Christmas that we challenge and rekindle in us the warmth of the human spirit, the spirit of fortitude and generosity. In that way we can spread goodwill and make warm friendships and cultivate the love of family. Love of family means that we should have the means with which to take care of our children.

When working mothers, particularly single parents, need child care spaces and cannot find one, what do we say to them? It is not fair. It is not fair that this government would promise to do something during an

election and just drags, drags and drags after the election.

Let us also remember that children are a unique group of citizens. Unlike adults, children continue to grow. For every day of delay in attending to the needs of children, those days can be multiplied in terms of adverse effects if we fail to deliver that service.

I would challenge the government to consider establishing child development centres across the country so that we can truly address the needs of our children, our most valuable national resource.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of State (Youth), Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, before starting my brief comments on this topic, I wonder whether it would be possible to obtain the unanimous consent of the House for dividing the 30 minutes allowed the government into two periods of 15 minutes, that is, two 10–minute periods, each followed by five minutes of questions and comments.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Danis:** I want to thank hon. members of the Official Opposition and of the New Democratic Party.

I rise to speak in this debate as Minister of State (Youth). As you know, my mandate consists in representing Canadians between the ages of 15 and 24 in cabinet and preparing national guidelines and designing national initiatives to promote their interests and well–being.

I realized that the motion presented by the hon. member for Hamilton East was about poverty and its impact, and that is why I was anxious to take part in this debate.

As the Minister of State (Youth), I saw with my own eyes, in the course of recent consultations, how poverty that affects children at an early age can later create problems that are practically impossible to overcome when they have to earn a living and support a family.

However, this motion does not give any recognition to what is being done today to deal with a very important aspect of the problem. Mr. Speaker, I am referring to employment. The best way to break the vicious circle of poverty is to find a job, and the best way to find a job is to get an education.

Let me give an example. According to a recent study, the poverty rate was 14.3 per cent among families where the head of the family had less than nine years of schooling, and this compares with 8.3 per cent for families where the head of the family had at least finished high school. When the head of the household had finished post–secondary studies or had a trade, the poverty rate was lower, around 6.7 per cent. Finally, only 3.7 per cent of families where the head of the family had a university degree were living in poverty in this country.

To recapitulate, the family poverty rate ranged from 14.3 per cent when the head of the household had less than nine years' schooling to 3.7 per cent when the head of the household had finished university. The only variable was the number of years of education.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, if we look at the circumstances of single parent families, we find a shocking poverty rate of 30.5 per cent. It is partly due to the fact that this group includes a very large number of either elderly or very young people with a very tenuous link with the labour market. This group also includes single parents such as teenage mothers.

In this case the difference is even more revealing. When the head of the family has not finished grade nine, the poverty rate is 53.8 per cent. In the case of single parents with a post–secondary education or some kind of trade, the poverty rate goes down to 20.4 per cent. If the head of the household has a university degree, the poverty rate goes down further, to 12 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, education can make all the difference. By continuing their education, young people can acquire the proper skills that will help them cope with future changes. I am sure we all realize that a child that grows up in poverty is more likely to drop out of school and thus contribute to the poverty of another generation.

One would think these figures would convince young Canadians that an education is important if they want a decent future. Unfortunately, that is not really the case. About 30 per cent of Canadian students drop out of high school. If the present drop-out rate continues, by the year 2000, one million under-educated and untrained young people will have joined the ranks of the labour force, at a time when the demands of global competition are such that we need an increasingly educated and skilled labour force.

Hon. members know that if Canada is to continue expanding as a trading nation, it cannot afford the social costs generated by an uneducated labour force that cannot compete with that of other countries. Since skill requirements in various sectors are increasing, the result will be a definite lack of productivity at a time that is critical for the Canadian economy.

Today, the number of researchers and scientists in this country is among the lowest per capita of all industrialized nations. In a survey conducted by the Conference Board of Canada last year, two Canadian companies out of three stated that among their employees they had a number of people who were illiterate and thus incapable of doing the tasks they were supposed to do. Furthermore, half of Canada's companies have trouble finding qualified employees with the requisite skills. In fact, earlier this year, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development made it clear that a lack of skilled workers was the most serious problem facing our economic growth in the 90s.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most members are aware of these facts. If we are to compete effectively in a global economy, we must take the necessary steps to provide our labour force with the skills it needs to meet the future requirements of the labour market.

That is why the government is leading the way in this area by taking steps to help young Canadians prepare for tomorrow. However, we are not alone in having to deal with this responsibility. In fact, the co-operation of industry and unions, provincial governments, educational institutions, communities, parents and young people themselves is both crucial and necessary.

Through the department responsible for Youth, the government is about to implement the *Stay in School* project. To that end, we have allocated $296.4 million. The project is aimed first of all at persuading young people to continue their secondary education. Although we realize that education is first and foremost a provincial matter, we intend to take advantage of the knowledge and good will of anyone who is anxious to find a solution to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would be the first to acknowledge the excellent work being done by teachers in this country. However, the time has come to create new partnerships in order to help our schools and reinforce the connection between education and the labour market. I would like to point out that this objective is about to be met thanks to the *Stay in School* project. Our plan is threefold. First, the federal government is developing new labour market entry programs and services and expanding existing ones to create awareness among those still attending school. There are the Cooperation Education Program, career workshops, Canada Career Week and counselling services to name a few.

• (1750)

We have since developed an activity called Starting Point as part of the Job Entry Program, which is an element of the Canadian Job Strategy. It is aimed at providing the young people with numerous tools, such as career evaluation, adoptive school and job experience.

Second, we are mobilizing our partners at the national and local levels to get them involved in solving the problem. In the Mobilization of partners part of the program, we are bringing together counsellors and business people, labour representatives, teachers, parents, social organization officials and the young people themselves. I recently arranged a series of meetings with the young people, including young native people. Widening the scope of the labour market entry programs is one thing, but solving the drop out problem is another. That is why a concerted effort is essential.

The best thing to do is to start by gaining the support of the young people who were confronted to the problem so that they can relate their experience.

During the next four years, the federal government, on the advice of the provincial and territorial governments, will work closely with groups interested in issues

relating to the students to better connect education to the labour market.

Our objective is to support community projects and to encourage community participation. By encouraging the community to look for an answer to the problem of dropouts, we are allowing the community to come up with solutions that will have popular support.

In this way, everyone at the national as well as local level is contributing to finding ways of keeping young people in school.

Third, as part of the information component of the *Stay in School* program, we are preparing information packages on careers and trying to create more public awareness about the dropout issue. We want to inform potential dropouts and their parents on career opportunities and the fundamental importance of high school.

[*English*]

Reducing the drop–out rate is a real challenge, but not one beyond our grasp. We owe it to our young people to make a parallel effort. Since last February when the stay–in–school initiative was first announced, a range of activities has taken to promote this objective.

Last April, for example, the federal government co–sponsored the Conference Board of Canada's first ever National Conference on Business Education Partnerships. More than 400 senior executives from business, labour, and education attended the conference, along with representatives of government, community groups, and young people.

We must help people understand themselves. What is required is for them to go in a direction that appeals to them. But to do so, we must give the professionals the tools they need to provide proper and meaningful career guidance to young people.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret the minister's time has expired. Questions and comments.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the Minister and I thank him for his comments. There is an issue of particular interest to me, and the minister raised it. It is this whole issue of the dropouts in our school system. The Minister mentioned a number of programs. Some of them are totally new and have a good chance of being successful, at least I hope they will, being myself the father of two teenagers. Fortunately, they are both in school. One is a bit too young to consider dropping out and the other is attending the university, Thank God, as far as I know, he has no intention of dropping out. But the same is not true for many young people. I see friends of my son dropping out of school at 16 or 17. Of course, as long as everything goes well, they have no problem, but when we face hard times—as we do now—they are the first to loose their jobs because they lack seniority, of course, and for other reasons as well.

Can the minister tell me if any of the programs in his Department provide better incentives for staying in school? Has the minister considered for instance something along the line of investing more into programs like Cooperative Education. Such programs at least teach the young people the importance of pursuing their studies by showing them that it is not always so great on the labour market.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. minister has two minutes to answer.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of State (Youth), Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. friend for his question. There is no doubt in my mind that school dropouts are among the problems facing Canadians today. Let me quote you a few statistics. For instance, 30 percent of our high school students in Canada drop out. The rate varies across the country. In some provinces, it is 20 percent, while in others it exceeds 70 percent. That is totally unacceptable.

When we look at Germany or Japan, where the rates of dropouts were as high as ours 25 or 30 years ago but have now fallen to 4 or 5 percent, we know it can be done. Therefore, the initiatives I mentioned earlier in my short speech are among the initiatives the federal government undertook these past few years in an attempt to reduce the rate of dropouts. The specific program my friend referred to, the Cooperative Educaton Program, is indeed one of the programs—

[*English*]

It is really one of the most successful programs that we have in place. It is certainly our intention to make sure the program continues to make as much progress as it has in the past. In my travels across the country, that is one of the programs that the kids have told me they appreciated the most.

Like my friend, I also have two kids, but at least they are in school for now. Thank God for that.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Comments are now terminated. Debate. The hon. parliamentary secretary to the Minister of State for Finance.

**Mr. Dave Worthy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs) and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, debating this bill is like arguing against motherhood. There is not a single person in the House—and I do not think there are too many people in Canada—who would not be happy to do something directly, not only for the working poor—which this bill addresses—but for any of the people in Canada who are in poverty today, in fact anybody in the world who is in poverty.

A person has to consider what, in fact, is in the best interest of the working poor of Canada. Is it to continue the process of spending more than one has? Driving the national debt up? Borrowing from our children to pay for today? Or, is it in fact to establish an economic program that is sound and that will take us into the future where our children and our grandchildren can look at a country where they not only have a job but they see far reduced levels of poverty in the working poor, as well as in any other category, whether it is the seniors or the children.

Whenever a Conservative in particular stands up to address a topic like this, people immediately say: "Oh, he is a Conservative. He doesn't care about people." I would like to point just a brief example.

It is not just Canadians who think this way. There are other countries around this world which also recognize that you cannot give something out unless you have the money in pocket. To take another country in America, if you look at Mexico, it has far more people in poverty than we in Canada. If you want to call it working poor, most of those people are working and they are very poor.

• (1800)

What is in their best interests? Is their government's approach to try to solve that poverty without an improved economy? It has tried, but it does not work. We cannot improve the plight of the working poor without upgrading our economy. That is the task that this government has undertaken.

But, in every step of the way in trying to improve this economic condition in Canada, we have been opposed. At first I thought it was just politics, but I have come to realize that many people in the opposition actually believe in what they are saying and what they are doing. They do not believe that you need to have a sound economy before you can spend the money—

**Mr. Boudria:** Yes, we do.

**Mr. Worthy:** —that if you want to spend more, no matter what the cause, that it is okay, that somehow or other that debt does not really count.

I do not believe that, Mr. Speaker, and thank goodness a number of people in Canada do not believe that. Just as an example, the economic program that this government has established is a sound one. We believe that if you want a bigger piece of pie, you have to get a bigger pie.

That is a simple analogy. You do not need to be a rocket scientist to figure that one out. If you want more pie, you have to have a bigger pie in total. Our policies are encouraging that. But what has happened? Just this fall we saw nearly a year's backlog of sound economic legislation being held up by our friends down the hall. The first was Bill C-21, the reform UI bill, very important to this country. If you want to upgrade the working poor, especially the ones who need to get from a low paying job to a better paying job, you need a program that is going to work on training and education. Part of that was in Bill C-21. That was one of the main reasons for it. It was a a reform UI bill that would provide some of the help that the opposition is actually looking for.

We had Bill C-28, another tax reform, to try to get greater taxation from large corporations. That was held up. We have Bill C-69, the government expenditure restraint bill, again trying to put this economy on a sound footing. That also was held up.

These, if they had not passed, would have added billions to our deficit.

Now, what is the bill currently being held up? It is the goods and services tax, a tax designed to improve our local industry, to make us more competitive on world markets, to take away the unfair competition that importers have over the producers of our own products, to try to put our exporters on an equal footing.

The bill does more than that. It adds capital initiative to the whole economy, up to $9 billion a year initiative that is in fact going to end up with a net result of more jobs and more dollars for the exact people we are talking about today.

Also, in passing, it helps businesses so that their capital and operating costs are more effective, more competitive, and of course therefore providing more jobs.

If we really want to assist the working poor, I would encourage the hon. members who proposed this bill to urge their friends down the hall to in fact pass it.

These bills are the ones we have just passed in the last year to try to improve our economy, but we have been practising economic policy for six years now. What is the result of that? It has been aimed at restraint, at tax reform, and at improving our whole economy.

Let us address restraint just briefly. In spite of the fact that 33 per cent of our government spending is for transfer of spending, there is another 24 per cent in transfers to the provinces. These are the dollars that go directly, in most cases, to the kinds of people who need it the most. It is transfers for the elderly. They get $17 billion per year. Their increases over the last five years have been at a rate exceeding 7 per cent. There are the UI recipients. There is family allowance for the young people we are talking about. There is veterans allowances. Under the transfers to the provinces, there are the hospitals, the schools and, of course, the welfare payments that are very important. All of those have been increasing at close to 6 per cent per annum. Yet, the total government spending has been at a rate of 3.6 per cent. It is obvious that we have been cutting back on many other aspects of our program. It is an example I have used in the House. I would like to repeat it one more time.

When we took office, this government was spending $10 billion per year more than it was bringing in in revenue. Currently, we are bringing in $10 billion more in a year than we are spending. That is a $26 billion a year turnaround to try to get this country back in shape so that we can afford the programs that we all wish we could provide for the working poor.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask again for the consent of the House that two Liberals could be allowed to speak in succession. Unless we get that unanimous consent, our Quebec colleague from Montreal will not be allowed to speak. That would be terrible, given the tremendous state of poverty there.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville):** In a few days, Mr. Speaker, most Canadians will celebrate Christmas, time for culinary traditions, joy, peace, religious ceremonies, family reunions, and gift sharing. For most of them it will be a time to rejoice, yet an ever increasing number of Canadians will only be able to remember better days. What with increasing lay-offs and practically nonexisting opportunities to find alternate employment at decent wages, our population is getting poorer at an alarming rate! We are in a recession, the government promises to implement the GST next month, and chances of landing permanent jobs are getting slimmer by the minute.

Mr. Speaker, food banks, clothing distribution centres and people queuing for a bowl of soup are increasingly common. Still we lack the resources and the funds to bring a minimum of relief to the ever larger numbers of needy people.

[*English*]

Poverty is being felt throughout this country and some areas are touched more than others. From Vancouver's lower east side to Halifax's north end, from Winnipeg's core area to Toronto's Jane, Finch and Regent Park complexes to name but a few, poverty is fast becoming a fact of life of too many fellow Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Just as an example, in one month a food bank in the Montreal region counted roughly 1,200 people, including 400 children under age 15 who were so hungry they could not wait to eat whatever they could find in the grocery bags! These children often leave for school without eating anything because there is nothing to eat at home. These children have a hard time concentrating and learning on an empty stomach.

A child with an empty stomach finds it hard to listen to what the teacher has to say.

• (1810)

Mr. Speaker, those children will be our next adult generation. They are the ones who will have to fashion to future of our country. And they will be our judges.

That so many children live in poverty in a society like ours is intolerable. According to the Canadian Association of Food Banks, the parents of over one million children must rely on food banks to feed their children every day.

Mr. Speaker, it also intolerable that so many young need to escape trough artificial means in order to survive in a world that has let them down. We are talking about young people who live in this very country. We are talking about our own young people. About youth who have a potential to offer, but whose essential needs are not met.

What is this government going to do about it? When will it make poverty in Canada a priority on its agenda? Poverty is not only a provincial responsibility, it is also a federal responsibility.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote Judge Ruffo who is well known for her stand for children: "Our children are trying to tell us something, but we aren't listening. Our children have no hope so they are destroying themselves in drugs and suicide and prostitution and committing more and more violent crimes".

We must all stop ignoring the problem. We must get involved. This government must admit that there is a crisis, that there is indeed an emergency. This government must get involved before it is too late. It might already be too late. Throwing the problem in another camp will only delay things. Those in power must act now or there will not be a tomorrow for thousands of Canadian kids. When will this government commit itself? When will it accept to do something?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not, the problem is here and, far from going away, it is growing, Pediatricians report that the number of cases of ear infection, pneumonia, diarrhea and meningitis among children of low-income families is increasing. Child abuse is on the rise: 36 and 35 per cent respectively among girls and boys age 14 and 15 in Canada were victims of sexual abuse. How long will this government wait before taking action? When will this government accept to face the music and realize that the problem is in its own backyard?

Mr. Speaker, poverty goes hand in hand with all the other social ills. It is urgent to find and implement ways to put an end to this critical situation.

According to Statistics Canada, one child in ten lives in poverty. The death rate among new born babies of poor parents is twice the national average. The rate of school dropouts among children of poor families is 2.2 times higher than for other children. What a sad picture!

What will tomorrow be like if we refuse to face these facts? When will the Prime Minister make Canadian men and women a priority? In Canada, the number of poor people, among all age groups, is increasing. Unfortunately, this is a well established fact. Hardship is no longer limited to some social classes and certain age groups.

Bankrupcies plant and store closures, job losses and salary cuts are every day occurrences. Overnight, Canadian men and women by the thousand find themselves financially destitute.

How can we believe in a country which so easily neglects its own citizens? There is no longer any income security or any hope to make dreams come true. A much too large proportion of our citizens have a very uncertain future. What tragedy will have to happen before this government wakes up and implements programs in co-operation with the provinces? The situation has become unacceptable and yet, only a modicum of help is being offered. We expect voluntary agencies to do everything, but it is not possible, it is not enough.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention the situation of our senior citizens, too quickly forgotten by a society moving in high gear. To illustrate what I want to say I will give you the example of the group Sun Youth in Montreal, which announced that it would hold, last November 21st, a distribution of used clothing for older people. It was supposed to start at 8.30 a.m., but at 6 a.m. people started to line up. More than 1,200 people over 60 came to get free clothing, and this during a single day. These are people who barely managed on their pension or welfare cheque. Once they have paid for rent and some food they have nothing left. Mr. Abramson, 74, who was in charge of the quality of clothing said and I quote: "Senior citizens are the most mistreated of our citizens. Governments have money for this or that, but nothing for those who helped build this country and paid for it with their taxes."

Mr. Speaker, what more does this government want? Our children are going to school hungry; teenagers struggle for survival in the street due to a lack of income and decent employment; our senior citizens line up to get free clothing to face the elements.

We are often told that: "Canada is a rich country, a caring country, but for who? When will the gouvernment acknowledge that this country is in a crisis, not just a recession? When will the government put in place job creation programs to offset all the closings and to increase the number of jobs available? When will the gouvernment invest in this country and give equal opportunities to all its citizens? When is the government going to act?

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I have here a document dealing with Canadian children which I received recently from Statistics Canada. By the way, I wish to congratulate Statistics Canada for providing hon. members with this very useful tool.

In this document I have found rather alarming data concerning children living below the poverty line. Here are a few facts: In 1988, 4 per cent of children lived in families where the annual income was below $10,000; 11.7 per cent lived in families where the annual income was between $10,000 and $19,999, that is to say, between $10,000 and $20,000. These two groups together represent nearly 15 per cent of the population.

What I find even more appaling, Mr. Speaker, are the following statistics: When we consider single-parent families, where the heads, in 80 per cent of the cases, are women, 23.9 per cent of children live in families where the income is below $10,000 per year, and what is even more surprising, 41.5 per cent belong to families where the income is between $10,000 and $20,000 per year. If we combine both these figures, we find the following statistics: 65.4 per cent of children from single-parent families belong to families where the income is under $20,000 a year.

I wish to in view of these disturbing figures ask my hon. friend if she does not feel that the time has come for all levels of government to make sure that former spouses—men most of the time—do their part in providing for their families after a separation or a divorce. In my opinion, these statistics are a national disgrace and I would hope that the various governments will deal with this issue and make sure than men—I say men, because these estranged spouses are almost always men—provide for their children after a marriage breakdown. May I ask my hon. friend to comment on this.

• (1820)

**Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to my colleague and I am grateful to him for giving me this opportunity to speak about children that have been forgotten in the vacuum left as a result of family divorce or break-up.

For a number of years now the two government levels have been throwing the problem back and forth between themselves. They say: "Not our fault, this is a provincial responsibility. There is no federal legislation covering that aspect". I would suggest that time has come indeed for both government levels to assume their responsibilities.

I want to get back to the situation of these children, if my colleague will allow me. Earlier today the minister was telling us that the number of poor children, children who go hungry, is going down. That is quite false! On the island of Montreal the numbers are not going down.

Here is an example concerning schools. La Salle's Saint-Jean-Baptiste school ranks 70th among Montreal's poorest. If we talk about the city of Montreal it is even worse. But for the whole island the figures are dismal, 41 per cent in one school. Referring to the island or only the city of Montreal as such, we are looking at

almost 40 per cent in practically every ward. The mortality rate in the poorest areas is 68 years of age, against 80 in the richest district.

One out of four Montrealers lives in poverty. These are not the figures which the minister gave us this afternoon for last year or the year before, no, these are the findings of the latest surveys made in Montreal. I think that the government has the duty to help Canadian men and women who live below the poverty level.

[*English*]

**Mr. David Walker (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in this very important debate. I must say, as an aside in beginning this debate, that I am a little surprised by the unwillingness of the NDP to participate in the way that we wish to participate.

It is a party that has long prided itself on cornering the market on the concern for the poor but, when a push comes to a shove, it has singularly been unable to provide speakers for this very important debate. I certainly hope it is not a sign that it puts the partisanship of a by-election, where its members are working today, over an important debate on the future of this country.

**Mr. Boudria:** Well, they are not going to win in that by-election anyway.

**Mr. Walker:** Perhaps, but the people of Canada expect members to come in and debate these issue very seriously.

This has been a very good opportunity to hear different points of view on the poor of Canada. Sometimes in reciting our concerns for money, as we have heard from the government side, and some of the problems that have emerged in our economy, we lose sight of what these figures mean. What does it mean to have a reduction in funds?

Let us look at the big question of what happened in the early part of 1980s, and why a deficit was created versus what is happening right now.

In the first case, the deficit was created because the Liberal Party was too generous to the poorer regions of the country. Year after year we tried to increase the amount of moneys we gave to the provinces. People forget that. For example, from 1979–80 through to 1984–85, before this miserable government took over, we went from $1.8 billion in transfer payments to over $4 billion. That is an increase of over 100 per cent. The deficit, of course, has gone up from just over $120 billion right up to $400 billion. The government has been niggardly toward the provinces. It has increased the transfer payments by only 30 per cent.

There has been a tremendous, negative impact across the country as a result. We raise questions constantly in the House having to do with food banks. They should look at reality of 1.4 million people at various times during the year having to go to food banks and deal with the reality that by the third week of the month people are out of money.

They should deal with the reality that there is a welfare economy out there and people are pushed into lousy housing. They should deal with the reality they cannot feed and clothe their children, not make denials or say that they do not have any money. There is money in this country. They should check out the profits, the way in which people spend their money, and the charter flights to the States. They should check out their friends. There is money if we have the guts to work for the poor.

I challenge this government to work for once for the poor and not against them. The food banks have come to the Parliament of Canada, not looking for a legal argument from the Minister of Health and Welfare that it is not his responsibility. They have come with the very important desire to see that the right to eat and to have food is considered a basic human right in this country. When, since the Depression, have we had Canadians coming to this building asking to be fed as a right? We have all assumed we would feed each other. We have all assumed that volunteers could do it or that government could do it. The volunteers are tired, and the government is saying it has no money.

On this side of the House we believe that the government has a responsibility. We want the minister to step forward and begin to outline a plan of action so that Canadians can be fed, housed, and clothed.

Throughout this country it affects people from all walks of life. Nobody plans on being poor, but people do end up being poor. Let us quit blaming the victims. Let

us quit pretending that somehow people got themselves into this trap because of their own doing.

They should look at the job losses in the last month alone in Ontario and Quebec. All those ministers are sitting quietly there thinking that they do not have to worry about it because it is out there and not in their region of the country. They should check with the people at home at Christmas. This is a problem in their constituencies. This is a problem among their voters. They want to have some reassurance from this government that it understands what is going on.

I would like to talk to the House about a very important poverty problem in the city of Winnipeg. For the last 10 years, the three levels of government under the leadership originally of the member for Winnipeg South Centre brought forward a program called the core area initiative, which is perhaps the most innovative program, without exaggeration, in North America. It has been an award winning program. All three levels of government have contributed and worked hard together. They have probably generated $.5 billion in investment and expenditures in an area. Winnipeg has developed, I am very sad when I say this, into one of the poorest regions of the country. It and downtown Montreal have the most pressing urban poverty questions dealing with people who have ended up so poor that they cannot deal with that reality.

The minister of energy, who is responsible for this program on behalf of the federal government, said in the press, to the mayor of Winnipeg, and to the premier of Manitoba last week that he was not sure he could find the money. He was not sure that the program was any good. He was not sure that the accountability was appropriate. He was not sure whether he wanted to deal with the city of Winnipeg any further. He was not sure until he heard from the people of Winnipeg and therefore he wanted public hearings.

The language of public participation and public hearings is something we all generally support. We want the government to have some hearings. But what he did not say in public—and it is what every person in Winnipeg who is concerned about the future of the core will say—was that he has never shown up at public hearings. He refuses to answer correspondence. He refuses to take phone calls. He will not talk to the people until it is too late.

In downtown Winnipeg, the urban futures group headed by a very respected academic from the University of Winnipeg has just completed five months of hearings, five evenings plus private hearings. They had 95 presentations. Every major group concerned about the future of the downtown made a presentation. They were listened to and out of that came a very important report. In that report they wanted to send a message to the governments in Manitoba, at city hall and in Ottawa that the core area initiatives should be continued. They ask:

> Continue the tripartite commitment to inner city revitalization. Much has been accomplished by the CAI, but much more needs to be done. The time has come to reassess direction and focus, not to abandon the undertaking and leave that which has been achieved vulnerable to erosion.

It is the absence of other programs that terrifies the people in the inner city.

• (1830)

We talk about refugee programs, immigration programs and the cutbacks that are hitting the new poor in this country. When we talk about cutbacks to aboriginal language programs, to aboriginal education, to aboriginal training programs, and to aboriginal economic development projects, we are talking about the same people in the core area initiative. When we talk about the lack of funding for university education, we are talking about people—

**Mr. Hockin:** There is no cutback on that program.

**Mr. Walker:** There are cutbacks. If the minister is willing to get into a semantical fight about whether or not this government has cut back, then I think that he should understand his estimates much better. Every Canadian knows there have been cutbacks; every Canadian feels it. Is the minister going to say that there have been no cutbacks in the CBC, in the same constituency? Is he going to say the core area initiative has not been cut back? The minister should be better prepared when he comes into debate and not be taking potshots when the sidelines.

The second thing the group was looking for was to give priority to initiatives that foster community and individual empowerment and that directly improved the conditions in which current inner-city residents lived. To accomplish this, they asked that government broaden the partnership to include a much greater planning and decision-making role for inner-city communities, second, that they provide greater support to education, training, employment, community-based economic development and social service initiatives that promote ownership, self-help and self-determination, not depen-

dency and, finally, focus physical renewal on neighbourhood needs such as adequate affordable housing, infrastructure and community facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on, but it is a case like the core area initiative that could be used in every city in this country. Instead of cutting back, instead of pretending to Canadians that life is continuing on as normal and that there are still plenty of programs out there, if the government would face the reality that it has created a problem for itself and now for every Canadian and that we face a moral crisis, an economic crisis, a taxation crisis, and a crisis of poverty caused by the programs that the government created, and if the government would come out of today's debate understanding that one essential point that the opposition is not here to harangue it but is here to help them understand the desperate voice of poor Canadians in wanting Parliament to respond. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to join in this debate.

**Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)):** Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask my hon. friend three questions.

He speaks about funding for the poor in Canada and he especially made reference to the aboriginal community. Is he aware, first of all, that the Canadian Aboriginal Economic Development Program, which is close to half a million dollars for the next five years, was increased more than inflation, close to 8 per cent year-over-year from the previous funding?

That program includes in it a whole host of self-help programs, including the small business start-up program which was increased from $72 million to $80 million a year. It is a program which is my responsibility. We were able to get that increase above 10 per cent year-over-year. Is he aware that that program has created 5,000 different, small businesses, on and off reserves, in the last five years? Is he aware that that program has done more than any previous federal government program for reducing dependency and creating entrepreneurship, creating jobs and creating business on and off the reserves, and that it has been increased far above the level of inflation, far above almost any other line in the federal government budget?

**Mr. Walker:** Mr. Speaker, in a debate of honesty and sincerity, one recognizes that there are always ministers who try. But the problem becomes that, for these small efforts, they expect to be congratulated. Unemployment on the reserves remains somewhere between 80 per cent and 95 per cent. In Winnipeg there are probably somewhere in the neighbourhood of 50,000 unemployed aboriginals. Anybody who can stand up and say that this program has made a substantial difference in the community simply ignores the reality of the depth of poverty. The problem with this government is that it gets to be defensive about these issues instead of saying that it has started but it has not really accomplished anything.

The major programming that affects the plight of aboriginal people is not only the on-reserve programs such as education. Do not forget the tremendous changes created by the people returning to reserves on issues of housing. The government is probably 15 years behind in housing programs. Just when we found out last year that young people wanted to go to post-secondary education facilities more than ever before, they are faced with a government cutback. We heard in Question Period today about the need for further funds in Labrador.

We find that at the very moment in which we see a tremendous amount of pride emerging in the aboriginal community, this minister and the minister of Indian affairs, since the crisis in the summer, standing up and saying, "Don't you understand how much we have done for them".

When people have a good working relationship, they do not have to stand up and tell people how much they are doing for each other. These people understand it. What we find is the absence of any real progress is causing tremendous frustration in a community which deserves every opportunity it can get.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Guy Ricard (Laval—Ouest):** Mr. Speaker, earlier, when the hon. member for Winnipeg North was making his speech, I asked him about the figures, and he told me that they could be used to say anything one wanted them to say and that they could be interpreted any way at all. I

listened to what was said by the previous speaker, who also referred to a number of figures. I would like to know whether the figures he just referred to are the absolute truth. Should we bear in mind what was said by the hon. member for Winnipeg North or does the Liberal Party have the absolute truth on this matter, Mr. Speaker?

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions and comments are now terminated. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

**Mr. Walker:** On a point of order, the hon. member asked me whether or not my statistics are correct. Is he calling into question the quality of the research and the honesty with which I approached my speech? Everything was correct in my speech.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. Minister for Science on a point of order.

**Mr. Winegard:** Mr. Speaker, if you are going to allow time for someone to respond to one question, perhaps he would like to respond to the question that my hon. colleague put, which he carefully avoided.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions and comments are now terminated. On a point of order, the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, on a point of order.

**Mr. Milliken:** Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today on a point of order concerning the legislation we shall be considering later this afternoon. I spent almost all afternoon reading the legislation. I found some rather strange things and I would like to comment on them now here in the House.

I looked up Standing Order 81(5) which reads as follows, in English, and I quote:

[*English*]

> Supplementary estimates shall be referred to a standing committee or committees immediately they are presented in the House. Each such committee shall consider and shall report, or shall be deemed to have reported, the same back to the House not later than three sitting days before the final sitting or the last allotted day in the current period.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that today is the last day of the period. It is also obvious that two standing committees of this House did not meet to consider the supplementary estimates. The two committees were the Standing Committee on Transport and the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations.

Mr. Speaker, we have evidence that this is so. On Monday, December 5, the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell said in the House that he had written a letter with three other colleagues in, the Liberal caucus to the Clerk of the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations, asking him to arrange for a meeting of the committee. However, he said that this was impossible. Obviously a committee that did not meet could not have examined estimates.

• (1840)

On October 18 last, the hon. member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan raised a question of privilege in the House and indicated the Standing Committee on Transport had held one meeting, but that all members of the government had stayed away from it. On November 28 last, the Speaker gave his decision on the question of privilege and said the following:

[*English*]

> I have to say to hon. members and to the public that the working of committees is very important to the working of the House of Commons. I do ask hon. colleagues to make every effort possible to come to whatever agreements and understandings among themselves which are necessary to make these committees work.

[*Translation*]

If those committees are so important, as the Speaker said, and I agree with him, it is crucial that they meet, pursuant to the Standing Orders of the House, particularly section 81(5).

[*English*]

We were told when this was raised last week by the House leader for this party, the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier, that debate could take place in this Chamber on these estimates on the allotted days.

I have already indicated there are six allotted days in the supply period. Today is day number six. Day number five was on November 21. In other words, all five days had elapsed on November 21 before these supplementa-

ry estimates were tabled on November 23. The government apparently held back these supplementary estimates so there was only one day left in the House to discuss them, which is not in breach of the rules, and I cannot complain on that score. But for the government House leader to suggest, as he did, that somehow we had an opportunity to debate these estimates on supply days was utter nonsense because today is the only day we have an opportunity to debate them. These particular estimates in these two committees could not be considered in the committees because the committees could not meet because the government refused to allow them to meet in clear breach of the obligations under the rules.

The point that has to be made here is that on November 23 when the supplementary estimates were tabled in the House, the President of the Treasury Board, who I am sure took advice from his colleague, the Leader of the Government in the House—and clearly it was misguided advice in the circumstances—proposed a motion to refer these estimates to various committees.

The two that I think are worth noting are the references to the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations. There were a series of votes referred there and then there were three votes referred to the Standing Committee on Transport.

I have filed with the Clerk of the House a notice of objection in respect to every single one of those votes. A motion of concurrence has been proposed by the President of the Treasury Board to concur in these 17 or so votes because of these notices of objection.

My point is that the notices of objection relate to these particular items because they could not be considered in committee because the government refused absolutely to allow these committees to meet. There is ample evidence contained in the proceedings in *Hansard* to which I have referred on the dates that were raised by hon. members and which were not effectively refuted by any member of the government. No one stood up on the government side and said: "We have done our best to get these committees together". They, in fact, had done their best to stop these committees from meeting.

Since Standing Order 81(5) requires that each committee shall consider and shall report these estimates and since the committees could not meet to consider, I submit that these estimates should not be in this bill. The draft bill that is going to be introduced later, if the votes all carry the way they are, has these very votes in it. I was horrified to read these in here. I thought the government would have the good sense to excise them without having to wait for Your Honour to rule them out.

I ask Your Honour, in having heard my argument and having realized, I am sure, as the government House leader must realize that—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I regret that I must interrupt the hon. member.

It being 6.45 p.m., it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 81(15), to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of Supply.

* * *

## SUPPLY

### CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 17B, DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS

**Hon. Marcel Danis (for the President of the Treasury Board)** moved:

That Vote 17b, in the amount of $19,496,000, under Consumer and Corporate Affairs—Goods and Services Tax Consumer Information Office, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, 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:** 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.

*Before the taking of the vote:*

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Kingston and the islands on a point of order.

**Mr. Milliken:** Mr. Speaker, immediately before the bells began to ring, I was in the midst of making a point of order before this House concerning the validity of the government's proposed supply bill. I deliberately put the point of order before the House at that time because I did not want to be met with the argument that because the House had adopted these resolutions, these supply motions, that somehow it affected the validity of this bill.

My submissions were that the bill was out of order and, with great respect, I think I am entitled to a ruling on that before the House proceeds to consider this bill.

My colleague, the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott–Russell, had no opportunity to intervene in the point of order and I think he may have something to say on this important point, Sir.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the House, and I will try to speak loudly so as to overcome the heckling of the Secretary of State for External Affairs—

**Mr. Speaker:** We certainly do not want a situation in which the hon. member is unable to put the argument.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I want to make this argument very brief and very succinct. I want the Chair to be aware that I share very much the opinion of my colleague for Kingston and the Islands that the estimates of all departments and agencies dealing with and reporting to the consumer and corporate affairs and government operations committee should not be proceeded with at this time.

I say this to the House pursuant to a letter that I tabled in the House of Commons on December 5, 1990. This is a letter from the clerk of that committee which indicated to me that the committee could not convene "until the chairman has been duly elected". I quote further from the letter, which says: "The only person authorized to convene a committee for the election of a chairman is the chief government Whip, as in the case of special committees". In other words, what we have been told by the clerk of the committee is that the estimates could not be dealt with at that committee because the government Whip did not cause the meeting to happen, did not cause the committee to sit, enabling it to elect a chairman, thereby making us unable to consider the estimates before us.

This opinion was given to us by the clerk of a standing committee of this House and it remains unchallenged by the government. It is an opinion that comes from a committee chairman, presumably then with the cognizance of the Clerk of the House. Need I remind the Chair that the clerks work for the Chair of this House.

If the committee could not meet, as it was indicated to me, I submit to you that we cannot tonight consider a vote on those particular estimates.

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, I too want to submit, as have previous speakers, that proceeding with the bill before us is really out of order. I refer to Standing Order 81(5) which states:

> Supplementary estimates shall be referred to a standing committee or committees immediately they are presented in the House. Each such committee shall consider and shall report,—

Mr. Speaker, it says shall consider, not may consider or possibly consider, but shall consider. We know that the national defence committee has not considered the $350 million expenditure for the gulf operation. We also know that the consumer affairs committee has not looked into the incredible overruns regarding the GST.

I raised it with the government House leader and actually sent a letter to the chairman of the defence committee suggesting that they do what the Standing Orders require them to do. They have not. These supplementary estimates have not been considered by the respective committees because the committees have not met.

Therefore, I submit, as have previous speakers, that proceeding with this bill at this point would be in fact out of order.

• (1910 )

**Mr. Speaker:** I have, of course, listened very carefully to the arguments that have been put forward. I do not think that it is necessary that I should leave the chair and reserve on this. This is not the first time this argument has been put forward. It is an understandable one

because of the rules being that at a certain point these matters will be dealt with.

I have listened carefully to the hon. members, but if it is the wish of the House to change the proceedings, then it will be necessary to change the rules. I do not find that I am able to comply with the arguments that have been put forth, although I understand perfectly well why they were put forward.

These arguments have been put forward on other occasions by members who are not sitting in the same place tonight.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

*(Division No. 341)*

YEAS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Belsher
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Halliday
Hockin
Horner
Hudon
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Layton
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McKnight
Merrithew
Moore
Paproski
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Andre
Beatty
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boyer
Browes
Cardiff
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gustafson
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horning
Hughes
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Larrivée
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McLean
Monteith
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reimer
Robitaille
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Siddon
Soetens
Sparrow
Tardif
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Weiner
Wilbee
Assiniboia)
Worthy—120
Stevenson
Têtreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—
Winegard

NAYS

Members

Anawak
Arseneault
Bélair
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Campbell (South West Nova)
Clancy
Crawford
Ferguson
Flis
Gardiner
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kristiansen
Lee
Maheu
Milliken
Mitchell
Nystrom
Proud
Robinson
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Stewart
Taylor
Walker
Wood
Angus
Baker
Bellemare
Black
Blaikie
Breaugh
Catterall
Copps
Dingwall
Finestone
Fulton
Gray (Windsor West)
Hopkins
Hunter
Keyes
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacWilliam
McGuire
Mills
Murphy
Pagtakhan
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Stupich
Waddell
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—56

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

• (1920 )

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. To move the evening along in terms of all of the voting ahead of us, I wonder if you would find unanimous consent to apply the division we have just taken to Motion Nos. 2, 11, 13, 19, 20, 22, and 23.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Kamloops has invited the House to apply the vote on the motion we have just taken to Motion Nos. 2, 11, 13, 19, 20, 22, and 23. Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Agreed and so ordered.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1B—DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

*Supply*

That Vote 1b, in the amount of $14,305,000, under the Department of Finance—Financial and Economic Policies Program, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 342*)

YEAS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Belsher
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Halliday
Hockin
Horner
Hudon
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Layton
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McKnight
Merrithew
Moore
Paproski
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Weiner
Wilbee
Assiniboia)
Worthy—120

Andre
Beatty
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boyer
Browes
Cardiff
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gustafson
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horning
Hughes
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Larrivée
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McLean
Monteith
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reimer
Robitaille
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—
Winegard

NAYS

Members

Anawak
Arseneault
Bélair
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Campbell (South West Nova)
Clancy
Crawford
Ferguson
Flis
Gardiner
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kristiansen
Lee
Maheu
Milliken
Mitchell
Nystrom
Proud
Robinson
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Stewart
Taylor
Walker
Wood

Angus
Baker
Bellemare
Black
Blaikie
Breaugh
Catterall
Copps
Dingwall
Finestone
Fulton
Gray (Windsor West)
Hopkins
Hunter
Keyes
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacWilliam
McGuire
Mills
Murphy
Pagtakhan
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Stupich
Waddell
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—56

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 102B—DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 102b, in the amount of $1.00 under Industry, Science and Technology—Canada Post Corporation, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 351*)

YEAS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Belsher
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Duplessis
Epp

Andre
Beatty
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boyer
Browes
Cardiff
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham

Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Halliday
Hockin
Horner
Hudon
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Layton
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McKnight
Merrithew
Moore
Paproski
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy–Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Weiner
Wilbee
Assiniboia)
Worthy—120

Fontaine
Friesen
Gustafson
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horning
Hughes
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Larrivée
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McLean
Monteith
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reimer
Robitaille
Saint–Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec–Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—
Winegard

## NAYS

Members

Anawak
Arseneault
Bélair
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Campbell (South West Nova)
Clancy
Crawford
Ferguson
Flis
Gardiner
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kristiansen
Lee
Maheu
Milliken
Mitchell
Nystrom
Proud
Robinson
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Stewart
Taylor
Walker
Wood

Angus
Baker
Bellemare
Black
Blaikie
Breaugh
Catterall
Copps
Dingwall
Finestone
Fulton
Gray (Windsor West)
Hopkins
Hunter
Keyes
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacWilliam
McGuire
Mills
Murphy
Pagtakhan
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Stupich
Waddell
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—56

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

*Supply*

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5B—DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 5b, in the amount of $60,500,000, under Department of Public Works—Real Property Program, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

*(Division No. 353)*

## YEAS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Belsher
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Halliday
Hockin
Horner
Hudon
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Layton
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McKnight
Merrithew
Moore
Paproski
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy–Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Weiner

Andre
Beatty
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boyer
Browes
Cardiff
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gustafson
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horning
Hughes
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Larrivée
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McLean
Monteith
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reimer
Robitaille
Saint–Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec–Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
White

Wilbee
Assiniboia)
Worthy—120

Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—
Winegard

## NAYS

Members

Anawak
Arseneault
Bélair
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Campbell (South West Nova)
Clancy
Crawford
Ferguson
Flis
Gardiner
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kristiansen
Lee
Maheu
Milliken
Mitchell
Nystrom
Proud
Robinson
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Stewart
Taylor
Walker
Wood

Angus
Baker
Bellemare
Black
Blaikie
Breaugh
Catterall
Copps
Dingwall
Finestone
Fulton
Gray (Windsor West)
Hopkins
Hunter
Keyes
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacWilliam
McGuire
Mills
Murphy
Pagtakhan
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Stupich
Waddell
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—56

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

### CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1B—DEPARTMENT OF SUPPLY AND SERVICES

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 1b, in the amount of $15,769,000, under Supply and Services—Operating expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 359*)

## YEAS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Belsher
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick

Andre
Beatty
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boyer
Browes
Cardiff
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie

Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Halliday
Hockin
Horner
Hudon
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Layton
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McKnight
Merrithew
Moore
Paproski
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Weiner
Wilbee
Assiniboia)
Worthy—120

Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gustafson
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horning
Hughes
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Larrivée
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McLean
Monteith
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reimer
Robitaille
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—
Winegard

## NAYS

Members

Anawak
Arseneault
Bélair
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Campbell (South West Nova)
Clancy
Crawford
Ferguson
Flis
Gardiner
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kristiansen
Lee
Maheu
Milliken
Mitchell
Nystrom
Proud
Robinson
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Stewart
Taylor
Walker
Wood

Angus
Baker
Bellemare
Black
Blaikie
Breaugh
Catterall
Copps
Dingwall
Finestone
Fulton
Gray (Windsor West)
Hopkins
Hunter
Keyes
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacWilliam
McGuire
Mills
Murphy
Pagtakhan
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Stupich
Waddell
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—56

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5B—DEPARTMENT OF SUPPLY AND SERVICES

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 5b, in the amount of $10,997,000, under Supply and Services—Capital expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

*(Division No. 360)*

YEAS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Belsher
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Halliday
Hockin
Horner
Hudon
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Layton
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McKnight
Merrithew
Moore
Paproski
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Weiner
Wilbee
Assiniboia)
Worthy—120

Andre
Beatty
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boyer
Browes
Cardiff
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gustafson
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horning
Hughes
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Larrivée
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McLean
Monteith
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reimer
Robitaille
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—
Winegard

NAYS

Members

Anawak
Arseneault
Bélair
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Campbell (South West Nova)
Clancy
Crawford
Ferguson
Flis
Gardiner
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kristiansen
Lee
Maheu
Milliken
Mitchell
Nystrom
Proud
Robinson
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Stewart
Taylor
Walker
Wood

Angus
Baker
Bellemare
Black
Blaikie
Breaugh
Catterall
Copps
Dingwall
Finestone
Fulton
Gray (Windsor West)
Hopkins
Hunter
Keyes
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacWilliam
McGuire
Mills
Murphy
Pagtakhan
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Stupich
Waddell
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—56

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1B—DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 1b, in the amount of $229,200,000 under Department of National Defence—Operating expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

*(Division No. 362)*

YEAS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Belsher
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture

Andre
Beatty
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boyer
Browes
Cardiff
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)

Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Halliday
Hockin
Horner
Hudon
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Layton
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McKnight
Merrithew
Moore
Paproski
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Weiner
Wilbee
Assiniboia)
Worthy—120

Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gustafson
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horning
Hughes
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Larrivée
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McLean
Monteith
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reimer
Robitaille
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—
Winegard

## NAYS

Members

Anawak
Arseneault
Bélair
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Campbell (South West Nova)
Clancy
Crawford
Ferguson
Flis
Gardiner
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kristiansen
Lee
Maheu
Milliken
Mitchell
Nystrom
Proud
Robinson
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Stewart
Taylor
Walker
Wood

Angus
Baker
Bellemare
Black
Blaikie
Breaugh
Catterall
Copps
Dingwall
Finestone
Fulton
Gray (Windsor West)
Hopkins
Hunter
Keyes
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacWilliam
McGuire
Mills
Murphy
Pagtakhan
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Stupich
Waddell
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—56

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5B—DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 5b, in the amount of $120,800,000 under Department of National Defence—Capital expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 363*)

## YEAS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Belsher
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Halliday
Hockin
Horner
Hudon
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Layton
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McKnight
Merrithew
Moore
Paproski
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)

Andre
Beatty
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boyer
Browes
Cardiff
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gustafson
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horning
Hughes
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Larrivée
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McLean
Monteith
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reimer
Robitaille
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt

Van de Walle
Venne
Weiner
Wilbee
Assiniboia)
Worthy—120

Vankoughnet
Vien
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—
Winegard

NAYS

Members

Anawak
Arseneault
Bélair
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Campbell (South West Nova)
Clancy
Crawford
Ferguson
Flis
Gardiner
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kristiansen
Lee
Maheu
Milliken
Mitchell
Nystrom
Proud
Robinson
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Stewart
Taylor
Walker
Wood

Angus
Baker
Bellemare
Black
Blaikie
Breaugh
Catterall
Copps
Dingwall
Finestone
Fulton
Gray (Windsor West)
Hopkins
Hunter
Keyes
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacWilliam
McGuire
Mills
Murphy
Pagtakhan
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Stupich
Waddell
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—56

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 10B—DEPARTMENT OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 10b, in the amount of $152,500, under Privy Council—Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, 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:** 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 House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 343*)

YEAS

Members

Anawak
Andre
Atkinson
Beatty
Bellemare
Benjamin
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Boyer
Browes
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Catterall
Clancy
Clifford
Collins
Copps
Corbett
Couture
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gardiner
Gray (Windsor West)
Halliday
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horner
Hovdebo
Hughes
Jacques
Joncas
Karpoff
Keyes
Kristiansen
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacWilliam
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Mitchell
Moore
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Porter
Proud
Reimer

Anderson
Angus
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bird
Black
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Campbell (South West Nova)
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Fulton
Gibeau
Gustafson
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hockin
Hopkins
Horning
Hudon
Hunter
Johnson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Koury
Landry
Layton
Lee
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Maheu
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McGuire
McLean
Mills
Monteith
Murphy
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard

Richardson
Robinson
Rodriguez
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Stewart
Tardif
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Walker
White
Wilbee
Assiniboia)
Worthy
Riis
Robitaille
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Soetens
Stevenson
Stupich
Taylor
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Waddell
Weiner
Whittaker
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—
Wood
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—169

NAYS

Members

Milliken—1

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

• (1930 )

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, this is a mysterious place sometimes. May I suggest now that we have taken the vote on Motion No. 3 that the division that has been recorded on Motion No. 3 also be applied to Motion Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 21.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Agreed and so ordered.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I would like it to be known that I want to record my vote as in favour on all items except No. 7 on which I will abstain as I did on the previous vote for the same reason.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1B, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 1b, in the amount of $59,000,000, under Department of Transport—Operating expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

*(Division No. 344)*

YEAS

Members

Anawak
Andre
Atkinson
Anderson
Angus
Baker
Beatty
Bellemare
Benjamin
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Boudria
Brightwell
Campbell (South West Nova)
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Fulton
Gibeau
Gustafson
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hockin
Hopkins
Horning
Hudon
Hunter
Johnson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Koury
Landry
Layton
Lee
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Maheu
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McGuire
McLean
Mills
Monteith
Murphy
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Riis
Robitaille
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Soetens
Stevenson
Stupich
Taylor
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Waddell
Weiner
Whittaker
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wood
Young (Beaches —Woodbine)—170
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bird
Black
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Browes
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Catterall
Clancy
Clifford
Collins
Copps
Corbett
Couture
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gardiner
Gray (Windsor West)
Halliday
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horner
Hovdebo
Hughes
Jacques
Joncas
Karpoff
Keyes
Kristiansen
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacWilliam
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Mitchell
Moore
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Porter
Proud
Reimer
Richardson
Robinson
Rodriguez
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Stewart
Tardif
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Walker
White
Wilbee
Worthy

## NAYS

Members

Milliken—1

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 10B, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 10b, in the amount of $1.00, under Department of Transport—Contributions, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

*(Division No. 345)*

## YEAS

Members

Anawak
Andre
Atkinson
Beatty
Bellemare
Benjamin
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Boudria
Brightwell
Campbell (South West Nova)
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Fulton
Gibeau
Gustafson
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hockin
Hopkins
Horning
Hudon
Hunter
Johnson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Koury
Landry
Layton
Lee
Loiselle
Anderson
Angus
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bird
Black
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Browes
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Catterall
Clancy
Clifford
Collins
Copps
Corbett
Couture
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gardiner
Gray (Windsor West)
Halliday
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horner
Hovdebo
Hughes
Jacques
Joncas
Karpoff
Keyes
Kristiansen
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Maheu
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McGuire
McLean
Mills
Monteith
Murphy
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Riis
Robitaille
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Soetens
Stevenson
Stupich
Taylor
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Waddell
Weiner
Whittaker
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wood
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—170
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacWilliam
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Mitchell
Moore
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Porter
Proud
Reimer
Richardson
Robinson
Rodriguez
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Stewart
Tardif
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Walker
White
Wilbee
Worthy

## NAYS

Members

Milliken—1

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1B, DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 1b, in the amount of $1,992,100, under Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs—Operating expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

*(Division No. 346)*

## YEAS

Members

Anawak
Andre
Atkinson
Beatty
Bellemare
Benjamin
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Boudria
Brightwell
Anderson
Angus
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bird
Black
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Browes

Campbell (South West Nova)
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Fulton
Gibeau
Gustafson
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hockin
Hopkins
Horning
Hudon
Hunter
Johnson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Koury
Landry
Layton
Lee
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Maheu
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McGuire
McLean
Mills
Monteith
Murphy
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Riis
Robitaille
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Soetens
Stevenson
Stupich
Taylor
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Waddell
Weiner
Whittaker
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wood
Young (Beaches —Woodbine)—170

Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Catterall
Clancy
Clifford
Collins
Copps
Corbett
Couture
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gardiner
Gray (Windsor West)
Halliday
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horner
Hovdebo
Hughes
Jacques
Joncas
Karpoff
Keyes
Kristiansen
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacWilliam
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Mitchell
Moore
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Porter
Proud
Reimer
Richardson
Robinson
Rodriguez
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Stewart
Tardif
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Walker
White
Wilbee
Worthy

## NAYS

Members

Milliken—1

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

## CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5B, DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 5b, in the amount of $2,209,000, under Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs—Capital expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

*(Division No. 347)*

## YEAS

Members

Anawak
Andre
Atkinson
Beatty
Bellemare
Benjamin
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Boyer
Browes
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Catterall
Clancy
Clifford
Collins
Copps
Corbett
Couture
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gardiner
Gray (Windsor West)
Halliday
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horner
Hovdebo
Hughes
Jacques
Joncas
Karpoff
Keyes
Kristiansen
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacWilliam
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer

Anderson
Angus
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bird
Black
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Campbell (South West Nova)
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Fulton
Gibeau
Gustafson
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hockin
Hopkins
Horning
Hudon
Hunter
Johnson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Koury
Landry
Layton
Lee
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Maheu
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski

McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Mitchell
Moore
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Porter
Proud
Reimer
Richardson
Robinson
Rodriguez
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Stewart
Tardif
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Walker
White
Wilbee
Assiniboia)
Worthy
McGuire
McLean
Mills
Monteith
Murphy
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Riis
Robitaille
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Soetens
Stevenson
Stupich
Taylor
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Waddell
Weiner
Whittaker
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—
Wood
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—169

NAYS

Members

Milliken—1

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 25B, DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 25b, in the amount of $240,000, under Consumer and Corporate Affairs—Patented Medicine Prices Review Board in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

*(Division No. 348)*

YEAS

Members

Anawak
Andre
Atkinson
Beatty
Bellemare
Benjamin
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Boudria
Brightwell
Campbell (South West Nova)
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Anderson
Angus
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bird
Black
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Browes
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Catterall
Clancy
Clifford
Collins
Cooper
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Fulton
Gibeau
Gustafson
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hockin
Hopkins
Horning
Hudon
Hunter
Johnson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Koury
Landry
Layton
Lee
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Maheu
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McGuire
McLean
Mills
Monteith
Murphy
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Riis
Robitaille
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Soetens
Stevenson
Stupich
Taylor
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Waddell
Weiner
Whittaker
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wood
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—170
Copps
Corbett
Couture
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gardiner
Gray (Windsor West)
Halliday
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horner
Hovdebo
Hughes
Jacques
Joncas
Karpoff
Keyes
Kristiansen
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacWilliam
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Mitchell
Moore
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Porter
Proud
Reimer
Richardson
Robinson
Rodriguez
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Stewart
Tardif
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Walker
White
Wilbee
Worthy

NAYS

Members

Milliken—1

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

*Supply*

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 90B, DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 90b, in the amount of $4,735,000, under Industry, Science and Technology—Statistics Canada—Operating expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 349*)

YEAS

Members

Anawak
Andre
Atkinson
Beatty
Bellemare
Benjamin
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Boudria
Brightwell
Campbell (South West Nova)
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Fulton
Gibeau
Gustafson
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hockin
Hopkins
Horning
Hudon
Hunter
Johnson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Koury
Landry
Layton
Lee
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Maheu
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McGuire
Anderson
Angus
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bird
Black
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Browes
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Catterall
Clancy
Clifford
Collins
Copps
Corbett
Couture
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gardiner
Gray (Windsor West)
Halliday
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horner
Hovdebo
Hughes
Jacques
Joncas
Karpoff
Keyes
Kristiansen
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacWilliam
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McKnight
McLean
Mills
Monteith
Murphy
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Riis
Robitaille
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Soetens
Stevenson
Stupich
Taylor
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Waddell
Weiner
Whittaker
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wood
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—170
Merrithew
Mitchell
Moore
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Porter
Proud
Reimer
Richardson
Robinson
Rodriguez
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Stewart
Tardif
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Walker
White
Wilbee
Worthy

NAYS

Members

Milliken—1

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 95B, DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 95b, in the amount of $310,000, under Industry, Science and Technology—Capital expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 350*)

YEAS

Members

Anawak
Andre
Atkinson
Beatty
Bellemare
Benjamin
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Boudria
Brightwell
Campbell (South West Nova)
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbeil
Anderson
Angus
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bird
Black
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Browes
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Catterall
Clancy
Clifford
Collins
Copps
Corbett

Côté
Crawford
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Fulton
Gibeau
Gustafson
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hockin
Hopkins
Horning
Hudon
Hunter
Johnson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Koury
Landry
Layton
Lee
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Maheu
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McGuire
McLean
Mills
Monteith
Murphy
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Riis
Robitaille
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Soetens
Stevenson
Stupich
Taylor
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Waddell
Weiner
Whittaker
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wood
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—170

Couture
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gardiner
Gray (Windsor West)
Halliday
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horner
Hovdebo
Hughes
Jacques
Joncas
Karpoff
Keyes
Kristiansen
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacWilliam
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Mitchell
Moore
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Porter
Proud
Reimer
Richardson
Robinson
Rodriguez
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Stewart
Tardif
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Walker
White
Wilbee
Worthy

## NAYS

Members

Milliken—1

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

*Supply*

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1B, DEPARTMENT OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 1b, in the amount of $37,644,930, under Department of the Privy Council—Program expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

*(Division No. 352)*

## YEAS

Members

Anawak
Andre
Atkinson
Beatty
Bellemare
Benjamin
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Boudria
Brightwell
Campbell (South West Nova)
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Fulton
Gibeau
Gustafson
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hockin
Hopkins
Horning
Hudon
Hunter
Johnson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Koury
Landry
Layton
Lee
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Maheu
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McGuire
McLean
Mills

Anderson
Angus
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bird
Black
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Browes
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Catterall
Clancy
Clifford
Collins
Copps
Corbett
Couture
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gardiner
Gray (Windsor West)
Halliday
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horner
Hovdebo
Hughes
Jacques
Joncas
Karpoff
Keyes
Kristiansen
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacWilliam
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Mitchell

Monteith
Murphy
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Riis
Robitaille
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Soetens
Stevenson
Stupich
Taylor
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Waddell
Weiner
Whittaker
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wood
Young (Beaches —Woodbine)—170

Moore
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Porter
Proud
Reimer
Richardson
Robinson
Rodriguez
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Stewart
Tardif
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Walker
White
Wilbee
Worthy

## NAYS

Members

Milliken—1

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

### CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 15B, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 15b, in the amount of $2,656,000, under Department of Public Works—Crown Corporations Program—Canada Museums Construction Corporation, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

*(Division No. 354)*

## YEAS

Members

Anawak
Andre
Atkinson
Beatty
Bellemare
Benjamin
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Boudria
Brightwell
Campbell (South West Nova)
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbeil
Côté

Anderson
Angus
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bird
Black
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Browes
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Catterall
Clancy
Clifford
Collins
Copps
Corbett
Couture

Crawford
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Fulton
Gibeau
Gustafson
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hockin
Hopkins
Horning
Hudon
Hunter
Johnson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Koury
Landry
Layton
Lee
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Maheu
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McGuire
McLean
Mills
Monteith
Murphy
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Riis
Robitaille
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Soetens
Stevenson
Stupich
Taylor
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Waddell
Weiner
Whittaker
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wood
Young (Beaches —Woodbine)—170

Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gardiner
Gray (Windsor West)
Halliday
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horner
Hovdebo
Hughes
Jacques
Joncas
Karpoff
Keyes
Kristiansen
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacWilliam
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Mitchell
Moore
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Porter
Proud
Reimer
Richardson
Robinson
Rodriguez
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Stewart
Tardif
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Walker
White
Wilbee
Worthy

## NAYS

Members

Milliken—1

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 16B, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 16b, in the amount of $2,000,000, under Department of Public Works—Crown Corporations Program—Payments to Harbourfront Corporation, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

*(Division No. 355)*

YEAS

Members

Anawak
Andre
Atkinson
Beatty
Bellemare
Benjamin
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Boudria
Brightwell
Campbell (South West Nova)
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Fulton
Gibeau
Gustafson
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hockin
Hopkins
Horning
Hudon
Hunter
Johnson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Koury
Landry
Layton
Lee
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Maheu
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McGuire
Anderson
Angus
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bird
Black
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Browes
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Catterall
Clancy
Clifford
Collins
Copps
Corbett
Couture
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gardiner
Gray (Windsor West)
Halliday
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horner
Hovdebo
Hughes
Jacques
Joncas
Karpoff
Keyes
Kristiansen
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacWilliam
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McKnight
McLean
Mills
Monteith
Murphy
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Riis
Robitaille
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Soetens
Stevenson
Stupich
Taylor
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Waddell
Weiner
Whittaker
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wood
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—170
Merrithew
Mitchell
Moore
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Porter
Proud
Reimer
Richardson
Robinson
Rodriguez
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Stewart
Tardif
Têtreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Walker
White
Wilbee
Worthy

NAYS

Members

Milliken—1

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 25B, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 25b, in the amount of $104,300,000, under Public Works—Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

*(Division No. 356)*

YEAS

Members

Anawak
Andre
Atkinson
Beatty
Bellemare
Benjamin
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Boudria
Brightwell
Campbell (South West Nova)
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbeil
Anderson
Angus
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bird
Black
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Browes
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Catterall
Clancy
Clifford
Collins
Copps
Corbett

Côté
Crawford
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Fulton
Gibeau
Gustafson
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hockin
Hopkins
Horning
Hudon
Hunter
Johnson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Koury
Landry
Layton
Lee
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Maheu
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McGuire
McLean
Mills
Monteith
Murphy
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Riis
Robitaille
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Soetens
Stevenson
Stupich
Taylor
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Waddell
Weiner
Whittaker
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wood
Young (Beaches —Woodbine)—170

Couture
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gardiner
Gray (Windsor West)
Halliday
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horner
Hovdebo
Hughes
Jacques
Joncas
Karpoff
Keyes
Kristiansen
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacWilliam
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Mitchell
Moore
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Porter
Proud
Reimer
Richardson
Robinson
Rodriguez
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Stewart
Tardif
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Walker
White
Wilbee
Worthy

## NAYS

Members

Milliken—1

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

## CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 30B, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 30b, in the amount of $300,000, under Public Works—National Capital Commission, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following motion:

*(Division No. 357)*

## YEAS

Members

Anawak
Andre
Atkinson
Beatty
Bellemare
Benjamin
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Boudria
Brightwell
Campbell (South West Nova)
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Fulton
Gibeau
Gustafson
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hockin
Hopkins
Horning
Hudon
Hunter
Johnson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Koury
Landry
Layton
Lee
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Maheu
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McGuire
McLean
Mills

Anderson
Angus
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bird
Black
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Browes
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Catterall
Clancy
Clifford
Collins
Copps
Corbett
Couture
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gardiner
Gray (Windsor West)
Halliday
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horner
Hovdebo
Hughes
Jacques
Joncas
Karpoff
Keyes
Kristiansen
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacWilliam
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Mitchell

Monteith
Murphy
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Riis
Robitaille
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Soetens
Stevenson
Stupich
Taylor
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Waddell
Weiner
Whittaker
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wood
Young (Beaches —Woodbine)—170

Moore
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Porter
Proud
Reimer
Richardson
Robinson
Rodriguez
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Stewart
Tardif
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Walker
White
Wilbee
Worthy

NAYS

Members

Milliken—1

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 25B, DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote 25b, in the amount of $799,000, under Secretary of State—Public Service Commission, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 358*)

YEAS

Members

Anawak
Andre
Atkinson
Beatty
Bellemare
Benjamin
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Boudria
Brightwell
Campbell (South West Nova)
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford

Anderson
Angus
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bernier
Bird
Black
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Boyer
Browes
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Catterall
Clancy
Clifford
Collins
Copps
Corbett
Couture
Crosbie (St. John's West)

Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Fulton
Gibeau
Gustafson
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hockin
Hopkins
Horning
Hudon
Hunter
Johnson
Jourdenais
Kempling
Koury
Landry
Layton
Lee
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Maheu
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McGuire
McLean
Mills
Monteith
Murphy
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Riis
Robitaille
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Soetens
Stevenson
Stupich
Taylor
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Waddell
Weiner
Whittaker
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wood
Young (Beaches —Woodbine)—170

Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dingwall
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gardiner
Gray (Windsor West)
Halliday
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horner
Hovdebo
Hughes
Jacques
Joncas
Karpoff
Keyes
Kristiansen
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacWilliam
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Mitchell
Moore
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Porter
Proud
Reimer
Richardson
Robinson
Rodriguez
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Stewart
Tardif
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Walker
White
Wilbee
Worthy

NAYS

Members

Milliken—1

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

*Supply*

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE L15B, DEPARTMENT OF SUPPLY AND SERVICES

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That Vote L15b, in the amount of $5,000,000, under Supply and Services, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

*(Division No. 361)*

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anawak | Anderson |
| Andre | Angus |
| Atkinson | Baker |
| Beatty | Bélair |
| Bellemare | Belsher |
| Benjamin | Bernier |
| Bertrand | Bird |
| Bjornson | Black |
| Blackburn (Brant) | Blackburn (Jonquière) |
| Blaikie | Blais |
| Blenkarn | Bouchard (Roberval) |
| Boudria | Boyer |
| Brightwell | Browes |
| Campbell (South West Nova) | Campbell (Vancouver Centre) |
| Cardiff | Catterall |
| Chadwick | Clancy |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Clifford |
| Cole | Collins |
| Cooper | Copps |
| Corbeil | Corbett |
| Côté | Couture |
| Crawford | Crosbie (St. John's West) |
| Crosby (Halifax West) | Danis |
| Darling | de Cotret |
| Della Noce | Desjardins |
| Dick | Dingwall |
| Dobbie | Domm |
| Dorin | Duplessis |
| Edwards | Epp |
| Feltham | Ferguson |
| Ferland | Finestone |
| Flis | Fontaine |
| Fretz | Friesen |
| Fulton | Gardiner |
| Gibeau | Gray (Windsor West) |
| Gustafson | Halliday |
| Harvey (Edmonton East) | Hawkes |
| Hockin | Holtmann |
| Hopkins | Horner |
| Horning | Hovdebo |
| Hudon | Hughes |
| Hunter | Jacques |
| Johnson | Joncas |
| Jourdenais | Karpoff |
| Kempling | Keyes |
| Koury | Kristiansen |
| Landry | Larrivée |
| Layton | LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | Littlechild |
| Loiselle | Lopez |
| MacDonald (Rosedale) | MacDougall (Timiskaming) |
| MacKay | MacWilliam |
| Maheu | Malone |
| Marin | Martin (Lincoln) |
| Masse | Mayer |
| Mazankowski | McDermid |
| McGuire | McKnight |
| McLean | Merrithew |
| Mills | Mitchell |
| Monteith | Moore |
| Murphy | Nystrom |
| O'Kurley | Pagtakhan |
| Plourde | Porter |
| Pronovost | Proud |
| Reid | Reimer |
| Ricard | Richardson |
| Riis | Robinson |
| Robitaille | Rodriguez |
| Roy-Arcelin | Saint-Julien |
| Schneider | Scott (Victoria—Haliburton) |
| Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) | Skelly (North Island—Powell River) |
| Skelly (Comox—Alberni) | Sobeski |
| Soetens | Sparrow |
| Stevenson | Stewart |
| Stupich | Tardif |
| Taylor | Tétreault |
| Thorkelson | Tremblay (Québec-Est) |
| Turner (Halton—Peel) | Valcourt |
| Van de Walle | Vankoughnet |
| Venne | Vien |
| Waddell | Walker |
| Weiner | White |
| Whittaker | Wilbee |
| Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia) | |
| Wood | Worthy |
| Young (Beaches —Woodbine)—170 | |

NAYS

Members

Milliken—1

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

CONCURRENCE IN SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B)

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance))** moved:

That the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, laid upon the Table Friday, November 23, 1990, except those items disposed of earlier this day, be concurred in.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Loiselle** thereupon moved that Bill C-94, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1991, be read the first time.

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, to expedite the passage of this bill, I think you might find unanimous consent to apply the vote on Motion No. 1, which we have dealt with, to the first reading of the appropriation bill, the second reading of the appropriation bill, the various clauses of the appropriation bill, the report to the House of the appropriation bill and the third reading of the appropriation bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Agreed and so ordered.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

*(Division No. 364)*

YEAS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Belsher
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Halliday
Hockin
Horner
Hudon
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Layton
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McKnight
Merrithew
Moore
Paproski
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Weiner
Wilbee
Assiniboia)
Worthy—120

Andre
Beatty
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boyer
Browes
Cardiff
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gustafson
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horning
Hughes
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Larrivée
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McLean
Monteith
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reimer
Robitaille
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—
Winegard

NAYS

Members

Anawak
Arseneault
Bélair
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Campbell (South West Nova)
Clancy
Crawford
Ferguson
Flis
Gardiner
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kristiansen
Lee
Maheu
Milliken
Mitchell
Nystrom
Proud
Robinson
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Stewart
Taylor
Walker
Wood

Angus
Baker
Bellemare
Black
Blaikie
Breaugh
Catterall
Copps
Dingwall
Finestone
Fulton
Gray (Windsor West)
Hopkins
Hunter
Keyes
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacWilliam
McGuire
Mills
Murphy
Pagtakhan
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Stupich
Waddell
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—56

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

**Mr. Loiselle** thereupon moved that Bill C-94, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1991, be read the second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the President of the Treasury Board the customary question, to certify to the House that the bill is done in the usual form and style traditional to this House.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Loiselle:** Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to inform the House that this Bill is similar to other bills on Supplementary Estimates submitted to this House in the past years.

[*English*]

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

*(Division No. 365)*

YEAS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Belsher
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell

Andre
Beatty
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boyer
Browes

Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Halliday
Hockin
Horner
Hudon
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Layton
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McKnight
Merrithew
Moore
Paproski
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy–Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Weiner
Wilbee
Assiniboia)
Worthy—120

Cardiff
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gustafson
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horning
Hughes
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Larrivée
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McLean
Monteith
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reimer
Robitaille
Saint–Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec–Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—
Winegard

## NAYS

Members

Anawak
Arseneault
Bélair
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Campbell (South West Nova)
Clancy
Crawford
Ferguson
Flis
Gardiner
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kristiansen
Lee
Maheu
Milliken
Mitchell
Nystrom

Angus
Baker
Bellemare
Black
Blaikie
Breaugh
Catterall
Copps
Dingwall
Finestone
Fulton
Gray (Windsor West)
Hopkins
Hunter
Keyes
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacWilliam
McGuire
Mills
Murphy
Pagtakhan

Proud
Robinson
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Stewart
Taylor
Walker
Wood

Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Stupich
Waddell
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—56

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the second time, referred to a Committee of the Whole, deemed considered in Committee and deemed reported to the House without amendment.

**Mr. Loiselle** moved that the bill be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

*(Division No. 366)*

## YEAS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Belsher
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Halliday
Hockin
Horner
Hudon
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Layton
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McKnight
Merrithew
Moore
Paproski
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy–Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif

Andre
Beatty
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boyer
Browes
Cardiff
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gustafson
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horning
Hughes
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Larrivée
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McLean
Monteith
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reimer
Robitaille
Saint–Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault

Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Weiner
Wilbee
Assiniboia)
Worthy—120

Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—
Winegard

NAYS

Members

Anawak
Arseneault
Bélair
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Campbell (South West Nova)
Clancy
Crawford
Ferguson
Flis
Gardiner
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kristiansen
Lee
Maheu
Milliken
Mitchell
Nystrom
Proud
Robinson
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Stewart
Taylor
Walker
Wood

Angus
Baker
Bellemare
Black
Blaikie
Breaugh
Catterall
Copps
Dingwall
Finestone
Fulton
Gray (Windsor West)
Hopkins
Hunter
Keyes
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacWilliam
McGuire
Mills
Murphy
Pagtakhan
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Stupich
Waddell
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—56

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

**Mr. Loiselle** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 367*)

YEAS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Belsher
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Duplessis
Epp

Andre
Beatty
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boyer
Browes
Cardiff
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham

Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Halliday
Hockin
Horner
Hudon
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Layton
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McKnight
Merrithew
Moore
Paproski
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Weiner
Wilbee
Assiniboia)
Worthy—120

Fontaine
Friesen
Gustafson
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horning
Hughes
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Larrivée
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McLean
Monteith
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reimer
Robitaille
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—
Winegard

NAYS

Members

Anawak
Arseneault
Bélair
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Campbell (South West Nova)
Clancy
Crawford
Ferguson
Flis
Gardiner
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hovdebo
Karpoff
Kristiansen
Lee
Maheu
Milliken
Mitchell
Nystrom
Proud
Robinson
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Stewart
Taylor
Walker
Wood

Angus
Baker
Bellemare
Black
Blaikie
Breaugh
Catterall
Copps
Dingwall
Finestone
Fulton
Gray (Windsor West)
Hopkins
Hunter
Keyes
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacWilliam
McGuire
Mills
Murphy
Pagtakhan
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Stupich
Waddell
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—56

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the third time and passed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** We have another vote. It being 7.25 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 45(6), the House will now proceed to the taking of deferred division on a motion at the report stage of Bill C–258, an act respecting the establishment of a centennial flame research award to publicize the contribution to Canadian public life of persons with disabilities.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

### CENTENNIAL FLAME RESEARCH AWARD ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

**Mr. Patrick Boyer (Etobicoke—Lakeshore)** moved that Bill C–258, an act respecting the establishment of the Centennial Flame Research Award to publicize the contributions to Canadian public life of persons with disabilities, as reported (without amendment) be concurred in.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps to help, I can say that the members of the New Democratic caucus support this bill unanimously.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, I think you will find a disposition in the House that if the question is put members would be unanimously supporting this bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is that agreed?

**Mr. Andre:** Mr. Speaker, on private members' bills we have a tradition around here of not applying the whip. However, I think the idea that our employees should receive this kind of treatment is worthy of examination.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Boyer:** Mr. Speaker, following the lead given by the House leaders of the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party, perhaps in this private members' matter, I might have the rare moment to speak for the Conservative Party on this and suggest that on this side of the House, also, there would be unanimity in supporting this bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** When shall the bill be read a third time?

**Some hon. members:** Now.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is there consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Patrick Boyer (Etobicoke—Lakeshore)** 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.

Motion agreed to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** On a point of order, the hon. member for Kamloops.

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, I believe there was some understanding that we would also deal with Bill C–225, a motion to withdraw the bill and send the subject matter to committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** That is exactly what I was going to put. Merry Christmas.

* * *

### PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Young (Beaches—Woodbine) that Bill C–225, An Act to amend the Public Service Employment Act (staff of Members of the House of Commons), be read the second time and referred to a Legislative committee; and on the amendment of Mr. Funk (p. 15354).

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** It being 7.40 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the House will now proceed to the taking of a recorded division on the amendment of Mr. Funk, at second reading stage of Bill C–225, an act to amend the Public Service Employment Act (staff of Members of the House of Commons).

Shall I dispense with the ringing of the bells?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

The House divided on the amendment which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 368*)

YEAS

Members

Angus
Black
Blaikie
Gardiner
Hovdebo
Karpoff
MacWilliam
Murphy
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Taylor
Whittaker
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Fulton
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hunter
Kristiansen
Mitchell
Nystrom
Robinson
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Stupich
Waddell
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—26

NAYS

Members

Anawak
Andre
Atkinson
Beatty
Bellemare
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boyer
Browes
Cardiff
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gustafson
Hawkes
Holtmann
Horner
Hughes
Johnson
Jourdenais
Keyes
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Maheu
Marin
Mayer
McDermid
McLean
Milliken
Moore
Pagtakhan
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Robitaille
Anderson
Arseneault
Baker
Bélair
Belsher
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Boudria
Brightwell
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Catterall
Clancy
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crawford
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Gibeau
Halliday
Hockin
Hopkins
Hudon
Jacques
Joncas
Kempling
Koury
Layton
Lee
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Malone
Masse
Mazankowski
McKnight
Merrithew
Monteith
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Stewart
Thompson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Weiner
Wilbee
Assiniboia)
Worthy—134
Schneider
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Soetens
Stevenson
Tardif
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Walker
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—
Wood

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the amendment lost.

• (1950 )

The question is on the main motion. 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 House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 369*)

YEAS

Members

Anderson
Angus
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Boyer
Browes
Chadwick
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Danis
de Cotret
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gibeau
Andre
Atkinson
Belsher
Bird
Black
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais
Brightwell
Cardiff
Champagne (Champlain)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferland
Fretz
Fulton
Gustafson

Halliday
Hawkes
Horner
Hudon
Hunter
Joncas
Karpoff
Koury
Larrivée
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
MacWilliam
Marin
Masse
Mazankowski
McKnight
Merrithew
Monteith
Murphy
O'Kurley
Porter
Reid
Ricard
Riis
Rodriguez
Saint-Julien
Skelly (North Island—Powell River)
Sobeski
Sparrow
Stupich
Taylor
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Van de Walle
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hockin
Hovdebo
Hughes
Jacques
Jourdenais
Kempling
Kristiansen
Layton
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacKay
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mayer
McDermid
McLean
Mitchell
Moore
Nystrom
Plourde
Pronovost
Reimer
Richardson
Robitaille
Roy-Arcelin
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Soetens
Stevenson
Tardif
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
VankoughnetVenne
Vien
Weiner
Whittaker
Young (Beaches —Woodbine)—126
Waddell
White
Wilbee

NAYS

Members

Anawak
Bélair
Blenkarn
Catterall
Copps
Ferguson
Horning
Keyes
Maheu
Pagtakhan
Walker
Arseneault
Bellemare
Boudria
Clancy
Crawford
Finestone
Johnson
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Milliken
Stewart
Worthy—22

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I declare the motion carried.

Bill read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 7.59 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Tuesday, December 11, 1990**

The House met at 11 a.m.

*Prayers*

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### THE ENVIRONMENT

TABLING OF REPORT *GREEN PLAN FOR A HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT*

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), it is my great pleasure to table today in both official languages Canada's *Green Plan for a Healthy Environment*.

[*Translation*]

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. de Cotret:** Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to offer my sincere thanks to the many Canadians who helped to prepare the Green Plan.

[*English*]

I would also like to underline the commitment of the Prime Minister and all my colleagues to this very worth-while initiative that we are putting forward today.

* * *

### AIR ONTARIO CRASH

TABLING OF SECOND INTERIM REPORT

**Mr. Ross Belsher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the hon. Virgil P. Moshansky's second interim report into the Air Ontario Crash at Dryden, Ontario, and the Minister of Transport's initial response to the recommendations of this interim report.

## PETITIONS

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Madam Speaker, it is a privilege and, indeed, an honour to have this opportunity to present a petition pursuant to Standing Order 36 on behalf of the citizens of the great city of Kamloops.

The petition points out a whole variety of concerns that the petitioners have regarding the government's intention to proceed with the 7 per cent goods and services tax. They call it a cruel and brutal tax, coming at the wrong time, hitting the wrong people and being the wrong tax along with the fact that is a very regressive consumption tax as opposed to a fair tax reform.

The petitioners are asking that the government reconsider this decision, back off on proceeding with this tax and introduce a comprehensive fair tax reform package instead.

THE ENVIRONMENT

**Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex):** Madam Speaker, I rise today to present almost 1,000 names and petitions from residents in the city of London, Ontario, and other places in southwestern Ontario.

The petitioners point out to the government that they are very upset about the ever increasing automotive emissions, the thinning of the ozone layer and global warming. We need to take immediate action to protect our environment and communicate the advantage of using ethanol as an environmentally clean automotive fuel.

The petitioners are equally concerned about the use of MMT as a gasoline additive. The manganese portion of MMT that comes out of the exhaust emissions of automobiles is an insidious neuro-toxic substance that must be banned to protect the lives of the children of this country.

I am very pleased to table these petitions on behalf of the people of southwestern Ontario.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Madam Speaker, I have the privilege, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to lay upon the table 10 petitions.

The petitioners reside in the provinces of British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Ontario, Alberta, Quebec and indeed in communities across the country.

All petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to withdraw the goods and services tax. In particular, they make reference to the tax which is proposed to be on magazines, books and on newspapers. They would hope that the Government of Canada would see its way clear in removing the goods and services tax, particularly at this time in view of the Canadian-made recession and the various negative effects it is having on Canadian consumers and, indeed, small businesses across this country.

• (1110)

CHILD POVERTY

**Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam):** Madam Speaker, under Standing Order 36 I have the honour to place in front of the House a petition from nurses across Ontario who have petitioned with their concerns about the grave implications of future social costs of child poverty and have noted that in fact well over one million children in Canada are caught in lives of poverty and they are calling upon Parliament to urge the government to call a First Ministers' conference on poverty and on child poverty specifically. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to table this.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to table a petition signed by numerous residents of Toronto and Mississauga. These Canadians are outraged at the government's proposal to place a tax on books and the printed word as contained in Bill C-62, the goods and services tax bill which, fortunately, is being held up appropriately in the Senate to try to save Canadians from this monstrous tax grab.

These Canadians call upon Parliament to reject the goods and services tax.

LOW-LEVEL FLIGHTS

**Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina):** Madam Speaker, it is my honour and pleasure to present a petition under Standing Order 36 from a number of residents of Alberta and other provinces. This petition has been prepared by the Diocesan Peace and Justice Committee and adopted by the Program and Planning Committee of the diocese. It calls on the government to halt all NATO low-level flight testing and related training over lands inhabited and claimed by the Innu and Inuit people, to withdraw Canada's invitation to NATO to establish a permanent NATO tactical weapons training centre in the Goose Bay-Nitassinan area which would vastly increase the number of low-level flight tests annually, and to take steps to protect the livelihood of Canadians who would be adversely affected economically by the cessation of fighter bomber training.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina):** Madam Speaker, I have another petition from a number of residents of metro Toronto who are concerned about the government's legislation for a goods and services tax, and it points out the many unfairnesses and disadvantages of it, and urges the government to reject the proposal, and instead to reduce the bank interest rate by 2 per cent so as to reduce interest rates on the federal debt and increase small business and general employment, and increase employment in such useful work as—and they list a number of badly needed public works across many Canadian cities.

LOW-LEVEL FLIGHTS

**Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina):** Madam Speaker, I have a further petition from a number of residents of metropolitan Toronto, also concerning the low-level flights over Nitassinan, who oppose the establishment of NATO operations in Canada, including the proposed tactical fighter and weapons training centre at Goose Bay, and demand that Canada end all NATO-NORAD low-level flight training in Canada, and redirect the NATO-NORAD funding toward enabling Canada's aboriginal people to regain control of their lands and their livelihood and promote sustainable development for all Canadians.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might have unanimous consent to revert to Reports from Committees.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

* * *

## STRIKING COMMITTEE

59TH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present the 59th report of the Striking Committee. This report deals with the membership of the legislative committee pursuant to Standing Order 113(1). Upon presentation, such reports are deemed adopted.

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

* * *

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Shall all questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

## PETRO-CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Thursday, December 6, consideration of Bill C-84, an act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada, as reported (without amendment) from the legislative committee; and Motion No. 4A of Mr. Langdon (p. 16404).

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Resuming debate, the hon. Minister of State for Privatization.

ALLOCATION OF TIME TO CONSIDER REPORT AND THIRD READING STAGES OF BILL C-84

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Madam Speaker, I rise this morning to move:

> That, in relation to Bill C-84, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage and one sitting day to the consideration of the third reading stage of the bill; and



> That, fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time provided for government business 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 in order to dispose of the stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively, without further debate or amendment.

**Some hon. members:** Shame.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Minister of State for Privatization.

**Mr. McDermid:** Madam Speaker, I will be brief, because I know the opposition will want to rant and rave for a couple of hours this morning and shed great big crocodile tears on how terrible the government is—

**Mr. Baker:** I wonder, Madam Speaker, if you could rule that the hon. gentleman is in fact in order by speaking. He has already spoken on moving the motion.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** As the House may have seen, I hesitated before recognizing the minister. I think the hon. member is right.

The minister could have given his speech and moved the motion at the end of his speech. Then automatically his remarks would have been heard and the motion would have been moved, but in the circumstances I cannot give the floor to the hon. minister.

I will, then, recognize someone on my left. The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Madam Speaker, I have had to make a speech several times on government time allocation motions, so it is getting to be a bit of a habit.

I am sorry that the hon. member for Prince Albert finds the speeches boring. If he paid closer attention, he probably would be able to glean germs of truth about the autocratic and dictatorial way that this government treats the House of Commons. He is going to get another 10-minute lecture on it this morning, I am afraid to say. I have some facts and figures that I think will amuse hon. members opposite when they consider how dictatorial their efforts have been.

I want to turn particularly to the record of this House during this session of Parliament which has gone on for almost two years, it started in April 1989, so that members can hear the litany of time allocation and closure that has been used throughout the session of Parliament. First of all, I want to look at the raw data. The fact is that in the official statistics produced by the Table, it is evident that 294 hours and 41 minutes have been spent considering second reading of government bills. I will repeat that figure for the hon. member for Cariboo—Chilcotin. He looks interested: 294 hours and 41 minutes.

There have been 82 government bills that have received second reading, from my quick count of the records. This means that the average time spent on second reading debate through this session has been 2.14 hours per government bill. That is not excessive, and yet here we have time allocation once again.

• (1120)

On third readings, the total time spent is 94 hours and 27 minutes. Some 53 government bills have already received third reading, and they say we are holding things up. Imagine, 53 government bills which have received third reading. That means 1.7 hours of debate per bill at third reading, and this is considered excessive by hon. members opposite. I find their approach to Parliament absolutely incredible. Their attempts are always to ram things through.

Let us look at the record. I keep citing these figures; they seem to fall on deaf ears. Closure has been used in this Parliament, that is since November 1988, a total of 13 times by this government. Then there is time allocation—and I am separating the two for the purpose of this discussion—which has been used seven times until today. This is number eight. That is seven times previously and eight times so far in this Parliament.

But that is only part of the story. If we look back at the lamentable record of government members since May 1985 when they started using time allocation, they have now used it on a cumulative basis 25 times in five years, from 1985 to 1990. They have threatened to use it on at least four other occasions when they proposed time allocation and then either withdrew it or had it thrown out by the Speaker, as they did in October of this year, because the Minister of State for Privatization, who got up and once again made an error as he did this morning in not making a speech first, tried to propose time allocation at second reading of this bill. We in the opposition, ever vigilant of Parliament's rights, got up and urged the Speaker to chuck that notice out, and he did. Therefore the minister was unable to move it as quickly as he would have liked.

If we count the attempts—and I see the minister has reappeared—we will find it has been 31 times that the government has either attempted or succeeded in using time allocation in debates in a five-year period. In the 19 previous years, Liberal governments used it a total of 29 times. On any comparison this government has gone hog wild in trampling on the rights of Parliament to debate.

I would like to quote some words. I found some quotations as I was browsing through books last evening. Perhaps hon. members opposite would care to guess whose words these are. I will first quote this line:

> Professor Ivor Jennings, the great English authority on Parliament said—and rightly—that "the function of Parliament is not to govern but to criticize, to modify Government policy, and to educate public opinion". To those who say that Parliament should be turning out legislation in quantity, my answer is that its mission is freedom and the assurance that all the people shall receive justice. It is not a slot machine into which one drops a slug to see the legislation come out.

Who said those words? Was it a great Liberal Prime Minister of Canada? No. Was it one of the members of the present government? No, certainly not. One would not expect to hear those words from the present government, the way it tramples on Parliament's rights. I will tell the House who it was. It was a previous leader of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada and a former Prime Minister of this country, the Right Hon. John George Diefenbaker. He said these words. Let's hear them again. When referring to Parliament he said:

> —its mission is freedom and the assurance that all the people shall receive justice. It is not a slot machine into which one drops a slug to see the legislation come out.

Yet this government and in particular the government House leader take the view that if Parliament does not pass second reading of bills in faster than two hours, it is too slow and it had better get on with it, have time allocation applied and jam it through in a day.

That is exactly what we have heard from the Minister of State for Privatization this morning: one more day at report stage on this very important piece of legislation that is selling off part of the purchase of Canadian taxpayers, Petro–Canada, which they have bought and paid for with their tax dollars. The government is selling it off in order to meet its lust for privatization of Canada's assets. I submit that the government is misguided, as usual.

Let us hear some more words from the Right Hon. John George Diefenbaker who must be held in some esteem by hon. members opposite. I would be the last to want to quote Mr. Diefenbaker as an authority on much, but on the rights of Parliament he had some very sound ideas and certainly he understood the institution better than the present government House leader and his entourage. In fact I would venture to say that Mr. Diefenbaker was one of the best Leaders of the Opposition that Canada ever had. No one will deny that as a Leader of the Opposition he was outstanding. I do not think anyone will deny that as a Prime Minister he was a disaster. The hon. member for Edmonton East would not deny that.

**Mr. Harvey (Edmonton East):** I certainly would. The Conservative Party has abandoned John Diefenbaker.

**Mr. Milliken:** I am sorry that he thinks he was good. He should join the Conservative Party then, because clearly that is where his ghost remains.

Mr. Diefenbaker spoke about the importance of opposition, and I would like to quote again from this speech. I assume it was a speech given in Parliament by Mr. Diefenbaker, but someone with great foresight published it in this book entitled *Those Things We Treasure*. It is a collection of speeches, and I commend it for reading to the government House leader and his entourage. I quoted from page 46 of this little work:

> The need of a strong Opposition is supported by almost every political writer. Among these is Professor Bassett, who has stated that: "The Opposition is not merely tolerated, but treated as indispensable". He emphasizes the existence of an Opposition as an example of the difference between democracy and autocracy.
>
> Opposition is as necessary to the parliamentary system as is the Cabinet. The two are inseparable. One without the other would mean tyranny or chaos. It is commonplace for all governments to view effective opposition as obstruction and this is a view too often and too lightly taken up by critics outside Parliament. An Opposition that discharges its parliamentary responsibilities properly is bound to appear to those opposed as obstructionist.
>
> The weapon of the Opposition is discussion and argument. If the Opposition stand is not justifiable in the opinion of the people, the people are not slow to show their displeasure.

I could go on, but these are words of a former Leader of the Opposition and a former Prime Minister who understood the role of an opposition in Parliament, who suffered at the hands of an opposition in Parliament because it was an effective opposition.

I submit that this government is afraid to suffer at the hands of this opposition, and that is why it keeps closing off debate on the demerits of the bills that the government is continually bringing before this House. Debate on every contentious bill is closed off. I have already indicated the list of over 20 time allocation or closure motions in this Parliament. Never before has closure been used as often as it has been in this Parliament. Yet the government just carries on as though this was a perfectly normal and perfectly standard procedure. The fact is it does not want to hear the truth about the dreadful bills it is producing.

I want to read one more quotation about the role of an opposition, and I quote again from Mr. Diefenbaker:

> Without an Opposition, the administration of the day could and would carry on the task of running the country, but such a situation would be identical with a totalitarian one–party state. Efficiency of administration was claimed by Hitler and Mussolini, but freedom died.

That is exactly what is being trampled out here. It is an effort to stifle criticism, to stifle objection, to stifle the legitimate concerns of the people of Canada as expressed through their elected representatives.

We were not sent here to sit and pass bills willy–nilly. We were sent here so we could offer alternatives, criticize proposals, and educate the public on the damaging effects of government measures. Certainly the damaging effects of many of its measures are becoming readily apparent. One only has to look at the unemployment it has created, the high interest rates it has pushed and established in this country, and the various economic disasters with which it has come up. I do not want to go into those matters in the course of my speech, but I do say that in considering the approach to the public this government has an obligation to listen to the people of Canada, to listen to their representatives in Parliament, and to give us a fair and reasonable opportunity to be heard.

We have had one day on report stage of this bill. There were many amendments moved. There are many more to discuss, but the fact is that we are now being limited to one further day and third reading on a very contentious bill is going to be limited to one day. I call it a disgrace and I call on the government to withdraw this motion.

• (1130 )

**Mr. Ross Harvey (Edmonton East):** Madam Speaker, once again I find myself participating in a debate limiting the time of the House for consideration of Bill C–84. We had the same thing, of course, at second reading. We had a total of three days of debate on Bill C–84 at second reading.

I should note perhaps that the hon. member who is sponsoring the bill, the Minister of Privatization and Regulatory Affairs, sent a letter to one of my local newspapers, the *Edmonton Journal* in which he claimed that in fact there had been four days of consideration by this House of Bill C–84 at second reading. Of course, he neglected to point out that one of those days was taken up with the debate on the time allocation motion so that in fact there were three effective days of debate on Bill C–84 at seconding reading, approval in principle of the scheme to privatize Petro–Canada and thereby to alienate from the Crown assets worth, depending on how we wish to calculate it, somewhere between $2.3 and $6.7 billion.

Having been rushed through this House, like an over–large bride to the altar, the bill wound up in committee. In committee, we had an organization meeting a week before we were to start hearing witnesses. This meant that the witnesses that those of us on the opposition benches did manage to convince the government majority to invite, had a week or less to consider whether or not they could make the time to appear before the committee at the times made available to them by the committee; consider whether or not they had the time to prepare the presentation that would do justice to their beliefs and considerations; and consider therefore whether or not it was even worth–while to make the venture.

I can tell you, Madam Speaker, that several of the witnesses that even the committee in its stingy wisdom decided to invite had to decline because they were unable to make the necessary arrangements at such short notice. Although there was no closure or time allocation in the committee, the effect was the same. Consideration of the bill in committee was truncated. That too has led to inadequate consideration of this bill.

Ten days were devoted to the study of the bill in committee. They were October 31, November 6, 7, 8, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28 and 29. In those 10 days we heard a total of 11 witnesses, of which all but six were government witnesses. We heard six witnesses representing themselves or groups, including the Canadian Life and Health Insurance Association Inc., the Energy Clean Air Caucus of Alberta Friends of the Earth, an investment counsellor by the name of Mr. Gobert, the Council of Canadians, Professor Hershel Hardin. That is about it; $6.7 billion in assets, six non–government witnesses. That is more than a billion dollars a witness. We rushed them through there.

Now we find ourselves at report stage. Several amendments are being proposed. We have had one day's consideration. After one day's consideration, the government has determined that that is enough. It is time to bring down the axe and move this thing off into the final day of report stage consideration and then one day at third reading. That will be the equivalent from the start of second reading to the conclusion of third reading, with all steps in between including all the days spent in committee, to authorizing that expenditure or that alienation of the assets of $6.7 billion at the rate of roughly $400 million a day. That is big spending. It certainly makes me uncomfortable.

I do not believe that this House and its committee has given anywhere near the careful consideration to the bill that it warrants. It is the largest privatization ever undertaken by the government and ever likely to be undertaken by the government. It means the selling off of the one major Crown asset in what, virtually everyone agrees, is a strategic resource area. It is proposed to be done through a regime that will see the Canadian people recoup nowhere close the full worth of their assets.

Why, Madam Speaker? It cannot be haste, arising from the need to have the legislation itself in place because once the proposed legislation passes third reading in this House, it will go the other place. Most people around here are of the opinion at this point that the other place, being consumed with the matter of the GST, will undertake little or nothing else, while that is being considered. Further, it is expected that that consideration will conclude and the sound and fury will finally subside sometime before Christmas. Do you know what happens then, Madam Speaker? The House prorogues and all things on the Order Paper die.

So one of two things is going to happen, Madam Speaker. Either this bill will be stuck in the Senate and die with all the other unfinished business there, in which case what is the point of ramming it through the House? Or the GST fight will continue in the Senate, in which case we have plenty of time in this place to give this bill the full consideration it warrants.

But the government is determined that this massive alienation of the assets of the people of Canada, this turning off of those opportunities which Petro-Canada could represent to the Canadian people in the future, those opportunities to diversify our energy base away from the traditional hydrocarbons of oil and gasoline into far greener pastures, should be accomplished with a haste that is at least unseemly and, in my less charitable moments, I would characterize as obscene.

It is clear that the government is not to be dissuaded from this path. It is clear that, as is the case with most other matters that it has brought before this House, at least in my experience here, it is unshakeably convinced of the near divine wisdom of its proposals and is thus uninterested in consideration of either alternatives or of nagging problems within its own proposals. Presumably it believes them not to exist. But I must tell the government, Madam Speaker, that the Canadian people believe them to exist. The Canadian people can see what is going on in this House, they can see the overweening pride with which the government conducts its business in this place and the Canadian people, in the long run, will not tolerate it.

**Mr. Dave Worthy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs) and Minister of State (Finance)):** Madam Speaker, I would like to deal, just briefly, with some of the statistics that were being used to indicate that there has been a lot of use of closure and of time allocation. Unfortunately, the member is correct, there have been a number of occasions when these were used. But I think if we look back to the period from 1980 to 1984, there were 25 different times that the government of that time, the Liberals, used time allocation and twice that they used closure.

In the subsequent four years, 1984 to 1988, this government used time allocation on 20 occasions and used closure on two occasions. But there have been, in this last two years, as the member has indicated, an unusual number of occasions when closure and time allocation were used. I think a person has to ask why.

Madam Speaker, it does not take a rocket scientist to figure it out. It is obviously considered by the opposition to be good strategy on their part to force the government to use closure or time allocation because it makes them look strong and they have the appearance of opposing. But the reality is that the government must pass its legislation. The people in this country demand it.

• (1140 )

They do not understand why it takes so long for us to move legislation through the House. There are a few other things that people of Canada understand, but it is sometimes difficult to get the opposition to understand.

There is good reason for this bill to be passed now, and I will try to address that.

There has been good coverage through the legislative committee. It did have several days of second reading review. I think this government is fully cognizant of the fact that there are many members in this House who would like to speak to this bill.

In endeavouring to satisfy that demand, because we feel it is a legitimate one, we offered to extend the hours last week. That offer was refused by both opposition parties.

I think that tends to speak a little bit to what I consider the seriousness of their desire to really speak meaningfully to some of this legislation.

I would like to address briefly why it is necessary that we pass the bill now. As the hon. member from Edmonton has indicated, it is the largest privatization in terms of dollars that we have undertaken in Canada. Many members would like to see it delayed, because they actually disagree quite aggressively with privatization.

We heard a number of witnesses in the legislative committee who directly addressed this. They told us as a committee: "Yes, you should get the bill through. You should put the minister in a position where he can deal with those shares as early as possible."

One of the witnesses, a financial analyst, termed it as a window of opportunity. The bigger the window we provide PetroCan and the investment community, the better their chances of returning optimum value for those shares to the Canadian taxpayers.

I think that is of great concern not only to the taxpayers but to every member in this House. It is a real window of opportunity. The witness talked about some of the current situations in Canada that we know affect the oil industry. We know it affects the share values.

We all know there is a crisis in the Middle East. Nobody knows exactly what the market response will be to it, but it is critical according to this witness that we set our affairs in order so that PetroCan, the government and the Canadian taxpayers can take maximum advantage of that window of opportunity.

I will keep it very brief, because my colleague has already discussed this. We held nine or ten committee meetings. We heard from 10 or 11 different witnesses and groups. There were a lot more people and we did group them, but we consciously tried to hear those people across Canada who the committee felt it was imperative that we do hear from.

We wanted to hear from people representing the environmental lobby groups, and we did that. We wanted to listen to investment dealers, and we did that. We wanted to get some legislative expertise advising the committee as to the PetroCan legislation, and we did have that.

In fact, we had a couple of visits from experts in that area. The committee desired to hear, and we were able to produce, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources who gave excellent testimony to the committee.

We heard from the executive officers of Petro-Canada. We heard from two labour groups; one representing the Energy and Chemical Workers Union and the other from the Canadian Labour Congress. We heard from a number of other groups, including the Petro-Canada International Assistant Corporation, the Bureau of Competition, the Commissioner of Official Languages who wanted to express his desire to see the French language provisions stretch further than what the bill allowed and what we were suggesting.

We had other consultants and representation from the Canadian Life & Health Insurance Association who were encouraging us to eliminate some the restrictions that we had on the bill. We resisted that effort.

It was an excellent cross-section that the committee heard. We heard testimony for and against, but most of the evidence against the bill tended to address the concept that Petro-Canada should be used as a policy instrument. They felt that somehow or other to understand and to control any of our resources or any of our major industries, we have to own and control a full cross-section of that industry. The logic escapes me, but it seems to be so obvious to others.

That implies to me that, if we want to understand and control the forest industry, the government should be out there acquiring and owning interest in an integrated forest industry company that controls resources in different parts of Canada. People in the industry and across the country would say we would be insane if we felt that that was the only way we could get a window on the industry.

Another major industry I could mention briefly is the food industry. There is nothing probably more important, except the forest industry in Canada. It would imply that for the government to understand, to know what is going on and to control it, we should be owning large tracks of farms and ranches and food processors. Heaven forbid that we should end up investing in the golden arches across Canada so that we have a window on that industry.

With reference to the witnesses we heard from, the Minister of Energy, for one, spoke to it elaborately. I realize I do not have time to cover it completely. Bill Hopper is another. One of the most interesting witnesses was the former minister who I understand had a part to play in the original creation of Petro-Canada as a government agency, Marc Lalonde. Just recently he was asked if we require Petro-Canada as a window on the industry? His response was: "We have developed in the government in the Department of Energy and the National Energy Board certainly a much greater knowledge about the industry than there was in the sixties and seventies." I could go on.

He covered consumer protection, energy prices, and the public policy role. His answer was: "No, no, no. We do not require PetroCan as a window on the industry or for us to know and understand this industry."

I realize my time is up. We do need to get this bill through. The window of opportunity is now. We have heard from the experts and I look forward to the ensuing debate.

**Mrs. Coline Campbell (South West Nova):** Madam Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate on time allocation on a very important Canadian bill, one which marks the demise of Petro-Canada in Canada.

I say this because we are debating at present the rights of Parliament to have a debate. My colleague from Kingston and the Islands has already spoken about the time that has been spent in debating this bill. We have not had ample opportunity in my opinion to do away with Petro-Canada.

• (1150 )

This government does not care about the rights of Parliament to debate. It does not care about the rights of Canadians, through their parliamentarians, to have a say in the policy of Canada. It was only 10 years ago that the very issue of the election was Petro-Canada and our National Energy Program. Canadians said yes to Petro-Canada at that time.

By using time allocation, the government is beginning to show Canadians why it has made Parliament an useless instrument as far as Canadian policy goes. I think that in this bill there should be an open vote. I think that Canadians should be able to tell their parliamentarians what they want from the government and they do not have that ability. We do not have an ability in the House to have a vote of all the Atlantic members together against an issue that the government may be proposing.

We only have a right to get up in two hours of debate and say that the process is wrong. It is wrong that the government cuts out the debate on such an important national company. It shows the complete disregard that the government has toward any process here in Canada. I would go on to say that it shows that the government is intent on destroying everything that has been made to make us a country called Canada.

In six years of government this Prime Minister has brought forward policies that have ended our ties as Canadians and brought about an adversity in regions that our ancestors in this hallowed place worked hard against. It was to try to make a place called Canada.

Petro-Canada had that very goal. It was brought into force at a time when Canadians needed protection in the oil and gas industry. We still need that protection, but the government says: "No, we will privatize everything or we will get rid of it."

Take the trains, for example. They went east and west, or west and east. We do not have them. Take Air Canada. The government privatized it. We used to have an airline that was first around the world, first in Canada for service and for safety. What do we find now? We do not have even two airlines that can exist in Canada because the policy of the government has been to go right along with the U.S. and deregulate.

The government has done it in the fishery, a natural resource that is now privatized. To what degree? My colleague from Newfoundland can tell me how much he thinks, but I would venture to guess that the fishery in Canada is probably privatized to about 80 per cent if one took the whole range of fish. The government is forcing our fishermen on the east coast in less than a week to make a decision on the livelihood and the role that their enterprise will play. Boats under 45 and boats over 45 must choose from a package of 100 pages sent out to them last week. They have not seen it before and they must choose by tomorrow as to what will become effective January 1. Of course they are confused, but that is exactly what the government wants—confusion in the west, confusion in Ontario, confusion in Quebec, confusion in the east, and it will govern. It will sell Canada short. That is what is happening in this bill.

Why? The Prime Minister does not come in to answer the questions on that. He will give you a smoke and mirrors discussion on what he sees as the role of Canada.

I think we should be given time to go home over Christmas and the government members should be made to ask their constituents whether they want to see Petro-Canada, the only oil company left in Canada, go to the U.S. We are giving 25 per cent ownership in this bill to foreigners.

We used to have expertise in air. We used to have expertise in oil and gas. We were respected around the world for our policies that made us Canadian, from east to west, north and south. But we had a goal as Canadians. The government is tearing that goal apart.

In the east we do not know where we will be after June 1990 because this Prime Minister does not want to give us any direction as to where he wants to see Canada go. He wants to see everything gone. He wants to see his big friends in the United States take it over, just like Petro-Canada and just like what is going to happen to our airline industry, in the end, with a minister who will bring in open skies that will go north-south instead of east-west or west-east-north-south within Canada. This government is tearing everything apart.

Let me just repeat that in our process—and it has certainly been shown up in six years—there has been no consultation with the Canadian people. There is no consultation by this government with its big majority to put an onus on the government back-benchers to go home and ask the people if they approve of the policies that are coming forward.

We are going to have so many parties in Canada that it will destroy Canada by making it into small regions instead of a strong federal system that can compete with all countries of the world. We used to be able to compete with all countries in the world. In oil and gas, we had a spot, not because of Mobil or any of the big U.S. multinational companies, but because the government had given Petro-Canada the ability to sit at the same board tables as the multinationals.

But not this government. This government says: "We'll privatize it." It will privatize it at a time when we are going through a potential energy crisis in the Middle East; when we are in a recession so that only the big income earners, who are not here in Canada except for the few millionaires who are friends of the government and for whom it has provided over the period of six years; when Canadians themselves are having increased oil and heating costs on the east coast that are incredible; and when incomes are going down as people are being laid off because of the readjustments that are happening as a result of the free trade agreement. The manufacturing sector is going out the window, just as this government likes to see all its policies go—out the window and down into the United States.

It is time Canadians started to know that every one of us have a constituency office and every one of us should be listening to our constituents. I would offer that every one of us in the House should be telling our constituents the exact position that their member of Parliament feels on a certain bill. If we were honest with the Canadian people and told them what the objectives of this legislation are, we would find a greater result right across Canada in terms of a bill such as this and in terms of a cut-off on such an important issue as a natural resource that is ours in Canada.

This government does not care about resources. It says: "Whoever is the highest bidder, we will give it to them, as long as they are our friends. If they are not our friends, we will give it to the second bidder. But we are not going to look much further than that."

In the two years that I have been back, I have seen it in the Post Office; I have seen it in the CBC, and I blame the CBC to a certain extent for some of their own cutbacks— I have seen it in Air Canada; I have seen in it with the trains; I have seen it in the fishery which is at our door-step. The government cares nothing about the policy as long as it can privatize a resource.

I know my time is up, Mr. Speaker. I feel very strongly about a time allocation that the people of Canada will not have an opportunity to voice their concerns because their members of Parliament are perhaps not even explaining it to them.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Calgary Southwest):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate this morning with regard to Bill C-84 and the privatization of Petro-Canada.

• (1200 )

I also had the opportunity of being a member of the legislative committee that reviewed the bill clause by clause. Indeed, we heard from quite a number of witnesses.

What I would like to bring to your attention today, and to indeed the attention of all my colleagues in the House, is that we had about 35 names of witnesses that were proposed from all the members on the committee, which we reviewed very carefully.

We did submit invitations to many of those witnesses. It was unfortunate that some could not come, or were unable to come for reasons which I will not refer to today. Out of the group, we did hear from nine. It was quite a balanced group.

There were some who were very much against the privatization, and I would like to review some of the reasons that they felt the company should remain in control of the government. Of course, there were some witnesses who were for the privatization.

I happen to come from Calgary which is in Alberta and happens to be one of the main producing provinces with regard to fossil fuels, mainly oil and gas. I guess we could say that 90 per cent of our oil and gas does come from the province of Alberta. We are particularly concerned that the total petroleum industry in general is a very healthy one and one that runs with no government intervention.

I speak of no government intervention. Let me clarify that the environment is very important. As we heard earlier—about an hour ago—the Minister of the Environment brought forth the green plan, and I have to commend him for it. Obviously fossil fuels in the emissions are problems.

No matter if the company is a Crown owned corporation or, indeed, if it is a privately owned corporation, it is going to be subjected to the same rulings, constrictions, hearings, observations, criteria and laws of the country.

Whether it is a Crown corporation or private, it will not make any difference. That was one particular issue that was brought forth with regard to the committee hearings.

In another area, it was mainly the fact of security of supply and a Crown corporation could guarantee security of supply. Actually, it is quite the reverse. A Crown corporation cannot guarantee security of supply. The one thing that is so very important is the capital that is needed to explore, develop and produce the hydrocarbons.

It is very expensive, more so with the synthetic type of oils, oil sands and, of course, in our frontiers it is more expensive than the western sedimentary basin.

Aside from that, the fact is that security of supply depends upon the petroleum companies exploring, developing and producing. Petro–Canada presently is quite strapped for funds, and a privatized company would really enable them access to financial markets.

In that case, it is going to make them directly more competitive with the industry. They are going to be able to become more aggressive in pursuing business opportunities.

I know it is hard for some people on the other side to understand, but just one little small word of wisdom is that these companies are in the business to sell oil and gas. When a barrel of oil or an MCF of gas is sold, it has to be replaced.

In order to replace it, a great deal of capital is required. What we are doing here, after a great deal of consultation, is allowing Petro–Canada the freedom to go out and access the capital. We are certainly cutting the apron strings to the government with regard to the financing.

That is not really new, because its mandate was changed in 1985 when it was told to operate within the private industry with no more government funding.

For security of supply, it has a far greater opportunity. With regard to the environment, it will be subjected to the same rules and regulations. I heard an hon. member just a few moments ago speak about Canada selling itself out. There is nothing further from the truth. In Bill C–84, there are qualifications for foreign ownership at 25 per cent. Indeed, no one person can own more than 10 per cent. So, I think the minister has done an excellent job in maintaining control in Canadian hands.

As to accusations that this government is selling out Canada, nothing could be further from the truth. The open skies project that the hon. member mentioned is not a *fait accompli*. We are holding consultations across the country on the open skies, as is the U.S. The consultations include people from all industries, labour unions, municipalities, airports and provincial governments. It is through these consultations that the ground rules for negotiations will take place. We have not said that there will be open skies. What we are doing is formulating the basis for negotiations, and if it is not good for Canada it will not go through. There is absolutely no way that we would sell out our industries.

We know in the airline industry that perhaps there is not a level playing field, but do not get the idea that because of a proposal, it is a *fait accompli*. That is simply not the truth.

In the other area about selling out Canada, I remember in December, 1988, the debates on the other side with the free trade deal. Madam Speaker, you know perfectly well that the free trade deal—and it is actually better management trade with the United States—is probably the greatest thing this country has.

We have watched over the last few weeks as the negotiations at GATT failed because of the high subsidies coming from the European market. But, what did we hear in December 1988? "Go to the GATT. That is where you should handle your international trade obligations, put all your eggs in one basket". We said: "No deal, we are not putting all our eggs in one basket. We will look to our greatest trading partner, which happens to be south of the border and you will live to see the day that this country and all Canadians will be grateful that we do have a Canada–U.S. trade agreement".

Not only that, but as the Europeans gather together in 1992 to form a trading bloc, you will see the western hemisphere pull together. When you put 400 million people with the 300 million people in North America, that is 700 million people to compete with the 350 million in Europe.

Let us get back to PetroCan, because it is really what we are debating today. I have to say that the prices of gasoline, oil and natural gas have nothing to do with this government or this bill. We have moved to a free market system, which is exactly the way it should be. If the price of petroleum in the free market goes up, the price of Canadian petroleum goes up. If the price in the free market system goes down, Canadian prices go down.

There is one thing I would like to see, and hopefully it may come about through the petroleum industry. This is the change of price at the pump. It is really relatively slow, but in some other countries it is last in, first out. This means that you see the price rise immediately and consumers may better understand why gasoline prices are going up and down. Right now, we have a 60 day to 90 day lag with the oil that is in the pipeline. So, the reflection of price changes are not seen at the pump for 60 to 90 days, and that is difficult for some Canadians to understand.

Moving to a free market system and a freed up privatized Petro–Canada will enable the company to compete and, after all, what this government is based upon is private enterprise. We should certainly not be holding oil companies under government intervention with regard to expanding their industry.

I am very pleased to participate and want to conclude by saying that we heard from many witnesses on both sides of the question in committee. I feel there has been a very fair hearing and it is time to get on with debate.

• (1210 )

**Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls):** Madam Speaker, as the hon. member from the government side was speaking and saying that there has not really been that great a change in Canada with the government's policy relating to Crown corporations, I was thinking about any number of communities, say, Grand Falls, Windsor, Botwood, or Gander, Newfoundland, and about a person sitting at home, right now, in one of those smaller communities and about what that person is thinking.

Well, the first thing that comes to mind about Crown corporations, since this government took over, is that the government sold the telephone company. It sold Terra Nova Tel. Now, when he picks up the telephone to make a telephone call, it is no longer a federal Crown corporation that he is dealing with. He is no longer dealing with "Information" or an operator who might be just next door. That Crown corporation was sold. This person looks down the street, while he is using his telephone, and he sees the place where the post office used to be. This is another Crown corporation and it has been replaced by an outdoor mailbox that he tries to get open when the weather turns cold. The government now sends around the names of various de–icing fluids and there is a hotline; it is nice that he has a hotline in the middle of the winter, to phone if the de–icing fluid does not work on his mailbox. There is 24–hour service and if he phones that number, somebody comes and opens his mailbox.

So the telephone company, a Crown corporation, has been sold. The post office, another Crown corporation, is gone; it has been replaced by an outdoor mailbox. Now, Madam Speaker, this same person worked in Bishop's Falls, a short distance away, where the railway used to be. The tracks are now being taken up. This is another Crown corporation which has been taken away since the Government of Canada came out with its policies on Crown corporations. He no longer can look up into the

sky and see Air Canada planes flying; that Crown corporation is also gone from his airport of Gander.

As if that were not enough, when it comes to his telephone, that Crown corporation was sold by this government, when it comes to his mail, that Crown corporation has a new policy which means no more post offices, and when it comes to getting to his place of work, the railway has been literally taken up and the tracks have been all stacked, just outside of Botwood, with the railway ties also being taken up. Air Canada is gone from his community. Now that was not enough.

There is only one Crown corporation left that Newfoundlanders now deal with and that is the great job-creator in Hibernia, Petro-Canada. Now we have a bill before the House to sell Petro-Canada. So that is his telephone, his mail, the railway, the airline, and his place of work, gone.

There is only one thing which one can conclude from all of that. With all of those Crown corporations gone, there is one more thing that has to go. That is the Government of Canada, and it is going to be gone in the next election.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Madam Speaker, I must say that if you listen carefully these days—and it does not matter what part of Canada you listen to—you will hear a rumbling going on which people ought to know is the government's effort at a demolition attempt to destroy the country.

What has happened is that slowly but very systematically the Government of Canada is dismantling what Canadians understand and know as their country. There is a growing rage across Canada. It does not matter if you are from British Columbia, Newfoundland, or the Territories; Canadians knows that their country is eroding around them.

They know that one of the most effective ways the government has employed to destroy Canada, or as some people have put it to Americanize Canada, is to eliminate those structures and those institutions that have made Canada different from the United States, that have set us apart, that have been uniquely Canadian.

I am talking about the systematic dismantling of the Canadian airline system through the selling off of Air Canada, the removal and elimination of VIA Rail service through critical parts of Canada, the elimination of rural post offices throughout the country, and the dismantling of CBC. We find today in terms of those people who were in hiding in Kuwait that one of the elements which kept their spirits up and motivated them to hope was listening to CBC International. That, of course, will no longer be with us after April 1. The Canadian presence globally through CBC will be dismantled.

We have seen whole sets of Canadian institutions destroyed, eliminated, curtailed, cut back as a result of this government's systematic sort of methodical dismemberment and dismantling of Canada. That is why when people today are asked, "What do you think of the present Mulroney government", they laugh. This isn't a government; it is almost some foreign agent at work in terms of dismantling what we built up over the decades.

We find that in the government's rush to eliminate one of the most critical institutions in terms of differentiating Canada from other countries as a major oil producer, almost every other oil producing country in the world has a national oil company like Petro-Canada. In some countries, as in the Middle East, their Crown corporations control all of their oil patch. Other countries control portions of it.

There is hardly any oil producing country in the world that does not have a version of Petro-Canada, and for a good reason. They want their citizens to benefit from this fossil fuel wealth. They want to have an eye on the industry. That is why we introduced Petro-Canada. Unfortunately, once the mandate was created, it did not operate as a lot of people thought it ought to operate in terms of being different than Mobil Oil, Chevron, Shell, or whatever.

Then the Conservatives decided to give it a very specific mandate and said: "Don't operate any differently than any of the private sector corporations". Then of course, Canadians wonder why we have this corporation which operates exactly like Shell Oil operates its companies. Other countries do not do that. Other countries operate their Crown corporations differently, and so they provide a whole range of additional services to their citizens.

Then government members hear that 60 per cent of Canadians do not want to privatize Petro–Canada, so they quickly start to move legislation through because they know when Canadians hear the arguments against this, more and more people will be mobilized against this government's action like they are against the GST and most other actions of the government.

What do we see? We see the government introducing closure. This government is so used to bringing in closure that it has become a way of life. Closure has now become a regular way of doing business because this government is anti–democratic. It does not believe in a parliamentary system. As a matter of fact, this government finds the parliamentary system an absolute nuisance.

• (1220 )

If you find the traditions and the time honoured approach of Parliament to be a nuisance, what do you do? You use closure and muzzle debate. You do not allow members of your own party to talk. You do not allow members of the opposition parties to present their views. You try to manipulate the news and the debate. You try to propagandize all the information that comes out, as we are seeing today with the green paper in terms of the incredibly sophisticated propaganda machine that is already at work.

There were three PR firms hired to put the right spin on the dream paper to give the people of Canada the illusion that the government actually cares about the environment. Canadians are not being fooled. They are bright and knowledgeable people. They can see through all this smoke and mirrors, fancy dancing and propaganda machines that the government continuously tries. If the government would only do a good job, then the people of Canada would support it; but it would rather put fancy spins on what it is doing.

Look at what we are doing today. Once again the government introduced closure. It introduced closure at second reading. My gosh, we only had three days to talk about the principle of dismantling and privatizing the largest Crown corporation in Canada with assets nearly $6.7 billion. After three days, it said that it had heard enough, that it did not want to talk about it any longer. It wanted to jam it into committee and then manipulate it through committee and so on, and it did not work. It tried to get a deal, deal, deal. It tried to roll the dice on this one and tried to make a deal. It wanted us to speak a few hours into the night and so on. It was absolutely ridiculous.

Of course there is no co–operation when it tries to dismantle Petro–Canada. Why on earth would we co–operate and facilitate the dismantling of what has become one of the critical symbols of our whole country? But this is nothing new. Look what the government has done to the GST.

Let me make a prediction that within a matter of hours the Conservatives in the Senate will pull some anti–democratic, anti–parliamentarian, absolute jackbooted, dictatorial, totalitarian technique, as they have done in the past, to jam the GST through the final stages in the Senate of Canada. Look at what they have done in this House with the GST. They brought in closure at second reading and then put it into the committee.

Then we saw an absolute spectacle of embarrassment when the chairman of the finance committee said: "I have to create a whole new set of regulations and rules because there is no way I am going to be able to move this using legitimate parliamentary procedure." He created a whole set of new rules. At least he had the courage to apologize to this House, which he did. He apologized for this unparliamentary behaviour. The whole matter had to be sent off to a committee because it was so irregular. That is how it got to the committee, because he could not use legitimate parliamentary procedure to do it.

**An hon. member:** What?

**Mr. Riis:** The GST. Then at report stage they brought in closure and then at third reading they brought in closure. Then it went off to the Senate and we saw an absolute abandonment of any shred of concern for democracy for the parliamentary tradition. Again, the Conservatives in the Senate, after abusing and abusing the parliamentary system in this House, are now doing exactly the same in the upper chamber.

This is a government that dislikes democracy. It dislikes the parliamentary system. It dislikes the traditions and the principles of the democratic parliamentary tradition. It uses what is at its disposal time and time again, more than any government in Canadian history. Over the last few months, it has said that it would impose this unpopular agenda on Canadians, that it would jam this legislation down their throats, and that the best way to do it would be to minimize debate so that it could fool the maximum number of Canadians so that they do not understand what the government is doing. Therefore it is going to use closure at every opportunity.

We ought not to be surprised that once again, while debating this incredibly important piece of legislation, the government is going to curtail debate. Here we are, having spent a handful of days, and I mean a handful of days, discussing the most elaborate, massive privatization effort in Canadian history. The minister responsible for privatization has announced that it is going to tolerate only one more day at report stage and one more day at third reading. Madam Speaker, you have given me an indication that my time is nearly up, but in closing let me say that Canadians realize that we have an elected dictatorship now where the government as elected says that it will do anything it wants to the people of Canada for four to five years.

When the people of Canada have had the opportunity, whether that opportunity is in Vancouver Island, in Labrador or anywhere in between, to indicate how they feel about these brutal totalitarian tactics, we have seen them indicate time and time again that they would turf this government out so far as to eliminate the Conservatives from the political landscape of Canada for years and years to come, in an effort to restore what all Canadians feel so strongly, and that is, our parliamentary tradition and our democratic way of life.

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley):** Madam Speaker, I must say that one of the more difficult tasks we have here in the House is to listen to the tiresome hyperbole that we have just listened to, talking about dictatorship and tyranny and so forth.

I would like to go back a bit and remind the member for Kamloops that the parliamentary process really begins not with the tabling of legislation here in the House but on the election trail when each one of the parties lays out its platforms and its intentions for a legislative program in the House. That is when we tell people what our agenda is going to be.

One of the traditions we have re-established in this Parliament that our Prime Minister has brought back to this Chamber is that the legislative agenda has a resemblance to what we talked about on the campaign trail, not like his predecessor, Mr. Trudeau, whose parliamentary agenda bore no relationship at all to the election campaign and the sloganeering.

We have brought back the basis of parliamentary democracy in that the campaign ought to introduce the ideas that we would bring forth in the legislative program. The member for Kamloops does not want to pay attention to this. He has a group of people going across Canada talking to Canadians about parliamentary reform. Meanwhile, that party over there frustrates Parliament here in the House by denying the government its legislation.

I was on the McGrath commission with their party representative, the member for Winnipeg—Strathcona. We took a trip to England to talk to members of the mother of Parliaments who said that over there in the election campaign each party has its agenda. They call it a manifesto, and when the party is elected the opposition party says: "Okay, you are now bringing in your manifesto in the form of legislation. You are entitled, on the basis of your election campaign, to your legislation. Provided that your manifesto laid it out and your legislation matches the manifesto, you are entitled to it".

I think members opposite know there is no secret at all across Canada that we have consistently campaigned on the notion that we believe in privatization. That is no secret. I think neither opposition parties will be fooled by any kind of a notion that we did not believe in that. We believe in privatization.

Back in the 1979 government of the right hon. member for Yellowhead, we brought in a program to begin privatizing Petro-Canada. It should not come as a secret or surprise to these people that we would want to do that.

In the United Kingdom, when they want to talk about the legislation resulting from their manifesto, the parties get together in the House of Commons and agree that the government is entitled to table legislation but the opposition is entitled to lay out its philosophy, its ideology, and its opposition. But the government is still entitled to the legislation. They decide how much time should be given to the debate. They decide if it should be four or five or six, not days, not weeks, but hours—five hours for a debate. Debate on the biggest pieces of legislation in the British House of Commons lasts four, five, or six hours.

This member for Kamloops talks about tyranny because he has not had several weeks to debate a bill, even though we have campaigned on it, even though it is an integral part of our philosophy, even though he knew we would want to do this. He does not believe that the government is entitled to its legislation.

• (1230)

I want him to know that this government was not elected to introduce or enact a socialist agenda. His objection to the legislation is that it does not conform to his ideology. He is entitled to his ideology and his beliefs but we were not elected to introduce his ideology. We were elected to introduce and enact ours. Privatization is an integral part of our philosophy and we are entitled to it. As a truly democratically elected majority government, we are entitled to this legislation.

I do not know why he gets so frustrated and why he introduces all the hyperbole, as did my friend from Gander, "Where is Air Canada gone?" I went home last Thursday and my boarding card said "Air Canada" on it. It had the famous red and white colours. I think all the personnel were Air Canada personnel. I think Air Canada is still flying. Why is it any less Air Canada that there are private shares held rather than public? I think Air Canada is there.

By the way, he says, "Where is the post office corporation?" I believe it was the Liberal Party, the Liberal government that privatized and made that a Crown corporation, took it out of the government portfolio and made a Crown corporation out of it. I think it was Andre Ouellet, as a matter of fact, who did it. Now he says, "Where are all the post offices?" I think they are still there. They have not been taken away.

We believe in this. We believe that privatizing Petro–Canada is good for Canada. I remember when the original bill was first brought in. My friend across the way who represents the farming community remembers when it was brought in. It was supposed to be a window on industry. I think the initial capital infusion was $500,000 back in about 1975. That was the window on the industry. Now we are talking about $5 to $6 billion. Some window. We think that privatizing Petro–Canada will be good for the company and it will be good for Canada.

My friend from Calgary who spoke just a few minutes ago pointed out one of the very important needs of Petro–Canada, and that is a cash infusion. We cannot keep injecting new government capital into that corporation. The people of Canada now know that the government—

**Mrs. Campbell (South West Nova):** They don't need money.

**Mr. Friesen:** The member for South West Nova says they do not need money. Tell Bill Hopper they do not need the money. They need the money. The people of Canada know the Government of Canada does not have the cash to throw into that corporation. However, if we do privatize it, if we allow the people of Canada to buy shares, there will be a fresh infusion of cash into that corporation that it could not get any other way.

I want to ask members opposite a very simple question. What is it that creates this marvellous transformation of a company that if it is a Crown corporation, a government–owned corporation, what is it that creates this great transformation of humanity that makes it so much better if the management of the corporation are all of a sudden government employees? Why are government employees running a corporation so much better than private employees who are subject to a board of directors elected by the company, by the shareholders? What is it that makes the president or the board of directors of a government–owned corporation so much more humane, so much more imaginative, so much more generous than if it were a privately–owned corporation?

Does some magical thing take place when that person takes his orders from the government? Would it not be better to have a company like this removed from the government agenda and let it run its own agenda based on the marketplace, without political input, or in some cases political interference?

Would it not be better to have it market driven and let its agenda be driven by the marketplace rather than by an agenda of a political party, whatever political party is in office? Would it not be a more wholesome company if it were driven that way, rather than by the agenda of some people who are elected and have their own agendas rather than a market driven agenda?

I say to hon. members that we have been elected on an agenda of a marketplace economy. I have made that freely known in every campaign I have run in and I have run in five. We have always made that known. We are bringing in a legislative agenda on the basis of our political campaign.

The government is entitled to its legislation. The opposition is entitled to voice its opposition. It has no business frustrating it and forcing the government to bring in time allocation.

**Mr. Ken Atkinson (St. Catharines):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this debate concerning time allocation on this bill.

I have listened with great interest to the speakers. There was an indication that somehow debate is being stifled in this particular matter. The record shows that there have been four days for second reading and approval in principle of this particular bill. There were 18 speakers, nine of whom were opposition members.

The legislative committee held nine meetings and heard from 11 witnesses, as we heard previously. Obviously, nine amendments were also discussed there. There was an opportunity to discuss the various aspects of this bill. Currently, at report stage, there have been 18 speakers; 15 of whom were opposition members.

We have gone through a process, and we will continue to go through a process with regard to this particular bill. There certainly is no intent on the part of the government not to have an orderly debate. Also, the government has the responsibility to get its legislation through and make sure that it is passed.

I look at the particular bill itself, the privatization of Petro–Canada. There has been mention made in the House about the privatization and a comparison made to Air Canada. I had the opportunity on Thursday last to be in Montreal when Air Canada appeared before a committee euphemistically known as the open skies committee.

It was a treat to see a company which is dynamic, ready to approach the problems that will result and the opportunities that will be presented a company that has private shareholders, that feels that it can compete in any market and wants the opportunity to take part in that competition.

There was some reference to certain conditions that they would like to see put forward so that they could compete more adequately in the United States market. They were not unreasonable requests, but they came before us and said: "Yes, we want the opportunity to compete. We feel that we can do it. We feel that we are a vibrant, alive company and we just want the opportunity to be able to compete in any market."

That is encouraging to see. It is not a company holding back, saying: "We cannot take chances. We cannot take part in these opportunities that present themselves." We know that with the globalization of the world markets, more and more competition is coming to the fore. These companies are going to have to be able to respond to that competition.

In that regard, the bill before us will take Petro–Canada into a private situation with private investors throughout Canada. It will give these investors the opportunity to invest in a vibrant Canadian company.

• (1240 )

There has been mention about the dismantling of Petro–Canada. Nothing could be further from the reality of privatization. Privatization allows an infusion of capital into these companies. It takes it off the backs of the taxpayers to provide the extra capital that may be necessary.

We know the financial position of the federal government at the present time. This privatization is a benefit to the federal government as well as a definite benefit to the company itself. It is better able to compete. It can have a fresh infusion of capital and it can go on and do the things it was set up to do. There will be no dismantling of this company as has been alluded to here, certainly just the opposite.

When we look at the original intent of setting up Petro–Canada as a Crown corporation, we must ask: Is the public policy initiative for this company still necessary? Should it be in a government controlled situation? I would submit that it certainly is not.

The original intent was to increase petroleum supplies and Canadian presence in the industry. Well, Madam Speaker, that has occurred. We moved from an interventionist aspect to one that allows market forces to freely take part and to allow the company to take advantage of the opportunities that present themselves.

We have to realize that the world has changed since Petro-Canada was originally set up. It has fulfilled its function, but it can fulfil its function better as a private company. As I mentioned, with the infusion of private capital and the board of directors being responsible for the company, that will occur.

Petro-Canada was also to act as an agent in any state to state trading. Apparently there has only been one contract ever signed, and that aspect has gone by the board over the years. So that particular public policy aspect for the company has disappeared as well.

We now get to what is the final matter. As has been mentioned, the company was to serve as a window on the energy industry. We have the various boards in place now that can monitor the energy industry, that can look into it. Obviously this is an expensive instrument to use as a window on the energy industry.

Petro-Canada has outlived all of its public policy purposes. With the necessity for an infusion of new capital and the flexibility that will bring when it is privatized, obviously it is important that this legislation get through this House and become law. This is what we are talking about with the time allocation motion.

There is also a question of time. This bill gives the minister, or whomever is designated, the opportunity to market the shares of Petro-Canada. Obviously, that has to be something that is looked at and done in a very timely fashion.

There are a number of safeguards built into the sale of shares. No one individual can own 10 per cent or more of the shares of the corporation. No foreign ownership can exceed 25 per cent. We have discussed that as well when the bill concerning Air Canada was before the House.

This is an opportunity for this company to go forward, to be able to compete and to still fulfil all the public policy objectives that were originally set out. It also unburdens the public treasury from any responsibility that it would have in that particular regard. That is very important in these economic times.

It is a very important bill. It is a bill that should go through this House and obviously is the reason for the time allocation motion that we see in front of us.

It has also been mentioned that maybe the Middle East crisis is going to create some difficulty with security of supply. As I mentioned, the whole world is coming to globalization and a market economy. We see that even in eastern Europe when they realized the futility of trying to have a centralized system and trying to control all aspects of what goes on within their companies. They realize that it has been a failure. It has not worked. They must allow the market to take part.

I see that you are indicating that my time is up, Madam Speaker. Again, with the safeguards that are built into this particular bill, with the opportunity for this company to have an infusion of capital and an independent board of directors, and the opportunity to go ahead in the petroleum industry, it is too important a bill to be bogged down in procedure in the House of Commons. There has been sufficient debate and we will have more. I certainly hope that this bill will go forward.

**Ms. Catherine Callbeck (Malpeque):** Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the government's decision to invoke time allocation on a bill which certainly affects the lives of Canadians across the country. Why the government does not want a full and healthy debate on the bill is obvious.

I certainly would like to have had the opportunity to voice my concerns in detail on the privatization of Petro-Canada because this bill is a very complicated and detailed bill. This time allocation is denying me the opportunity to discuss in detail how the privatization of Petro-Canada will affect Canadians.

As my colleague suggested in committee, this bill as written states that Petro-Canada may not sell all or substantially all of either its upstream or downstream assets to any one person or group of associated persons. The question is how is "substantially all" defined. That depends on one's view of this definition. It may well be that medium-sized assets that are of national or strategic importance are being left unprotected by the vague wording of this bill. These assets may lose their commercial importance to Petro-Canada but their sale may well impact on the lives of Canadians across our country.

My riding of Malpeque on Prince Edward Island is a rural riding. Such decisions which may not appear to be substantial can really have a major impact on a small community. Such a decision was certainly made by this government when it closed our CFB Summerside. It may not have been a substantial decision when one looks at the enormity of the Government of Canada as a whole, but it had a substantial effect on the lives of many of us in Prince Edward Island. In fact, the after shocks of that decision are still being felt today.

Just last week when I returned to my riding, islanders were concerned about a decision that had been made by Holland College to discontinue adult education classes at Summerside and Kensington as of January, 1991. These classes had to be cancelled due to a shortage of funds. That shortage of funds is really due to two decisions made by the federal government. The first was the closing of the base. Because of that closure, a number of islanders, in an attempt to put their lives back together, enrolled in the Holland College adult education courses to better prepare themselves for finding a new job. This larger enrollment created an under-funding situation.

The second reason was the government's decision to cut back on the funding to the provinces for education. That also of course contributed to the shortage of available funds. Fortunately, the provincial government came to the rescue and provided the extra funding needed to keep these important educational courses alive in 1991. I commend the Ghiz government for its swift and timely action on this matter.

• (1250)

I also commend the students for having the courage and initiative to go back to school to upgrade their skills and knowledge. But, I certainly condemn this government for its policies which created this crisis in the first place.

I condemn the government today for imposing time allocation and so denying me an opportunity to speak in detail about the effects that this bill will have on Canadians, especially Canadians in eastern Canada.

In my province of Prince Edward Island, as in all provinces in eastern Canada, we are very dependent on imported oil. The continuity of supply of this non-renewable resource is paramount to our economic growth and prosperity. Across Canada, the energy demand for petroleum is about 41 per cent, which certainly is a significant figure. However, in Prince Edward Island, we are doubly dependent upon petroleum for a total of 75 per cent of our energy demand.

We are trying to diversify the energy mix in my province through efforts in such areas as the biomass energy field which involves the burning of wood chips at very high temperatures. This initiative has provided the Island with an environmentally friendly energy source, along with badly needed jobs. Unfortunately, these efforts have been frustrated by the government's cuts to alternative energy and conservation programs. This is yet another example of the government's complete lack of attention to my province of Prince Edward Island. This bill may very well place Prince Edward Island in an even more volatile economic position due to our dependency on imported petroleum.

I urge the government to consider the ramifications of its decisions on the real people out there. There is more to effective decision-making than simply adhering to the bottom line. This bill requires a thorough and full debate due to the complexity of the subject matter itself.

This morning I expected that we in the opposition would have an opportunity to address the concerns of our constituents, concerns that the government is ignoring and which the government is not allowing to be heard in detail in this Chamber.

It is no wonder that Canadians have lost confidence in this government. I certainly regret not having the opportunity to speak in full detail today on the privatization of Petro-Canada.

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** Madam Speaker, I cannot say I am pleased with having to speak on time allocation today, but I want the opportunity to do so because I think that we are faced here with an approach by the government to push through the privatization process of Petro-Canada as quickly as possible. It recognizes that there is a growing wave of discontent across the country relative, not only to this particular bill, but to many other government actions.

This bill is the largest privatization in the history of this government or any other government and covers assets of $6.7 billion on which it will take a loss. There is no way that, under the structure that is being established in this bill, it will get this amount back.

If we had a concern for Canada's well-being, or if this government had a concern for Canada's well-being, it would be sure that there was ample opportunity to discuss the pros and cons of this bill before we got rid of Petro-Canada.

The resource that we are exploiting in Canada, the oil that is being exploited by Petro-Canada and other private corporations, does not belong to those corporations. It belongs to the people of Canada. It should be exploited in the best interests of the people of Canada.

We do not believe—many people of Canada do not believe—that Shell, Esso, Standard, and all the multinational oil companies that do this exploiting are doing so in the best interests of the people of Canada. They do not believe that getting rid of Petro-Canada is the best way to have at least some inkling into what is there.

We recognize that Petro-Canada has, to some extent, ceased to be an instrument of public policy. But this also is a planned approach on behalf of this government.

This company which has a good solid commercial base and more assets than most other companies do have in Canada has not showed up as being as possible as Shell or Imperial because the government has made it a policy approach that it should not show up as being entirely competitive with these companies. The only way it could defend the sale of it was if it was not making a return on its investment.

It has not been a particularly good investment, but it is very difficult at this time to say that we should sell this company. Judging whether or not Petro-Canada has some reason for being in the future, as far as the Canadian people are concerned, it is very difficult to say yes or no to that, because we, as legislators, must be sure before we make that kind of a move that what we do is in the best interests of Canada. We have not explored the possibilities. We have not spent the time necessary to do so.

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources did a fairly comprehensive study on Petro-Canada. Indeed, in the process, it made the recommendation that the privatization of Petro-Canada not be proceeded with until the federal government has completed the process begun in energy opposites and has articulated an energy policy.

That is why I suggest that we, in this House, as the Parliament of Canada, are proceeding with this bill much too quickly. In fact, I think that the time allocation should be turned around to the extent that the government should withdraw the bill until it knows whether or not it really needs Petro-Canada as an instrument of public policy.

In the six years that it has been responsible for Petro-Canada, the government has failed to use it. It has directly used it as an instrument of public policy, and it has directed Petro-Canada to operate as any other private sector oil company, except that it was not supposed to make any money.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I will interrupt the member at this time. There will be 5 minutes left should he with to continue with his remarks after Question Period.

[*Translation*]

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1 p.m., the House took recess.

---

### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*English*]

### BEAUSÉJOUR BY-ELECTION

**Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Miramichi):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in the beautiful riding of Beauséjour, Jean Chrétien and the faithful, local Liberal Party fashioned a great victory.

This is a victory for a courageous leader and also for all Canadians who are desperately looking for integrity and fairness in government. I say to these Canadians: Do not despair, in a few years the misery will be over. This is a victory for all Canadians, hoping for a real leader, one who will not hesitate to stand up for Canada and Canadian values, whether in western Canada, the north, the Atlantic, Ontario or Quebec.

This is a victory for all Canadians hoping for a real leader who will stand up for Canada and Canadian values. This is a victory for all Canadians who want a leader who will refuse to pay homage to American destiny by being head-waiter to the President of the United States. This is a victory for all Canadians who believe that the people, not the national media, are sovereign in this country.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member's time has expired.

* * *

## ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES

**Mr. John A. MacDougall (Timiskaming):** Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed in reading about the current case before the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal challenging that province's electoral boundaries. Nine university professors want to rewrite the political map based on representation by population. This would have serious repercussions in rural Canada.

It is often stated that our country's strength lies in our resources. Mr. Speaker, it would be more correct to state that the heart of Canada lies in the people who develop our natural resources. Our regions and its people are the essential part of this country that creates our wealth.

Throughout the ages, we have enjoyed representational democracy in this country, not rep by pop, but a hybrid of it. The Canadian democratic process has always allowed for a consensus among those regions of this country.

It is vitally important, whether we are talking about resource management, the environment, or the deficit, to have effective input from the heart of Canada.

We must resist the notion of rep by pop, Mr. Speaker, for the more responsible Canadian solution that has made this country strong and our parliamentary democracy an envy of the world.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member's time has expired.

* * *

## CANADA'S GREEN PLAN

**Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment promised Canadians a green Christmas present. What we received today, with the tabling of the green plan, is a snow job.

As a public relations exercise, the green plan is a great success and, in view of the money spent on promotions, this comes as no surprise. What is surprising is that the government actually expects Canadians to believe that this expensive ploy will miraculously make Canada a world leader in environmental policy.

In an effort to instil a warm feeling at Christmas time, the government has hired not one but three public relations firms. Under the façade of consultation, the government spent $6 million on a glitzy, cross-country PR caravan.

The big sell on the environment, begun by the member for Lac-Saint-Jean, has become a big bust. The green plan is part of the supposed "good news agenda". Canadians see no good news in a document designed purely to deceive. The Conservatives have once again demonstrated that when it comes to governing, nothing beats a good ad campaign.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## FAMILY VIOLENCE

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert):** Mr. Speaker, last week, Mr. Yves St-Germain, the Montreal Urban Community's chief of police, stated that one of the causes of family violence was that men were shocked to see their wives leave the family home to go to work. His statement is one of many attempts to put the blame on women who work outside the home.

Mr. St-Germain's comments, which were made at a conference organized to coincide with the anniversary of the tragedy at the École polytechnique, prove that a typical male prejudice that would blame women for all men's misfortunes is still alive and well.

Mr. Speaker, coming from the chief of police of the fifth largest police force in this country, such statements are intolerable, and I demand the resignation of Mr. St-Germain.

* * *

[*English*]

## BEAUSÉJOUR AND YORK NORTH BY-ELECTIONS

**Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq):**

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

*S. O. 31*

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in central and Atlantic Canada, Canadians re-elected Liberals to the House of Commons. Our thanks and appreciation go to the people of Beauséjour and York North for their confidence and support.

Congratulations to our leader, the hon. Jean Chrétien, and Maurizio Bevilacqua for their great electoral victories. In both ridings, despite the multitude of candidates, the Liberals won with more than 51 per cent of the vote.

There are many members of this House who would have liked to receive that much of a vote in their own ridings in the last federal election.

Aboriginal people, westerners and northerners welcome back their long-time friend, Jean Chrétien.

From north to south, and east to west, the Liberals will continue to fight for Canada and the people of this great land.

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

Jean and Maurizio, well done. The best is yet to come.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## GREEN PLAN

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, here are some of the measures proposed in the Green Plan. The government will reinforce existing partnerships and create new ones with aboriginal people and non-governmental organizations, including environmental groups. The same will apply to Canadian industry. Individual initiative will be encouraged, and funding for the Environmental Partners Program will be increased. The Environmental Choice Program and National Environment Week will also be maintained and reinforced. A national youth advisory committee on the environment and development will be established.

Furthermore, a Canadian youth secretariat on environment and development will prepare young Canadians and other young people for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development to be held in Brazil in 1992. To support scientific research, a five-year action plan on environmental sciences and technology will be established. And Mr. Speaker, this is only the beginning. Congratulations!

[*English*]

## BEAUSÉJOUR AND YORK NORTH BY-ELECTIONS

**Mrs. Diane Marleau (Sudbury):** Mr. Speaker, two by-elections, two exhilarating victories for the Liberals in Canada: Jean Chrétien in Beauséjour and Maurizio Bevilacqua in York North.

The NDP's "Rae" of hope faded in Ontario last night with the Liberal landslide victory over the NDP in York North. Liberals are not only alive, but thriving.

Is the Conservatives' showing at the polls in Ontario an omen? Are they about to tie their rate of popularity to the rate of the GST? The by-election proved that the only things less popular with Canadians than the GST are Tories.

Liberals won both by-elections with over 50 per cent of voter support. This is the trend of the future. There is hope for Canada.

* * *

## CANADA'S GREEN PLAN

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment's green plan, tabled in the House of Commons this morning, is little more than a feeble attempt at dealing with critical environmental issues facing Canadians today.

Despite the fact that the green plan is vague and promises business as usual for the immediate future, the essence of the plan hinges on adequate environmental assessment legislation. That legislation, Bill C-78, is currently in a House legislative committee where, to date, every single witness has criticized the government's bill, calling it inadequate and fundamentally flawed. There are plenty of reasons why Bill C-78 should be withdrawn and redrafted into a strong and enforceable environmental assessment bill.

• (1410 )

None is more important than the fact that the green plan now relies on it for environmental protection. What we have here is an environmental plan that rests firmly

on top of the San Andreas fault of assessment legislation. Without stronger initiatives for the assessment process, the inadequate green plan is meaningless.

* * *

## CANADA'S GREEN PLAN

**Mr. Walter Van De Walle (St. Albert):** Mr. Speaker, Canada's Green Plan was born out of a process of public consultation which began in March 1990. Canadians participated in information sessions in 41 cities and towns across the country. Recommendations were made by many representatives of the provinces and territories, municipalities, industry, unions, environmental groups, youth, natives, academics and religious organizations. In all, this process allowed for 10,000 people to present their views to government.

Canada's Green Plan is a strong response to the views and concerns of Canadians. It effectively adopts some 80 per cent of more than 500 recommendations that emerged from the national consultative session held in Ottawa in August.

The plan encourages participation of all Canadians. Canada's Green Plan will ensure a healthy environment for ourselves, our nation and our planet.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## GREEN PLAN

**Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond):** Mr. Speaker, the Green Plan will bear fruit. This is what we can expect in the months to come.

We should see tremendous progress in cleaning up our air, waterways and soil.

We should be able to reduce waste production very substantially and be far more careful in how we use our sources of energy.

There should be a definite improvement in the protection of wildlife and national parks. There should be better protection for the fragile environment of our northern regions.

In their development plans, companies will have to consider the impact their activities will have on the environment, just as today they would consider the cost of capital investment, manpower and equipment.

We are convinced that, on the basis of the criteria I just mentioned, the Green Plan will be very successful. Mr. Speaker. this is an action plan that will produce results, which will be a genuine test of our Canadian Green Plan.

* * *

[*English*]

## BEAUSÉJOUR AND YORK NORTH BY-ELECTIONS

**Mr. Sergio Marchi (York West):** Mr. Speaker, Jean Chrétien is back!

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Marchi:** Back in the House of Commons which has been home to him for many a year.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Marchi:** Yesterday's overwhelming victories were confirmation of Mr. Chrétien's vision for a proud, independent, and above all, united Canada.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**An hon. member:** Bravo.

**Mr. Marchi:** His campaign was a campaign for Canada and a call for Canadians to still believe in themselves and in their country—

**Some hon. members:** Call the election.

**Mr. Marchi:** —despite the cynicism and despair they hold for their national Tory government.

Yesterday's winners were Jean Chrétien, Maurizio Bevilacqua, and the Liberal Party of Canada.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Marchi:** By contrast, the loser was the Prime Minister of Canada who, as Leader of the Conservative Party, did not even have the courage to field a candidate in Beauséjour, and whose candidate in York North roughly equalled the same 7 per cent level of his GST.

Canadians spoke last night loud and clear. On behalf of the Liberal Parliamentary caucus, I welcome our two new Liberal members of Parliament, made in Canada for Canadians.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

### GREEN PLAN

**Mr. Jean-Marc Robitaille (Terrebonne):** Mr. Speaker, the Green Plan is a giant step we must all take together to guarantee sustainable development that will benefit both the environment and the people of this country. The Green Plan focuses, organizes and channels efforts being made across the country to protect the environment.

During the next five years, additional funding totalling $3 billion will be released under the Green Plan. With the budgets for existing programs, this will mean a total of nearly $10 billion in federal spending on the environment during the five years following implementation of the Green Plan—

**An hon. member:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Robitaille:** —in other words, a 50 per cent increase in federal funding in this area. This new budget is a clear demonstration that the Government of Canada considers spending on the environment as an investment in the health and economic future of this country.

Congratulations to the Prime Minister, to the Minister of the Environment and to the government!

* * *

[*English*]

### CANADA'S GREEN PLAN

**Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Mr. Speaker, forestry initiatives in Canada will suffer because of the lack of support for our forests and this government's green plan. In British Columbia, we were told to wait for the green plan to get an additional $300 million for forest renewal.

Instead we get recycled promises and no specific measures to help our forests.

The Tories have sold B.C. and other provinces a bill of goods, and in B.C. the forest minister took it hook, line and sinker.

The green plan's proposal for a personal contract to plant trees recognizes what Canadians already know: the Boy Scouts plant more trees than this government. The government should get on with the job of renewing expired forest agreements immediately.

### CANADA'S GREEN PLAN

**Mr. J. W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury):** Mr. Speaker, Canada's Green Plan makes history today in marking the first occasion that our country has committed itself clearly and comprehensively to the environmental imperative.

In so doing, we are recognizing that life in today's world demands two such imperatives—one environmental and the other economic—within which disciplines we must sustain our future development on earth.

The green plan identified eight strategic areas of priority and more than 100 specific initiatives to be aggressively addressed over the next five years. It truly is an action plan, but it is more than that: it is a profound statement of principal and philosophy about how we must live our lives on this earth if mankind is to survive.

* * *

[*Translation*]

### HON. JEAN CHRÉTIEN

**Mrs. Shirley Maheu (Saint-Laurent—Cartierville):** Mr. Speaker, today is the beginning of the end for the Tory Party: Hon. Jean Chrétien is on his way, and to quote Mr. Chrétien: "We are going to start working to get rid of this terrible government".

Our leader will once again prove it is possible to be a francophone and be at home anywhere in this country. It is possible to be a French Canadian. Welcome to our new leader! Tories, on your guard!

---

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

### CANADA'S GREEN PLAN

**Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard):** Mr. Speaker, before asking my question, I want to say what a pleasure it is to rise on behalf of a caucus that as of last night was strengthened by a factor of two: York North where the NDP's ray of hope was dashed and Beauséjour where we elected the Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Today, after much huffing and puffing, we have finally received the green plan.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Martin:** Its basic message is that of the Cheshire cat. How dare they clap as the environment of this nation goes down the drain.

Only a Tory party would clap over a plan that has the rest of the country crying. The basic message of this plan is straight out of the Cheshire cat in *Alice in Wonderland*. It says, and I can almost quote from the plan: "If you do not know where you want to go, then any road will get you there."

This plan has no vision. It has no coherence, and it has no legislation. This is not an action plan. Everything in the plan is subject to 18 months of consultation. Nothing is firm, and it is all subject to approval.

**Some hon. members:** Right on.

**Mr. Martin:** All the Tories are doing, Mr. Speaker, is asking Canadians—

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**Mr. Martin:** Mr. Speaker, they are asking us to trust them. They told Canadians to trust them with day care. You failed us before. Why should we trust you now?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, this morning we tabled the green plan for Canada. It is a comprehensive plan. It is a plan that was done in full consultation with Canadians. We had over 11,000 Canadians involved in the consultation process. It is a five-year action plan. It is a revolving plan. After year one, we will add year six.

It is a plan that addresses the concerns that we heard from all those Canadians who took the time and effort to participate in the consultations. It is a $3 billion plan: $3 billion of fresh, new federal money. That plan has been approved by cabinet and will be implemented.

• (1420)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard):** Mr. Speaker, "$3 billion", said the Minister of the Environment. New money invested in the Green Plan—and I quote—"—represents 1/2 of 1 per cent of government spending over the next five years". Furthermore, all funding promised in the Green Plan is subject to cabinet approval, which means further discussions. There is no guarantee that the Green Plan will not vanish in to the fog, like the commitment to a national daycare program.

Next year, the government will invest more new money to implement the GST than to protect the environment. That is where its priorities lie. And now for my question: How can the Prime Minister justify spending more money next year to clean out our pockets than to clean up the environment?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, what we are trying to clean up is a situation that was neglected by the previous Liberal governments for 60 to 75 years.

I think Canadians will understand that when a government makes a formal commitment to cabinet to invest $3 billion—that is, three thousand million dollars—in a plan that is clearly defined with specific objectives, that government is taking the kind of action those people in the opposition have never seen before.

[*English*]

**Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard):** Mr. Speaker, I have the plan in front of me. For a year now every time this minister or his predecessor has lost a battle in cabinet, every time they have had to eat crow, they have come before the cameras to mouth words which are not their own. Then they would lamely tell us to wait for the green plan.

Today we have the green plan, and it is the environment that has lost. Once again the minister is mouthing the words but the voices are not his own. They are the voices of the minister of energy, they are the voices of the minister of finance, they are the voices—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Martin:** Given the fact that the minister is unable to voice his own opinion but has to voice that of other departments, will he tell us in a Tory government what is the difference between a Tory Minister of the Environment and Milli Vanilli?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, when the member opposite was standing on his feet, he was waving what he claimed to be a copy of the green plan. It is a summary. I would be happy to send the hon. member a full copy so he knows exactly what we have in the green plan.

What is the difference between a Tory environment minister and anybody else in this country, particularly somebody from the opposite side? We care about the environment. We have done our homework. We have made the commitments. We have taken the action, and we have something to clean up the environment after all the years of neglect.

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

At Geneva in September and again today in the green plan the minister soft-pedals the urgent threat of global warming and ignores the overwhelming consensus of scientists that we can and must cut carbon dioxide emissions by 20 per cent by 2005.

Why does the minister's plan contain action to help Canadians prepare for global warming instead of stopping it dead in its tracks and committing Canada to cut our emissions by 20 per cent by 2005?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, the position of the Government of Canada on this issue is well known. It is one that is leading most of the industrialized countries around the world.

We are going to make sure that emissions by the year 2000 are no higher than they were by the year 1990. We are moving to encourage international partners to reach a convention and protocols simultaneously at the Brazil conference in 1992.

We are one of the countries that is funding less developed countries to develop the necessary research so that they can be at the table as equal partners. We are right at the forefront of that. We have made the direct commitment in Geneva that we fully recognize that we would have to go further after the year 2000. We want to go further, but with all the rest of the international community following because this is an international problem.

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same minister. Somebody has to lead, and it is obvious it is not going to be Canada now that this plan has been released.

The government has green words on alternative energy and conservation to slow down greenhouse gases, but it has a grey record since 1984 of savage cuts from $500 million to $50 million on alternative energy and conservation. We have a green plan today that is full of surprise packages which are full of hot air.

Is there one concrete action, one concrete funding program that has been approved by cabinet, now to cut greenhouse gas emissions and to improve the use of alternative energy and conservation?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite talks about grey words. On global environmental security, we are talking about $575 million of new money to deal with the issue. To my mind that green paper means something in this community.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister.

For decades Canadian governments, led largely by the Liberals and now today by the Tories, have refused our repeated demands to get tough with corporate polluters. This failure, as the government knows, is a major contributor to the environmental crisis that we are in now.

This government had an opportunity through the green to change that. It had an opportunity to come out strong for some kind of enforcement, yet it proposes to give taxpayers' money to those very corporations that pollute our environment.

Will this government abandon voluntary compliance, bring in real legislation with real enforcement, and make the corporate polluters pay?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the NDP had read the green plan carefully, she would have found that in the Green Plan we are talking very specifically about four new pieces of legislation and fifteen new areas of regulation.

Having said that, I believe, while they are required, that we have to go further in inciting Canadians to work as one. We have to work as a federal government with provincial, regional and municipal governments, with the private sector, and with Canadians as a whole to reach the purposes that have been set out in the green plan. Regulations, yes. Legislation, yes. But co-operation first and foremost.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister.

I have read the plan of the government very carefully. Where the document states that we have to rely on voluntary compliance and that self-regulation is better than government regulation, that means there are no regulations, no environmental auditor, no staff assigned to monitor legislative regulations. It is this reliance on voluntary measures that has created the mess we are in, and the minister knows that.

In the last year, under the Environmental Protection Act, we have seen three prosecutions. Will the government announce today that it will bring forth whistle-blowing protection legislation so that workers in this country, if they want to act environmentally responsibly, will have their jobs protected? That would be a real directive.

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, in the green plan we talk about the Drinking Water Safety Act, the Canadian Oceans Act, the Wild Animal and Plant Protections Act, the National Energy Efficiency and Alternative Energy Act. All of them are time targeted. All of them have been committed to by this government. All of them will be before this House in the very near future.

The green plan does promote a number of legislative measures and a number of regulatory measures, but the act also affords a measure of faith in Canadians. They have responded well in the past and will in the future because Canadians want their environment cleaned up.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, everyone wants the environment cleaned up, including the workers in this country who simply want protection so that they can participate in that cleanup without risk of losing their jobs.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the same minister. It is clear that like the previous government, this government has no intention of prosecuting companies that pollute the environment. Will this government at least announce the creation of a charter of environmental rights, so that Canadians can do what this government is not prepared to do itself?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, what this government has done is table a concrete action plan for the next five years which involves new federal funding totalling $3 billion. That is what Canadians have asked us to do and that is what we have delivered. That is what it takes to get all Canadians at all levels of society involved, with us, with you, in a genuine environmental program.

• (1430)

[*English*]

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. He keeps talking about the $3 billion in the green plan, which in fact is 40 per cent less than he had previously promised.

Isn't this $3 billion really an empty shell because not one nickel of that $3 billion has been specifically approved by cabinet for any of the projects mentioned in the green plan and, in fact, if any of these projects come before cabinet, they could well be axed by the Minister of Finance of the President of the Treasury Board and never actually see the light of day? Is that not the truth?

**Mr. Andre:** Three billion dollars means nothing to those guys.

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, a $3 billion empty shell must be a very huge shell indeed. We are talking here about $3,000 million of fresh new federal money for the environment, associated with a program that has been fully approved by cabinet. I am not sure where my hon. colleague is getting the information that he is using for his questions. This is fresh new money. It fulfils a major commitment of our Prime Minister and of this government to ensure that our environment is protected for the years to come.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the minister says it is fresh new money, but in fact Canadians will know it is the same old stuff from this government that cut the Canadian Wildlife Service by 25 per cent and cut $40 million from the energy division of the National Research Council, so it is the same old thing.

I want to ask the Minister of the Environment this question. The minister in his green plan asks Canadians to be friendly to the environment, yet he fails to exempt any environmentally-friendly products or services from the GST. How can Canadians take the government and its green plan seriously when the government intends to slap the GST on even environmentally-friendly products and services? Does this not show the government simply is not credible when it talks about its new-found belief in a clean environment for this country?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to take the question because it gives me an opportunity to congratulate my hon. friend on a job extremely well done as leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition and to congratulate the new leader of the Liberal Party who will be entering the House very soon.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Mulroney:** Mr. Speaker, ever since the leader was replaced in June, the popularity of the party has sunk from 53 to 30 per cent. So the question is going to be, "Can Herb really be replaced?" I wish him well and congratulate him on the excellent job that he did for his party and for all of Canada.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Some hon. members:** Herb, Herb.

**Mr. Mulroney:** My hon. friend asked his usual incisive question. He expressed a legitimate fear about environmental programs being—and I quote him—"axed by the Minister of Finance or the President of the Treasury Board".

This is presumably based on experience, because the federal-provincial water management program was cut. Grants to universities for water resources research were cut. The Pollution Abatement Technology Program was cut. The Arctic marine pollution program was cut, and the Wildlife Habitat Acquisitions Program involving purchases of land for habitat protection were cut, all on September 8, 1978, by the then Minister of Finance, Jean Chrétien.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

## FISHERIES

**Hon. Roger C. Simmons (Burin—St. George's):** Mr. Speaker, while we are in a congratulatory mood, maybe we ought to congratulate the Prime Minister for his marvellous performance at the polls last night.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Ms. Copps:** Where is your deposit, Brian?

**Mr. Simmons:** My question is for the Minister of Fisheries. The government's green plan is to focus national attention on the importance of the fisheries. It says it is going to have detailed federal strategies and operating procedures in place after 1992, all of which is commendable.

What I and thousands of fishermen and plant workers in Atlantic Canada want to know is what are his immediate strategies between now and 1992, particularly this winter, to deal with the very unprecedented crisis those people are facing through no fault of their own.

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** When the hon. member congratulates the Prime Minister on the results at the polls, I remember the poll of November 21, 1988. We thought they were excellent. Those that matter he tends to win. I like that.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Valcourt:** Mr. Speaker, concerning the important fishery issues to which the hon. member refers, as he knows, we have been consulting with the industry, the fishermen, the unions, the provincial Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, along with my colleagues who have been trying to find ways to help this winter.

It is important for those fishermen this year that we take measures to ensure that the groundfish management plan is adopted. We must also ensure the future of the fisheries in that part of Canada. We fully intend to do this.

**Hon. Roger C. Simmons (Burin—St. George's):** Mr. Speaker, my good friend the minister is smart to reflect on November 21, 1988 because that is the most pleasant electoral experience he and his crowd are going to have for a long time.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Simmons:** The Fraser River in British Columbia, as the minister will know, is home to the largest salmon run in the world. I noticed with pleasure that the minister has plans to double the fish population in that river over time. That, itself, is a commendable goal.

Will the minister make a similar commitment to work towards the doubling of Atlantic groundfish stocks over the same timeframe?

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, by the way, I remember some predictions in May of 1987 about the November 21 election of 1988. Again, I saw the results.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Valcourt:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member would probably invite me to make a statement that I, this government, or the scientists, can double the fishery in Atlantic Canada.

Unfortunately, I am not a Liberal. I do not work miracles. We have to keep working hard with the fishermen and scientists to try to do what is possible. What is possible is to sustain the fishery. That is part of the green plan, to sustain the fishery in Atlantic Canada. With participation, we can all do this together.

* * *

• (1440)

## CANADA'S GREEN PLAN

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment.

I am sure he is aware that the corks are popping in the boardrooms all over the country. This is a government that is standing by, without having an environmental assessment of any of the major megaprojects coming forward in this country. The green plan was supposed to be $5 billion with tough new anti-pollution laws. Unfortunately, it shrank and it has been deformed into a unsecured $3 billion political slush fund.

Will the minister explain the $2 billion that has been cut from the plan, and why the government has opted for voluntary compliance and self-regulation of polluters when that mindset is precisely what has brought about the decline and destruction of Canada's environment.

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to explain the disappearance of something that was never there.

We have a $3 billion, five-year action plan. This is a plan to support other initiatives that this government has taken on the environment, such as Bill C-78, one that my hon. colleague has not been too swift to approve in this House or in committee.

This is a bill that will be very helpful in terms of environmental assessment. It comes on the back of a record that would be enviable for any industrialized nation in this world in the matter of environment.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Phillip Edmonston (Chambly):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. It seems that for over three years now, the *Union des municipalités* has been requesting $5 billion in order to improve municipal infrastructures, namely sewers and water systems. We don't see in the Green Plan any reference to that. Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell us, first, how much money will be used to improve municipal infrastructures? Second, will he give us a schedule showing when this money will be provided to municipalities? Is the Green Plan only an empty plan?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, the Green Plan does address questions like the ones my friend raised. I believe he should know that municipalities are creatures of the provincial governments from a jurisdictional point of view and a constitutional point of view. This question has been raised many times and our gouvernment has frequently answered requests from municipalities.

[*English*]

**Mr. Joe Fontana (London East):** Mr. Speaker, this government's green plan is nothing but a garbage heap of reused and recycled propaganda with reduced commitment to the environment.

As an example, this government's drinking water safety act does not apply to a single drop of drinking water flowing into Canadian homes and communities. The standard only applies to federally-controlled water sources. It does not apply to water treatment in 99 per cent of the communities across the country.

My question to the Minister of the Environment is this. Why did the minister not provide the leadership in obtaining federal–provincial agreements to protect drinking water for all Canadians?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, when my colleague talks about a recycled plan, that the only thing that is recycled in this plan is the paper that it is printed on. Everything else is new and meaningful.

**Mr. Joe Fontana (London East):** Mr. Speaker, the provinces and the municipalities have been pushing this government for years to adopt an infrastructure program which would clean up sewage and water and share the responsibility among the three levels of government.

Instead, this government's answer was to provide and offer to sponsor a conference. Worse still, it wants to force another tax on drinking water of somewhere between 200 to 300 per cent.

Why is this government ignoring its environmental responsibilities and ignoring the co–operative approach in dealing with water and health concerns of Canadians?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to be very clear for the record. One hon. member opposite says that we do not have taxes in this plan and another says that we intend to increase taxes by 300 per cent.

The record can read very clearly that we are not proposing any new taxes in this green plan. We are proposing a comprehensive action plan for Canadians for the next five years. The plan will evolve. We will add year six after year one and year seven after year two. It is the most comprehensive environmental plan for the country that has ever been put before the House ever since Confederation.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. David Walker (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Minister of the Environment. Canadian farmers are anxious to build an industry less dependent upon chemicals and pesticides. Other countries such as the Netherlands have already implemented specific positive measures. Yet today in your green paper all you can assure Canadians is that there will be another report in 1991.

Why the delay? Why are you continuing to put this industry at risk?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, quite the opposite. We are not putting the industry at risk at all. As recently as last Saturday, I have had meetings with the industry. It is very concerned about the chemicals it uses in agriculture, and it would like to work with us to figure out the best approaches to deal with the issue.

The chemicals are pollutants and the agricultural people in this country are conscious of that and they want to work with government to find the best solution. That is exactly what we intend to do.

**Mr. Speaker:** I know the hon. member would want to put the question through the Chair. The hon. member for a supplementary.

**Mr. David Walker (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same minister. On page 28 of the green plan there is the following incredible statement:

> Native people are particularly at risk from environmental hazards due to traditional lifestyle patterns and food sources.

They are not at risk because of what they have done. They are at risk because of what we have done.

Why did the minister not deal directly with those companies and provincial Crown corporations which take turns in destroying our aboriginal communities?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, first of all the interpretation of that quote does not do justice to the statement in general that was made in the green plan about the plight of aboriginal people. We are addressing the concerns of aboriginal people in the green plan.

In terms of their traditional living habits, obviously there is a problem. There is a problem because the food chain for aboriginal people is quite different from that one would find in a city such as Ottawa, Montreal, or Toronto. We are concerned about that. We need better science. We need more help. The aboriginal people have pointed that out to us and we are working very closely with them to come to the best solution possible.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Ross Harvey (Edmonton East):** Mr. Speaker, the green plan projects new spending on energy conservation, renewables, and alternatives to counteract global warming of an average maximum $115 million a year.

Added to current spending, that will bring us up to about $155 million a year, just a little less than is spent on the nuclear industry all by itself, and less than 40 per cent of what was spent in these areas in 1984.

Given this unmistakable, unconditional surrender on global warming, will the minister agree that the green plan's section entitled "Anticipating and Preparing for Global Warming" represents the government's real strategy—do nothing substantive to stop it, but try to cope with it when it happens?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the hon. member has made mention of energy efficiency. In fact, I recall just in the last committee meeting that he and I attended when we were discussing the Petro-Canada privatization bill that he in fact commended the government and the department for the leadership we had taken in alternate energy.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of the Environment and also relates to global warming.

In response to another question in the House this afternoon, the minister responded by alluding to Canadian leadership on reduction of $CO_2$ emissions. Yet the document, the green plan, states that the target is going to stabilize carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions at 1990 levels by the year 2000. In the same document it states the government is going to have difficulty meeting the stabilization targets.

How is the government going to achieve this goal?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

• (1450 )

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, we have restated the goal in the green plan. That is a goal that we have committed to internationally at Bergen, repeated in Geneva, and expanded upon, as a matter of fact, in Geneva. It is a goal that we feel confident we can meet.

From a scientific point of view, we know exactly how we can reach most of the goal. We are very confident in this area, as was the case, for example, with CFCs and the ozone-depletion problem that we will probably be able to surpass the goal.

The science has to be developed further and if the hon. member looks at the green plan carefully she will see that there is a very significant part of the Green Plan that deals with research and development and scientific work in the field of the environment.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu):** Mr. Speaker, the new Minister of the Environment is costing $2 billion in losses for those who are concerned about the environment. We can see that the departure of the member for Lac-Saint-Jean was a very costly proposition for the environment, Mr. Speaker, just to end up with a series of pious wishes. Can the Minister of the Environment tell me whether the provinces have been consulted and how much of these $3 billion are earmarked for Quebec?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to tell my colleague from Richelieu that the Green Plan was drafted in full consultation with 11,000 Canadians. In addition, we did have consultations with all provincial governments, and I can assure my colleague that this new $3 billon appropriation is a lot more than anything that had been envisaged in a plan such as this one. The funds will be distributed equitably to all regions of the country so that we may all do our share to reach our environmental objectives.

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu):** My supplementary is for the Minister of the Environment. I said something about consultations with the Quebec government, Mr. Speaker, but I did not get an answer and three points needs to be clarified. For example, the report provided by the minister has precious little to say about research and innovation. And then PCBs will be dealt with in 1995, not 1992. I should also remind the minister that back in 1986 we were talking about investing $1.5 billion in wildfowl protection, but now we are down to $175 million for threatened species and historic sites and centres. Is a fire-sale priced environment the only thing the minister has to offer to Quebecers?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is suggesting that I did not answer his first question. I will give him a much more specific answer. Not only did I meet with the Quebec environment minister along with others, but I got to talk to him personally. I gave him an outline of the Green Plan and the Quebec Minister of the Environment was quite satisfied. There were further consultations about the finer points of the Green Plan and the Government of Quebec was satisfied with the approach taken by the central government.

* * *

## HOUSING

**Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond):** Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to Minister of State for Housing. Recent newspaper reports indicate that the Government of Quebec is not particularly enthusiastic over federal policies concerning subsidized housing. Can the minister tell us why the federal government would favour Ontario to the detriment of Quebec when it comes to funding subsidized housing?

**Hon. Alan Redway (Minister of State (Housing)):** Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that Quebecers will get their fair share of available resources and that Quebec is not short-changed to the benefit of other provinces or territories. In 1990, Quebec got 26.9 per cent of all housing units, against 25.2 per cent for Ontario. As you would know, Mr. Speaker, my responsibility is to help any low-income family find decent living accommodation wherever it happens to live.

* * *

[*English*]

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, CBC President Gerard Veilleux said today with respect to its cuts that "politicians, and in particular the cabinet, have the responsibility for keeping the CBC alive".

Will the Prime Minister admit that neither he nor the Minister of Communications even bothered to meet with the CBC President? They did not even bother to lift a little finger to do something to help the CBC before the savage cuts took place and were announced? Will the Prime Minister tell us why he and his cabinet abdicated their responsibility with respect to the public broadcasters?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Since 1936, Mr. Speaker, all governments, including this one, have assumed their responsibilities towards the CBC. Moreover, I met Mr. Veilleux on many occasions following his appointment as President of the CBC. He never mentioned that he wanted to discuss with me how the CBC budget should be spent and how the president and directors of the CBC should administer their own budget.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, it would make a very interesting exchange between the Prime Minister and Mr. Veilleux to find out who was correct in this particular situation.

[*Translation*]

I have a supplementary question. This morning, the CBC was unable to assure hon. members that there would be no further cuts nor any other closing of television or radio stations. The Minister of Communications did nothing to protect the CBC at the Cabinet meetings. Would the minister admit that he did not even lift a finger to help the artistic community in Canada? If you did, what did you do? Tell me!

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Since 1984, Mr. Speaker, this government on many occasions increased the budget of the CBC. As for the future, Mr. Speaker, only the Liberal Party knows it.

* * *

[*English*]

## CANADA'S GREEN PLAN

**Mr. Réginald Bélair (Cochrane—Superior):** Mr. Speaker, forest resources development agreements have not been mentioned in the green plan, yet they are fundamental to the survival of the forestry industry in Canada. The minister announced that he proposes to plant 325 million trees in our towns and cities.

Is the minister not confusing his priorities when there are some 220,000 hectares of harvested land that will not be reforested in Canada because they are not included in the green plan?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Michel Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Forestry)):** Mr. Speaker, I am afraid my hon. colleague is mistaken concerning the Green Plan and the regular programs. As far as reforestation is concerned, I suggest that the federal-provincial FRDA agreements have been quite successful so far.

The Green Plan is something else, an innovation which will benefit the Canadian people as a whole. Surely forestry was taken into account, but I would not want my hon. friend to confuse the resources allocated under the various federal-provincial FRDA agreements with those allocated under the Green Plan. It is something which is entirely separate in an effort to improve the situation. It is new money which is made available to Canadians for the development of forestry resources and for the use of the Canadian people as a whole. That is the intended goal of the Green Plan.

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

**Mr. Réginald Bélair (Cochrane—Superior):** Must I remind you, Mr. Speaker, as well as the government that there are in Canada six forestry development agreements which are essential to the survival of the forest industry in this country which have not been renewed. Why were they not included in the Green Plan?

**Mr. Michel Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Forestry)):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know where my hon. friend was when we signed forest resource development agreements with New Brunswick and when we increased the budgets. Each and every Canadian province has received an offer and is currently looking into the federal proposal.

I can tell my hon. friend that contrary to what his party has done, since 1984 we have increased the forestry budget by 300 per cent, we continue to develop the Canadian forest and the Liberals are certainly in no position to tell us what to do in this area.

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

• (1500)

[*English*]

## CANADA'S GREEN PLAN

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake):** Mr. Speaker, the minister's green plan hinges on strong, reliable and credible environmental assessment legislation. But, every witness appearing before the C-78 legislative committee has said that that legislation is flawed, inadequate, needs substantial amendment, or should be withdrawn and redrafted.

Is the minister prepared to go back to the drawing-board with Bill C-78, or is he content to let the future of his green plan rest on this San Andreas fault of environmental assessment legislation?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, as I have said time and time again, and particularly when I tabled Bill C-78 in the House, if there were some meaningful and constructive amendments to be brought forth, the government would certainly be interested in studying them.

Recently, I have met with my critics on the opposition side and we will be meeting shortly to talk about a potential amendment to Bill C-78. The important thing is that the bill goes much further than most environmental assessment bills that you find in any industrialized country. We need it badly. It is a tool that this country cannot do without. We will improve the bill if we can. We are open to ideas and constructive criticism of the bill and I will meet with the opposition parties very shortly to discuss it.

---

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

## PETRO-CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

### ALLOCATION OF TIME TO CONSIDER REPORT AND THIRD READING STAGES OF BILL C-84

**Mr. John A. MacDougall (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Madam Speaker, it gives me pleasure today to have the opportunity to make a few remarks with regard to Bill C-84, the Petro-Canada Public Participation Act.

**Mr. Dingwall:** Madam Speaker, perhaps the Chair would be kind enough to indicate to the House how much time is remaining with regard to this particular debate and the time allocation motion on Bill C–84.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I am advised by the Table that there are 17 minutes left to debate before I must put the question to the House.

**Mr. MacDougall:** Madam Speaker, again I would like to start and I understand we only have roughly 17 minutes left in this debate.

First reading of this bill was on October 1, 1990. Second reading took place on October 10, 1990. with a total of six speakers. Three of those speakers were opposition members. Again, on October 11 there were three and two. On October 23, three and one. October 29, six and three, for a total of 18 speakers, nine of whom were opposition members.

The legislative committee which met with regard to Bill C–84 held nine meetings and heard more than 10 witnesses and groups of witnesses. The Minister of State for Privatization and Regulatory Affairs and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources also appeared before the committee. I should refer to the fact that the minister for privatization appeared there twice. The bill was then amended on November 30 at report stage. As of today, there have been 18 speakers, 12 of them from the opposition parties.

While listening to the debate in my office I heard an uproar over the fact that again the government has moved time allocation. If you go back between 1980 and 1984, you will find that there were 25 time allocation motions and two closure motions moved. This party, between 1984 and 1988, moved 20 time allocation motions and two closure motions.

I now want to deal with the facts with regard to Bill C–84 and some of the witnesses who appeared before the committee. On October 23, 1990, CBC radio network, *Morningside*, former energy minister Marc Lalonde with regard to the privatization of Petro–Canada said that it was never the purpose of Petro–Canada to protect us against the various parts of the market.Nobody ever guaranteed that the assistance of Petro–Canada would mean cheaper oil. Petro–Canada had to buy the oil product and produce its oil and sell it for the price it carries in the marketplace.

This statement is quite interesting when you think back. October 28 is a black day on the calendar of western Canadians. That is the 10 year anniversary of the national Liberal national energy policy. It is a memory that will go on for many, many years for western Canadians and, in fact, for all Canadians, when the government of the day brought in its National Energy Program.

It was interesting to hear the leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Chrétien, who was elected last night, a former cabinet minister, admit that the National Energy Program was wrong. He stated in Calgary that it was a mistake. Just what the position of the Official Opposition is going to be on this issue, I do not know. We are already starting to see policies of yesterday when he was in cabinet. It is now going to be: "I am sorry, I made a mistake. We are going to try to do it over again".

It is interesting to talk to individuals such as Ian Smith, then of the Canadian Petroleum Association. He recalls: "I remember driving home with a Canadian oil company president. It was warm. His window was down. So was mine. He said, 'This is the worst day of my life'. People everywhere were saying 'They cannot be doing this to us'. He watched the TV. It was one blow after another; Allan MacEachen reading it out."

We all know that the hon. member now is in that other House and he is doing it again to Canadians. Now it is with regard to another piece of legislation that is going to move this country forward. The Liberal Party always loves to see us in a recession, whether it is caused by the national energy program which crippled this country, or through the debt which the Liberal government brought Canadians that we are now paying.

When we see what is going on, we understand our objectives which were largely anticipated from 1984 until now: to promote efficient development in the use of Canada's energy resource; increase the flexibility, diversification and competitiveness of Canadian energy companies; assure security of supply; ensure that energy production and use occurs in an environmentally responsible manner; the private opportunities for increased Canadian ownership and control of the domestic petroleum industry; and finally, to ensure energy contribution to a national reconciliation.

That is basically what we are looking at within Bill C-84, the opportunity for Petro-Canada to move forward, to move into this new decade, to ensure that it has the opportunity, the structure in place that it will be a stable company for years to come.

We listened to those who were before the committee hearings. I would just like to take a moment to read what some of the witnesses said. One of the witnesses from the investment community, Wilf Gobert, a financial analyst, said that "The legislation on privatization should be dealt with as quickly as possible. Whether or not the climate is right or the timing is right, the privatization of Petro-Canada should proceed as quickly as possible. The government ownership of Petro-Canada should be reduced to nil as quickly as possible".

• (1510)

There is an individual who really knows what should happen. He recognizes the fact that Canadians and Petro-Canada must have the opportunity to move forward.

As we hear day in and day out in this Chamber, the opposition are continually asking this government to move into more social programs and to move forward with new technology. There are only so many dollars out there and there are only so many things that we can do. If we are going to allow Petro-Canada the opportunity to move forward with some of its programs and projects, it is only right that we should be moving forward in this House with this bill.

I would like to move on with a couple of the witnesses. William Hopper, whom everyone in this House recognizes, said:

> We do not have the adequate funds available to meet our investment needs for the years ahead—. In the downstream we must make multi-million-dollar investments to improve the environmental impact of our activities.

He goes on:

> There have not been enough funds left from our cash flow to finance all our 1990 expenditures. We have had to take on more debt this year. To rely on further borrowing for large capital investment needs, we expect, over the coming years would be highly imprudent.

It is indicating once again by the president and chairman of Petro-Canada that this bill is vitally important to the ongoing process of Petro-Canada, to ensure that they will enhance the opportunities of the company.

I have some of the hearings in which these points were brought forward. It is vital that they be put on the record because they certainly indicate some of the concerns and some of the areas which should be dealt with. I am going to move on to Mr. Hopper and some of the information that was tabled at the time:

> Petro-Canada has clearly made a contribution to the security of energy supplies in Canada. What then of our role as a window on the industry?
>
> I think people have tended to read a bit too much into this phrase over the years. Our activities did help government understand the extent of Canada's petroleum resources and the available options for developing them. But Petro-Canada was never formally called upon to provide advice to government. We have not had any formal role in developing energy policy, but were just one of many sources of advice to policy-makers. I do not see any need for a unique role for Petro-Canada in this area in the future. Over the past 15 years, considerable expertise has been built up within the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, the Petroleum Monitoring Agency, the National Energy Board, the Canadian Oil and Gas Lands Administration and other agencies. And Canadians generally, have a much greater understanding of energy issues today than in the mid-1970s.

I think this type of information is worthy to put on the record. Let us get on with passing Bill C-84 and give Petro-Canada the opportunity to do the job it wants to do.

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Madam Speaker, I am delighted to speak on the current issues before us.

The first question is shall we allow privatization of Petro-Canada, the aim of Bill C-84, and what I call the product of this debate. My answer is no.

The second question is shall we limit full and extensive debate on this bill, including general public participation and input, as motioned via time allocation. My answer is it should not be.

First, I shall speak on the product. Petro-Canada, until now, has been a Crown corporation whose survival is now at a stage. It is on the list of the endangered species, that is the national species. It is not about wildlife nor our forests, it is about a national institution.

Previously, we had seen this government privatize Air Canada. We have no more public control of our skies in essence. We have privatized VIA Rail and dismantled it. The institutions that bind our land are no longer there. Recently, there was a threat to our Constitution. Federal-provincial relations have been strained.

Even more recently we have seen threats to our social programs: Unemployment Insurance Act amendments that would penalize our breadwinners, the clawback that would penalize our seniors, child benefit program cuts which were made, and even now the threat to medicare.

What does Petro–Canada reflect? It reflects public policy, Canadianism, and Canadian values. What are these values? Canadian ownership and control of the oil industry grew from 1980 to 1985. Three events at the time allowed it to happen. The key is that we have assumed Canadian ownership and control of our energy supply.

The second value is about security of energy supply. Canada is one of the fortunate countries in the world to have a wide range of conventional and renewable energy sources that it can call upon for its energy needs. We believe Petro–Canada is our only remaining energy lever against big, foreign owned energy multinationals.

Today we are facing a crisis in the oil industry due to the crisis in the gulf. We cannot leave things to chance. We must take control of our resources for the benefit of our nation, for the benefit of our future generation. We believe that Petro–Canada serves us as a useful instrument, as a useful insurance. As a national company it has played a vital role in state to state negotiations during periods of uncertainty in the world oil trade as we are now facing. Yes, Petro–Canada has a bright future for us to play as a public corporation. It could play a leading role in the ongoing growth of our nation. It has done an excellent job in the past. We should allow it to continue with the job. Canadians need a voice in the energy industry, and the answer is continuing public ownership of Petro–Canada.

In the remaining couple of minutes, I would like to speak about the process of time allocation. The member for Kingston and the Islands has kindly provided me with information that since May 1985, 31 attempts have been made by this government to impose time allocation. The success rate of this government in so far as time allocation is concerned has been great. It succeeded in 25 times out of 31 in moving time allocation, about 4.6 per year on the average, while the Liberal record on this note was only about 1.5 a year in the many years a Liberal government has served this country.

When one considers the many events in parliamentary debate during which time this government moved time allocation they concerned vital programs such as family allowances, employment equity, government expenditures, and today Petro–Canada.

As I look back at the problem before us, I would like to quote from the historical summary of Standing Order 78 which governs this particular motion:

> From the early years of the Canadian Parliament, it was recognized that complete freedom of debate was impossible and that some restraint would have to be exercised or some accommodation reached in order for the House to conduct its business within a reasonable time frame.

This quotation is from the *Annotated Standing Orders of the House of Commons*, 1989 Edition. The key words I would like to call to the attention of the House are: "within a reasonable time frame". I submit that we have not been provided with reasonable time for debate of this particular bill in this House. I know there is always a continuing conflict, a continuing competition between the role of the majority and the role of the minority. The real challenge to the majority is to see the hearts of the minority because the minority in this Parliament represents the majority of Canadians across the country.

As I conclude my debate on this issue, let me just say that yes, we are opposed to the privatization of Petro–Canada. The Liberal Party believes that it ought to continue as a national institution. We are equally opposed that the guillotine of time allocation has been imposed on this debate so that Canadians from across the country shall not be heard.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** It being 3.21 o'clock p.m., the two hours provided for the consideration of the motion now before the House, under the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), have expired.

[*Translation*]

Accordingly, pursuant to the Standing Orders, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the motion now before the House.

[*English*]

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. 370*)

YEAS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bouchard (Roberval)
Brightwell
Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Chadwick
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Desjardins
Dobbie
Dorin
Edwards
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Guilbault
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
Hudon
Jacques
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Layton
Loiselle
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Martin (Lincoln)
Mazankowski
McDougall (St. Paul's)
Andre
Attewell
Bernier
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boyer
Browes
Cardiff
Champagne (Champlain)
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clifford
Collins
Corbeil
Côté
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Danis
Della Noce
Dick
Domm
Duplessis
Epp
Ferland
Fretz
Gibeau
Greene
Halliday
Hicks
Holtmann
Horning
Hughes
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Larrivée
Littlechild
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Marin
Mayer
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
O'Kurley
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Schneider
Shields
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Weiner
Wilbee
Assiniboia)
Worthy—122
Monteith
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Robitaille
Saint-Julien
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Valcourt
Venne
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—
Winegard

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Arseneault
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bélair
Benjamin
Blackburn (Brant)
Boudria
Brewin
Campbell (South West Nova)
Comuzzi
Crawford
Dingwall
Duhamel
Ferguson
Foster
Gaffney
Guarnieri
Harvard
Heap
Hunter
Kaplan
Keyes
Kristiansen
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Laporte
Leblanc (Longueuil)
MacAulay
MacWilliam
Manley
Marleau
McGuire
Mifflin
Mills
Murphy
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Phinney
Plamondon
Rideout
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Stupich
Tobin
Volpe
Walker
Wood
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—93
Angus
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Baker
Bellemare
Black
Blaikie
Breaugh
Callbeck
Catterall
Copps
de Jong
Dionne
Edmonston
Finestone
Fulton
Gardiner
Harb
Harvey (Edmonton East)
Hopkins
Jordan
Karpoff
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Langan (Mission—Coquitlam)
Lapierre
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
MacLaren
Maheu
Marchi
McCurdy
McLaughlin
Milliken
Mitchell
Nault
Ouellet
Peterson
Pickard
Proud
Riis
Simmons
Speller
Taylor
Vanclief
Waddell
Whittaker
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)

[*Translation*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to.

• (1550 )

[*English*]

## FISHERIES ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

**Hon. Mary Collins (for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans)** moved that Bill C–74, an act to amend the Fisheries Act and to amend the Criminal Code in consequence thereof be read the third time and passed.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Debate.

**Hon. Roger C. Simmons (Burin—St. George's):** Madam Speaker, I was a little hesitant in rising, not because I lack enthusiasm for this marvellous bill, Bill C–74, but because I fully thought that, on third reading, my friend from St. John's East or the Minister of Fisheries would have talked to the House at least for a few minutes about their hopes as to what the bill will achieve.

**Mr. Reid:** I will. I will, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Simmons:** He promises that in time he will do that, so I shall forge on with my few remarks on this bill.

The basic premise of this bill is that it ought to improve fish stocks through tougher enforcement measures. The member agrees to that. I think I have his attention. We are on the same wave length as to what the bill ought to do.

**Mr. Reid:** Cheek to cheek.

**Mr. Simmons:** We are also cheek to cheek, as he says, on the matter of the need for such tougher measures, because those who stay within the law on this issue have nothing to fear.

The people who this bill goes after, in effect, are those who come into our waters illegally and engage in all kinds of illegal activity, from overfishing to dumping valuable fish resource, to polluting the ocean, and to using it as a dumping ground wilfully and without regard for its consequences and damage to fish habitat and the environment in general terms. These are the people we are after.

We can name them in terms of categories. By and large, they are the fishermen from metropolitan France, Portugal, and Spain. I have carefully said metropolitan France because I want to distinguish between the fishermen from St. Malo and other parts of metropolitan France, on one hand, and those from St. Pierre and Miquelon on the other.

That latter group of fishermen does not have a voice in the House because they do not belong to this country. But it should be said in passing that in many respects they are our brothers and sisters of the fishery. When we suffer in terms of loss of resource or depleted resource, they suffer. I stand to be corrected, but I do not know of any blatant examples involving the fishermen of St. Pierre and Miquelon. I know of many blatant examples of pollution and overfishing, going over many years, involving fishermen from St. Malo and other parts of metropolitan France.

Maybe, in passing, I might mention the relationship that has grown up over the years between the fishermen of St. Pierre and Miquelon, on the one hand, and the people of the south coast of Newfoundland on the other. For example, there are many cases of intermarriage between people from places such as Grand Bank, Point May, Lamaline, and those communities directly facing St. Pierre and Miquelon. I go to St. Pierre as often as possible, usually once or twice a year, to practise my French, Madam Speaker—

**Mr. Reid:** Oh, oh.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Simmons:** Ah, my friend from St. John's East can laugh.

[*English*]

Perhaps he has much justification for laughing at that idea, but he and I have a hope that one day we will be able to speak to our fellow Canadians in either of the two official languages.

I have a particular immediate aspiration in that about 4,000 or 5,000 of my constituents are French–speaking people whose first tongue is French. So, the onus is on me to get on with the task of being able to speak the other language. I have made a start. My Christmas cards this year, for the first time, are in both official languages. We are getting there very, very slowly—but I digress.

**Mr. Brewin:** Do you translate yourself?

**Mr. Simmons:** The hon. member for Victoria rears himself awake at this late hour in the afternoon. The answer to his question is, yes, I do translate. The problem is in being able to understand what my francophone friends are saying quickly enough to respond to them, but that will come in time. Now, I digress again.

Let me get back to some other French-speaking friends I have in St. Pierre and Miquelon. I do not represent them, of course. Let it be clear that I represent the people directly opposite on the coast of Newfoundland. But I was making the point along the way that they are not the people who are the culprits who are polluting and overfishing. They understand all too well how finite, how precious, and how delicate is the resource and fish habitat there, and how important is the need to protect it.

Having made that distinction, let me once again talk about the real polluters. They are the French fishermen from metropolitan France, the Spanish, and the Portuguese.

Human nature being what it is, I think it will come as no surprise that from time to time some of our own Canadian fishermen are involved in acts which do not contribute to the future well being of the fishery. Having said that, do not let anyone get off on the kick that somehow, if we can beat all our Canadian fishermen into the ground, we have solved the problem.

There is a particular instance—and I will not get into it, it is not on my part of the coast, nor is it in the part of the coast represented by the gentleman from St. John's East—in Atlantic Canada which is well known to members of the House where there was some flaunting of regulations to the detriment of the well-being of the fishery. But this is not an issue that particularly affects my coast. I am not saying all the people I represent are lily-white, but I am saying that my people in Burin—St. George's are very sensitive to the need to have proper conservation. That is why I can stand here and represent them in speaking to this bill and say to you, Madam Speaker, knowing that I have their support and encouragement, that fishermen and plant workers in Burin—St. George's, and I believe in Newfoundland and Labrador, generally, support this bill because, among other things, it seeks to implement better conservation measures through tougher enforcement of the requirements of fisheries related law.

At second reading, in committee, and at report stage, we on this side have said repeatedly that we support the principle of the bill and we support much of what the bill tries to achieve. But at the same time, we have some particular concerns about individual matters addressed in the bill or individual approaches of the bill. It is for that reason that my colleague and friend, the hon. member for Gander—Grand Falls, moved amendments at the committee stage, as did my colleague, the hon. member for Cardigan. Both of these members, in dialogue within our caucus, have been very helpful in bringing a perspective to the debate and in our arriving at a position that honestly reflects what the fishermen want and feel is needed while at the same time seeking to accommodate the government. It comes as a surprise, I am sure, that I would even say that. But we were seeking to accommodate the government on a matter on which we believe we are very much on the same wave length, that is the need to adequately conserve the stock so it is there for another time.

• (1600)

My colleague and friend, the hon. member for Cape Breton Highlands—Canso, will be getting into some of the detail of that subsequently as well as my friends, the hon. members for South Shore and Labrador.

There are a couple of points which I want to make before I finish. I am getting a signal from my good friend, the hon. member for St. John's East. I am not sure whether he wants me to go on for a long time or for a very short time.

**Mr. Reid:** Just as long as you want.

**Mr. Simmons:** I will tell him that, as usual, I will only take as long as is necessary.

**Mr. Boyer:** But not necessarily longer.

**Mr. Simmons:** The hon. member will realize, of course, that I have unlimited time. He should know that in my day, I have given two very different kinds of speeches. I stood not far from here in December 1979, just back here on the back-bench, and I gave my maiden speech in this Chamber. Fifteen minutes after I sat down, the government of the right hon. member for Yellowhead fell. Hon. members can see that I have been known to give very powerful speeches.

**Mr. Boyer:** This is the egocentric version of Canadian history.

**Mr. Simmons:** But I should tell him—

**Mr. Boyer:** There was another speech.

**Mr. Simmons:** Ah, ah, now the member has made that global leap that he is known for. I said two things: I said I made a speech and I said the government fell. He jumped to that silly and wrong conclusion, Madam Speaker, of thinking one affected the other. That is the kind of mistake he often makes and we forgive him for it, especially since it is so near the Christmas season.

I want to tell him about another speech. It was in the Newfoundland House of Assembly. My friend who is now in the Senate, Senator Doody, was the Minister of Finance and it was my honour to be his critic, in opposition. I was to do the lead-off speech, as I am doing here today, on another matter. It was thought needful at the time to talk at some length. I managed to talk for 16 hours and 42 minutes. So I have been known to give powerful speeches and long ones and, if the member will tell me which he wants today, I will accommodate him.

**Mr. Boyer:** There is so little time and so much to do, why don't you make it a short, powerful speech.

**Mr. Simmons:** I shall take the advice of my friend from Toronto. I am struggling to remember the name of his riding.

**Mr. Boyer:** Etobicoke—Lakeshore.

**An hon. member:** If you have a memory problem, that is not his fault.

**Mr. Simmons:** The hon. member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore, apart from being a man who makes mistakes, also is a man of great ideas and he just gave me one. He said that I ought to be short and powerful. I make him a commitment that I will keep at least one of those undertakings. Since my younger son is probably by now waiting in the lobby to go off to the Christmas party, I shall see that it is short and leave it to him to decide whether it was powerful.

Despite the need for brevity, I have a couple of things I would like to say. One of them is that I am absolutely appalled at the way this government is treating the fishery. The Atlantic fishery is what I want to talk about specifically because I know more about it than I do about the Pacific fishery, although my friends, the hon. member for Cape Breton Highlands—Canso, the hon. member for Cardigan and I are making some efforts to get our heads together on that issue as well. We three are the critics in this party for the fisheries issues. But let me stay with the Atlantic fisheries because it is something I know a little more about.

We live in a time of unprecedented crisis in the Atlantic fishery from foreign overfishing, from the depletion of the northern cod stocks through some miscalculations by the scientists three or four years ago, from the erosion of the Gulf stocks, and from the complete collapse of the inshore fishery on most of our coasts, particularly in Newfoundland.

**Mr. Dionne:** And the incompetence of the minister.

**Mr. Simmons:** All of those reasons we understand in some measure. What we do not understand is the government's approach to the problem.

When the present Minister of Fisheries, whom I have a lot of respect for, came into the ministry, I had great hopes for him and his ability to deal with the issue. I still do, given his competence, his track record in cabinet before, and his passion. I like somebody who has a bit of passion in any job, the kind of passion that the minister of energy exhibits. He tries to hide it most of the time but it beats just underneath and it comes through once in a while. Whether it shows or not, it dictates his actions. That is what encourages me. The same can be said about the gentleman who is the Minister of Fisheries. He engages his commitments with a passion, also with a right mind.

The minister's lieutenant, the member for St. John's East, is no amateur either when it comes to passion or intelligence. He might not agree because he is too modest a man. A good team, I say seriously. A good team. If that crowd has to be in the government—and I have serious problems with that—then I am delighted that the Minister of Fisheries and his parliamentary secretary are the gentlemen who are responsible for fisheries. Together they have the brains and the commitment to do something about the problem.

That being the case, why is something not happening? Part of the answer has to be that these guys got their marching orders, or to put it differently, got their orders not to march. They got their orders not to do anything. They got their orders to keep their feet as though planted in cement, to be motionless in achieving any results as far as the fisheries are concerned.

This government lacks any priority when it relates to fishery matters, not because the gentleman from Baie Comeau has a hate on for fisheries. That is not the issue. His lack of action on fisheries is incidental to the total issue. The total issue has to do with his deliberately spelled out agenda as it relates to rural Canada. Fisheries, fishermen and fish plant workers happened to have created the sin of living, of being born and raised and having found their employment in rural Canada, rather than downtown Montreal, Vancouver or Toronto.

I do not get my jollies going after those cities. I love those cities. I was in Toronto yesterday on a very special mission, a mission which I may say was successful, thanks to a lot of people. The mission is known as North York, and the gentleman from Etobicoke—Lakeshore, despite his attempts at denial, will know that it was a fairly successful mission, depending upon the point of view, of course. But I digress again.

Toronto is a great city. Vancouver is a great city. Winnipeg, of course.

**Mr. Edwards:** Edmonton.

**Mr. Simmons:** If the member says Edmonton is a great city, I absolutely agree with him.

**An hon. member:** What about Prince George?

**Mr. Simmons:** The member is pushing his luck back here now.

**Some hon. member:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Simmons:** Madam Speaker, it is not that we in rural Canada hate the big cities. If that is what turns you on and you like big cities, that is all right, but this government must have an obligation to the cities as well. These obligations to urban centres should never be treated as a trade-off against rural centres. It should never be an either/or situation. A government worthy of its name, a government worth its salt, as we say back home, has to recognize that there is to be a balance in terms of its treatment of all parts of this country.

That is why I have great difficulty. The fishermen and the plant workers also have difficulty understanding that they have to bear the brunt, whether it is in matters relating to fisheries, post office closings, rail closings, transport downgradings, taking the guy or the girl off the tower in St. John's after 12 o'clock at night. The member cannot agree with that. That is unconscionable. They would not do it in Toronto. These things are happening to rural Canada in the name of restraint, but no such restraint is taking place with respect to opera houses in Toronto or space centres in Montreal.

• (1610)

I am not saying we are against opera houses or space centres. I am saying if some pain has to be inflicted, in the name of common sense and the name of fairness, do it equally across the board. Do not say to us that it all has to be done in St. John's, Burin, Port aux Basques and those places but none has to be done in Toronto where the opera houses go ahead or Montreal where the space centres go ahead, restraint or no restraint. Do not tell me that somebody over there does not hate rural Canada when I see the evidence of it every single day, whether I am talking about the fishery, rural post offices or unemployment insurance gutting. It does not matter what I talk about. If it is rural Canada the code over there is the same. Rural Canada, cut the guts out of it. Urban Canada, that is a different matter.

I hope when one of the members on the other side representing the administration rises and gives the administration's view of reality on this issue, they will take up the issue that I have raised and explain to me if there is another reason why rural Canada is getting the axe at every single turn. I understand restraint. I understand we do not have unlimited amounts of money.

What I do not understand and will refuse to understand, as long as I represent the people of rural Canada in this House, as I have the pleasure of doing, as long as I represent people who live in 158 communities, almost all of them fishing communities along 2,000 miles of coast line in western and southwestern Newfoundland, as long as I represent those people, I will not either by my silence or by my words say: "It is all right, Mr. Prime Minister, to close rural post offices and ask people to drive great distances. It is all right to try to take blood out of a turnip in terms of what you are doing to fisheries spending. It is all right to do that as long as you keep the opera houses going in the Torontos of this world". It has got to be fair.

To the degree that I understand it, which is not a very great degree, I love opera houses. I went to one myself one time.

**An hon. member:** What opera?

**Mr. Simmons:** The gentleman from Provencher, from Manitoba, is an absolute delight. He knows I feel this. He is in absolute delight because even as I talk about a matter that serious, he can see the human side to it. That is what I like about him. He never ever loses his perspective, despite the crowd he is tangled up with over there. How he stays there, I do not know. That he keeps his perspective while there, I admire. He wants to know what opera. I shall tell him.

I have been to one opera in my life. It was last Sunday. It was a good one. Laugh all you want. It was a good opera. It was called *Amahl and the Night Visitors*, a special children's Christmas opera. I recommend it to everyone. It is about the Three Wise Men.

Madam Speaker, I know what you are thinking. You are thinking what has this got to do with the fishery. I was asking myself the same question. I think you will agree that I am allowed to say that I have just achieved something that nobody else has ever achieved in this House. I finally got the attention of the NDP. They might not understand what I am saying, but it appears they are listening from the noises coming from that corner.

As I was saying to my friends in the NDP and elsewhere, this government has treated the fishery very, very callously. I now want to make the distinction that I implied earlier. It is not because either the gentleman from St. John's East, the parliamentary secretary, or the gentleman from New Brunswick, who was minister of fisheries, has a hate on for the fishery. These fellows plead the case day and night and plead it well. But for them, the fishery would be in an even worse state than it is. They plead the case well.

They know the problem, but they are too loyal to the party to admit it very openly. The problem is the same problem that the gentleman from St. John's West is having, the Minister for International Trade who with his known candour is less secretive about his view of matters than the gentleman from St. John's East. He is known to be completely fed up with this entire approach to rural Canada. I predict that his days are numbered in that cabinet, not because he will be flicked out but because he cannot stomach it much longer. I would suggest that he will not be there come May or June. I will tell you that now, Madam Speaker. He is finding out what the gentleman from St. John's East and the minister of fisheries are also finding out, that this government has an agenda that excludes, that precludes, that shuts out forever, as long as it is in power, anything to do with improving infrastructure, way of life and opportunity in rural Canada. That is the problem right there.

I do not know how that can be changed except through change in the government. I think the people of Beauséjour and York North gave notice yesterday that they are prepared to do that. They spoke for all of Canada yesterday when they said that they were prepared to change the government as soon as the government gives them the opportunity to change it. That will come in time.

My fear, as it relates to fisheries, as it relates to rural Canada generally, and as it relates to the kind of country that I have come to love and want to continue to help build, is that by the time this crowd is turfed out of office in the next two or three years there will not be enough left of Canada for anybody to govern. The Canada we knew is fast disappearing. The east–west ties are being broken down whether we are talking about the pulverising of CBC last week or the other issues I have mentioned already. There will not be enough of this country left to govern, I say to the minister of energy. In addition to saying his prayers every night, he must cry himself to sleep when he thinks about this. There will not be enough left of this country to govern. My friend from South Shore—

**Mr. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso):** South West Nova.

**Mr. Simmons:** How I ever got her confused with the member for South Shore, I will never know. My apologies to both, but mainly to her. It is a matter I am not likely to be soon forgiven for, either. I know she has an important speech coming on and I should not delay her.

In conclusion, I would like to say that we support the principle of the bill. We have done it from the beginning of its legislative path to this House. We support the principle. We have a few difficulties with it. These are well known to the parliamentary secretary. We have

debated them in committee. He has been reasonably accommodating. The government eventually used its majority to have its way, but that is not completely within his control. He will have to answer for it in part. We tried to make it a better bill, but we still support the basic premise of the bill.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** For a minute I thought the hon. member was going to start singing Menotti's masterpiece to us in the House today.

Before recognizing the next speaker 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 Mission—Coquitlam—Food Banks; the hon. member for Trinity—Spadina—Immigration; the hon. member for Hamilton West—Hamilton Harbour.

• (1620)

**Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Madam Speaker, it gives me pleasure to have a chance to say a few words in the House today on Bill C-74.

I brought some of my material with me and I have covered my desk with some of the very important documents and reports that we had a chance to take a look at, both in committee and in the House. They will certainly help us as we proceed with discussion and debate on this legislation, which is an act to amend the Fisheries Act. It is a bill that, like the previous speaker as said, we have supported in principle since it first started its trek through the legislative process. In fact, in committee we moved a number of amendments.

I want to thank my colleague, the member for Nanaimo—Cowichan, who really started off the debate that we had in this House, for some his work on this legislation in committee.

I repeat a comment that I made at report stage when discussing some of the amendments to this bill. The quality of the witnesses before the committee was a credit to the industry and to the work of representatives from all coasts who had a chance to review the bill and give us some suggestions and advice. In particular, some of the advice was from those who really work day to day in the fishing industry. They had some very valid comments to make.

Bill C-74 is basically legislation that increases generally the fines for a number of offences under the Fisheries Act: ticketing offences or general offences under the act and, most important, an area that I spent some time on as well, that of habitat protection.

In committee some amendments were presented and in fact eventually came through to the House at report stage. I am pleased that two very important amendments were passed to the legislation. The first was a unique amendment that would require a person when convicted, if the court so ordered, to pay for promoting the proper management and control of fisheries or fish habitat.

In the original bill, the question of fish habitat was not involved. This gives a unique opportunity in terms of laying a charge and seeing that our fisheries habitat is protected so that a particular person, company or whatever that commits the offence understands the gravity of the problem and that hopefully Parliament and the courts recognize that it is not just a case of being a cost of doing business, as was repeated to us many times from the witnesses in committee.

The test of how good is the second amendment will likely come next year, because in the legislation we have also asked that the minister of fisheries be required to table in the House an annual report outlining the whole range of convictions and fines that the department has laid over the course of time. That will be an important report to Parliament, because it will give all Canadians an opportunity to see the direction and the impact that these legislative changes are having and that existing regulations are followed.

They will make the minister more directly accountable to the people of Canada for carrying out the Fisheries Act. This is an area of the legislation about which there has been a great deal of concern, in particular on the west coast. In fact many regulations of the Fisheries Act are not being followed and carried out by Fisheries and Oceans officers for whatever reason.

This will give yet another message to those fisheries officers and to the courts that Parliament takes fooling around with fisheries habitats seriously. We are not prepared to let whomever it is go and destroy fish habitat. They should understand that it is not just a $100, $200 or $300 fine, but that it is a serious charge. In fact those persons or operations will be charged to the point

where they will have to go out and promote better management and better protection of the fisheries habitat than existed before.

With regard to habitat protection in particular I want to make a few comments. The summary of the information and background material provided to the committee by the minister regarding fisheries violations was very interesting in terms of the number of ticketed offences, some of the habitat convictions, what has happened as a result interventions by fisheries officers, and whether in fact there was any follow through. I ran one particular figure by the witnesses who appeared to see how relevant it was, whether it related to their first-hand experience when it came to the fisheries resource.

In 1988 in the Pacific region there were 1,959 convictions, resulting in about $320,000 in fines. Habitat convictions totalled 11. I asked virtually all the witnesses concerned about habitat protection who appeared before the committee if this reflected in their view the problem that we are having with habitat protection, at least on the west coast. It was a clear no from virtually all of the witnesses. They said there were severe problems that Fisheries and Oceans officers had in a number of areas. In particular, they said that there was a sense within the department that when officers in their field work come across a skidder running across a creek, damaging a stream or whatever, they are reluctant to charge the particular operator. There is a sense that senior Fisheries and Oceans management will not back them up or support them. In fact it may go as far as Ottawa, that there may not be support there to back them up. If they are in fact charged, just exactly what does happen when it gets into the courts? They are slapped on the wrist, given a $100 fine and off they yet there may have been serious damage done.

That became painfully clear when an internal Fisheries and Oceans memo was released to the public which summarized, in the view of this particular Fisheries and Oceans officer, some of the very clear internal problems within the department when it comes to protecting the fisheries resource. I want to read into the record the particular quote from this memo, because it is clear to me that this officer felt strongly enough about the way the department was conducting itself to write to a supervisor to express concern.

I think it is an important message that we heard in committee and that we talked about in report stage. It has to be repeated today. If we are not aware of how important protecting the fisheries resource and habitat is, we must ensure that the department carries through with any of its concerns. I would like to quote from the memo which reads:

> We (DFO officials) have determined that DFO friendly corporations—will enjoy relative immunity from the Fisheries Act.

The memo went on to state:

> —it must be appreciated that DFO habitat enforcement has reached an all time high in inconsistency—

The memo went on to state that "it must be appreciated that DFO habitat enforcement has reached an all-time high in inconsistency". The memo states with respect to current violators of the Fisheries Act, that "because of the immunity phenomenon—a large number of violators—are not being properly pursued—It could appear that Alcan—et cetera, are given immunity from the law and we are just after the little guy".

• (1630)

Probably nothing sums up the concerns which people have with the Fisheries Act than that particular paragraph. It should tell this House how important it is that these amendments and this legislation carries through with the kinds of policies and procedures that will ensure our fisheries will be protected.

In fact, even in today's vague plan—not the green plan because it is really lacking in a great deal of specifics. One of the particular parts of the green plan released today talks about the release of the enforcement and compliance document. It is a very important document for this reason, and it was referred to in our committee by witnesses from the West Coast Environmental Law Association.

This document is the operating manual that fisheries officers use in their day-to-day field operations but has yet to see the light of day. We see yet another promise in the green plan to have it released. It is very important that that document see the light of day because it speaks directly to the comments made in this weak memorandum that the fisheries officers do not feel that they have the support in their department to carry out habitat protection work and to ensure that those kinds of provisions are carried forward.

I do not think we should talk about Bill C–74 and about habitat protection without mentioning a particularly sad example where the department and the minister failed to protect the fisheries resource and that is in regard to the Kemano project.

Last week the former minister of the environment from British Columbia made a very clear commitment to environmental assessment hearings conducted into this project, which will have a dramatic impact on the salmon habitat and the Nechako, a major tributary of the Fraser River. Yet it has been exempted from the environmental assessment process. Obviously, the former minister from British Columbia has learned that to fool with the environment is a very dangerous thing. He has now had to resign from cabinet, and who knows what he will go to next.

It is clear that that very important fisheries issue is not going to go away, it will stay in the news in British Columbia and across the country for some time to come. We have had a number of fisheries and oceans scientists who have expressed their concerns and will likely express their concerns further when this whole matter goes back into the courts in the new year. It is a very important issue that we cannot avoid. We have asked the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to conduct a full environmental assessment whenever the premier of British Columbia gets around to appointing a new or an acting minister of the environment. The whole cabinet is probably acting in some capacity or other because there have been so many resignations from the Social Credit government.

I would encourage the current Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to participate, not just with environmental assessment, but if there is to be public hearings. Are those now out the window because of the resignation of the B.C. minister of the environment who is a partner with this government in helping to destroy the Nechako river and reduce the flows on the Fraser?

Speaking specifically of the Fraser River, a major salmon rearing river in British Columbia, and one that all British Columbians are familiar with, it is going to be probably the subject of more debate to come, more work to come and an integral part of what we are talking about in Bill C–74. It comes to ensuring not just a multijurisdictional approach to resolving a lot of the problems around the Fraser River where all the stake holders are involved, the different resource industries and what have you, but as well in the commitment that we had, which again has very few specifics.

There is no funding commitment on stock rebuilding and protection of the habit base in the green plan, and of course the commitment to following that monitoring compliance and enforcement measures will be increased. That is essentially Bill C–74. It is important that this be done when it relates to the Fraser River because of the importance of that river to the fisheries in British Columbia.

Our caucus, in particular led by the chair of the New Democrat B.C. caucus, the member for Okanagan—Shuswap, has done some excellent work in preparing a report with our views about the importance of the Fraser River from top to bottom. There has been a management plan for the estuary part of the river that has been generally, not universally, seen as a positive approach and one that should be modelled for the entire river.

Our caucus held the only meeting in the upper end of the Fraser River in Prince George, where the Fraser River coming from the east end of my riding is met by the Nechako River coming from the west and starts its flow south. We were the only group to hold meetings in Prince George to talk about the importance of the Fraser River. As well, there are meetings coming up in the interior and a river boat tour of the Fraser River at the lower end itself. The department has produced what I think is a very revealing document that I certainly would be willing to provide to the parliamentary secretary if he is interested. It is a very revealing document about the concerns that the department and officials have about the protection of the habitat on the Fraser river. It is very revealing and perhaps even controversial. It shows the commitment at the field level from the staff. We hope this commitment is going to carry through all the way up to the minister. I hope it is there and I hope that this bill is going to encourage that that happens.

We have said that we support in principle Bill C–74. We were successful in getting two of my amendments through which the government supported. What is more important than that is I know we are going to ensure that we hold the department and the government accountable. If this bill is going through the House and if we are

supporting it, then in supporting it we have to follow up to ensure that the provisions of the legislation are followed and are acted upon and that the commitment to protect the fisheries resource on both coasts is there; that it is there from the field staff, it is there at the departmental level and it is here in the House of Commons and in the Parliament of Canada.

**Mrs. Coline Campbell (South West Nova):** Madam Speaker, I spoke on second reading of this bill. I attended one of the committees when some of the witnesses came before the committee. I feel pretty strongly about this bill, contrary to some of my colleagues who will be speaking in this debate.

I think it is very good to have a bill with the primary aim of protecting fish habitat, as this bill is supposed to do. But I have three areas of major concern about the bill. They are, first, the use of penalties to fishermen, to help conserve and protect the fish stocks. The second concern is about where these revenues, provided for in the bill, are to come from. They will come from those in the inshore fishery because they are in the majority. I will discuss each of these concerns at length.

• (1640)

Third, I do not feel that this bill will be equally applied. This stems from my second concern which is that the inshore fishermen are the ones who will bear the brunt of this particular move by the Minister of Fisheries. When I say that I do not think the penalties will be equally applied, I feel that it should not just be the inshore fishermen who will bear the brunt of this legislation. What about the foreigners who are overfishing? What about the offshore overfishing that has been going on?

I would like to say that, when one starts using penalties to force conservation and protection of the fish stocks, one can only feel that the communications or consultation process of this government has fallen down. It is like everything else, it has fallen down. I say that, because there is inadequate effort, on the part of the Minister of Fisheries and this government to arrive at a process of consultation with the fishermen who are going to be the ones who are going to bear the brunt of what we pass in this House. Certainly, there is overfishing. Certainly, there has been inadequate stock assessment.

The department of fisheries has not had the money or the capabilities in the Scotia Fundy area to assess the stocks. It has not wanted to listen to the fishermen. You could catch any number of fish in the Bay of Fundy this fall and this summer, and yet there was no reassessment of the stocks, no support to the fishermen who were looking to that stock in order to gain their living. There is no attempt by this government to reassess or to come back with an assessment of the stocks, an assessment which the industry has called for, I have asked for in this House, and the local communities have asked for. Madam Speaker, I say that this shows the inadequacy of the fishery policy of both the previous minister and this minister.

I will just read a letter which I received last night from a group of dragger fishermen, who have vessels which are under 45 feet long. I am bringing this up because it just happens that Canada's Green Plan mentions this and I will deal with it shortly. The letter states that, in respect of the individual boat quota allocation, it was agreed by the association not to accept the proposal, as is. This is a plea because these fishermen have to accept this by tomorrow. They say that it was agreed by the association not to accept the proposal as is. They got the proposal last week. It is about 100 pages long. They say: "We feel that the individual boat quota, as proposed, would be very destructive to the conservation of our fish stocks."

They go on: "The individual boat quota proposal does not address the problems of possible large-scale dumping of fish". We know that this goes on; the minister is aware of it; and, the department is aware of it. The letter goes on to say that the "problem of select high-grading is not addressed". Select high-grading means that they will take the larger fish and throw out the others. They will select from their catch and throw the smaller fish out. So it does not address that problem at all.

"It allows for dumping and for transhipping." That means if they have put their nets in and come up with too much, they either dump it in order not to meet the individual quota, or they give it to someone else—transhipping.

The association has said the individual boat quota proposal "does not address the problems of possible large scale dumping of fish, or select high grading which would cause dumping and transhipping which would be to the detriment of fixed gear quotas".

At this time, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans does not have the capability to curb the above problems which are sure to have serious consequences on our fish stocks. If it does not have the capability, why are we passing an act that, as I said, allows it to go and apply in an unequal fashion?

The association agreed that "more time was needed to implement a fishing plan that would better serve the fishermen, industry, and communities, again emphasizing better methods for conserving our stocks of fish". This is what this act is supposed to be about. They are asking for consultations.

In determining individual boat quotas, and I am reading again from the letter: "Using history, we feel an injustice has been done." This is the question that the fishermen are asking me, as well as other members of the House, I am sure, who come from inshore communities. Why can the government not listen to the fishermen? It has all this consultation. Why can it not listen to them that such a proposed quota policy is not going to work.

Yet today in Canada's Green Plan, it states at page 76, under "Domestic Action":

> Individual quotas, sometimes called "boat quotas" or "enterprise allocations", are an important feature of the management of several Atlantic fisheries, including groundfish and offshore scallop. They are shares of the Total Allowable Catch (TAC), or fleet allocation, assigned to individual licence holders. Individual Transferable Quotas (ITQs) take the approach one step further by allowing transfers among licence holders. This provides greater flexibility and promotes more efficient utilization of fishing capacity. ITQs have been implemented in several domestic fisheries and are in place in other parts of the world, including the fisheries of New Zealand and Australia.

Just on that point, we had Mr. Nichol from the west coast come before the Fisheries Committee recently. He mentioned that 85 per cent of the fishery in New Zealand was now privatized. But the ownership was not in New Zealand. It was with multinationals. It did not belong to New Zealand any more. What was theirs in their waters did not belong to them. It had been privatized because of the individual transferable quotas.

But it is stated in the first fisheries item in the green plan:

> Accordingly, in consultation with the fishing industry and the provinces, the government will put in place a system of Individual Transferable Quotas (ITQs) for various fisheries.

There are two things in that statement by the Minister of Environment. His counterpart, the Minister of Fisheries wants to see individual transferable quotas in various fisheries. To me, various fisheries could mean the lobster fishery, the crab fishery, or any type of fishery, capelin or whatever.

I have just read from a letter from a person in desperation to the Department of Fisheries saying that it was not consulting. Nobody in the industry wants individual boat quotas. No boat that I know of under 65, wants an individual boat quota without—

**Mr. Reid:** You better check your facts.

**Mrs. Campbell (South West Nova):** My colleague says that I had better check my facts. I can guarantee you that the only ones who want an individual boat quota are the minister's officials. I do not know why they want it. Is it for their rich friends who can then buy those individual transferable quotas, and eventually we will have a multinational company of the fishery on the east coast?

• (1650 )

The government uses that example, and then comes back to this act and states that "we are going to use individual boat quotas for conservation and protection of our fish stock." The whole being of this bill before us, Bill C–74, is to conserve and protect fish stock.

It does not make sense when there is a group saying that they would like to consult with the government, giving the things that they would like to see addressed, such as a management plan and consideration of under utilized species 4WS, east of Halifax on the mesh side, size of fish, fuel costs, and gear costs. Those are all good ways of looking at conservation.

With regard to mesh size, for instance, the sector applied a mesh size this year in that area, and it worked. They had been asking the department to put in a mesh size for years, and it worked. We got a good sized fish.

Now, on top of all of this and without any consultation, as of January 1, 1991, we are going to have new regulations that are going to affect every inshore fisherman whether in P.E.I., New Brunswick, or Nova Scotia. The penalties are going up.

**Mr. Reid:** For those who break the law.

**Mrs. Campbell (South West Nova):** The maximum penalties on summary conviction for a first offence—I come to my second point.

The parliamentary secretary over there is hollering at me, but I would say: Where are they getting the revenues?

Let us face it. The bulk of their fishermen are in the inshore. It does not apply to overfishing.

**Mr. Reid:** The bulk of them obey the law.

**Mrs. Campbell (South West Nova):** Any good legal person would tell you. Who are the people who cannot afford the lawyers? Who are the people who go in and plead guilty?

There is nothing in this act that separates a small, under 42-foot boat, an under 45-foot boat, an under 65-foot boat, or an over 125-foot boat. There is nothing in this act that distinguishes 1,000 pounds over, 500 pounds over, or 200,000 pounds over, which one might see. There is no distinction.

Because of that, we will find that the ones who can afford a good lawyer will probably get off. I am a lawyer. I know that. If they can afford a good lawyer, they are probably going to get off.

**An hon. member:** Fancy lawyers.

**Mrs. Campbell (South West Nova):** Fancy lawyers is right.

The bill does not distinguish between a big and a small infraction of the law. It does not say that the big can afford a defence lawyer, and the small are probably going to plead guilty. It does not say that the Department of Fisheries has the discretion to pick and choose whom it is going to go after, because it is overworked.

If it was applied to everybody, then people would say: "Well, everybody is going to get it." But they are not going to apply it to everybody. They are going to go to the easiest port or the easiest harbour and apply it to whomever happens to be there. It might be the one guy who happens to have a few more fish in his boat on that particular day and who never offends a law.

The department does not seem to be able to go after those people who break the law. Most fishermen would say it should go after them. For some reason, those are the people who get away.

As I said, it does not distinguish between the big and the small, between the big companies that can pay penalties and can get the benefits of having maybe thousands of fish over a long period of time—they may be caught once, get a good lawyer and get off—and the fisherman who may have that one catch for the first time over the limit is caught. He probably goes into court scared, and pleads guilty.

As I said, Madam Speaker, this bill does not go after some of the culprits who are out there. We give our under-utilized species away. We give them away. Just like we do not have a stock assessment, we do not have a program that helps the fishermen or the industry get into the under-utilized species. We just give it away and give a bi-catch that the foreigners can overcatch, dump, or select and throw out. We are not going after them.

We are not going after the Americans who come over on the Georges Bank side and take the fish when our fishermen are not allowed there because of stock protection.

This bill has many things in it that are bad for an inshore fishery. I can support the basic concept of protecting the habitat. I can support the oil-liner or the tanker that goes by and cleans out its oil tanks as it is leaving being penalized. That person should be penalized. Maybe there is not enough within the act to penalize that type of destruction of the habitat.

I cannot support a process that is just encouraging the minister not to consult with the industry and not to have letters come here stating that it has not consulted and that it is forcing people to take a ballot tomorrow. There is not one fisherman to whom I have spoken who was pleased with the results of lack of consultation or that whatever they had put forward had not been listened to.

I say to all my constituents who are fishermen, and I feel bad, that they should be aware that this bill will probably pass and be in force on January 1, and that the offences and the penalties are very serious. I say that because I am sure that it will be the inshore again which bears the brunt of this Minister of Fisheries' lack of putting into place a proper management plan that reflects that we have a natural resource. If there is a

good assessment of stocks, then there will be fairness in the fishery. There will also be an understanding by the players in that field that once the stocks are taken, then the fisheries should be closed.

This is not the way it is. The government is saying: "We are going to catch you, no matter what you do, whether the stocks are still there or whether the quota has been taken. If you come in that day over the limit, you have had it."

My time is almost up. I cannot say that I can support this bill. Given the opportunity, I will be voting against it. I think it shows policy that has no consultation with the industry, particularly the inshore. Again, the government is privatizing, using fines and penalties to overcome its ability to go out and consult with the people of Canada as to the viability of a natural resource, the fishery.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Ross Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Madam Speaker, as this is my first opportunity, now that the questions and comments are in place, I would like to assure my friends opposite that indeed I will speak in this debate. I look forward to being able to put forward the government's point of view and to be able to respond to some of the very good suggestions that my friend my Prince George—Bulkley Valley has made and as I am sure some others will.

I would like to comment very briefly on what our friend from South West Nova has just said. First, the premise that we must operate under is the people that will be paying penalties or fines under this act are only people who have broken the law of Canada, who have been charged and convicted. They are not the lion's share of my fishermen, and the fishermen whom I know, who do not break the law. They are so concerned about the management of the fishery that they, themselves, take into hand the law to preserve the fishery.

On the question of consultation, and I stand to be corrected, but I do not remember one witness, and I was there for every single one of them, who complained they had not been consulted. I should also point out that those witnesses said everything from, "throw the book at them" to "nail them to the cross" and that "what we needed was toughness". The way to address the question of equity between large and small was quite simply to take away their licence, an equal application.

I realize that time is there, but it is important to correct the record on a couple of points. I wish I had longer. I could certainly use it.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Deputy Speaker:** It being 5 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—BILLS

[*English*]

### MARRIAGE (PROHIBITED DEGREES) ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill S-14, an act respecting the laws prohibiting marriage between related persons, as reported (without amendment) from a legislative committee.

**Mr. Atkinson:** Madam Speaker, I would ask for unanimous consent that I be allowed to replace Mr. Nicholson for this particular bill.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Ken Atkinson (St. Catharines)** moved that the bill be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Atkinson** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

He said: Madam Speaker, I am pleased to make these remarks on third reading of this bill. The member for Niagara Falls has been looking after this bill through the House of Commons as he did with a similar bill in the 33rd Parliament. He cannot be here today. If I may I certainly would like to wish him and his wife well as they await the birth of their child. This is the reason I have replaced him here today, Madam Speaker.

This bill amends and clarifies the law in Canada prohibiting marriage between related persons. It reduces the number of prohibitions to two. They are brothers and sisters by whole or half-blood or by adoption, and lineal ascendants or descendants.

Today in Canada there are approximately 30 couples coming within the prohibited degree of relationship. As similar legislation has failed to pass in previous Parliaments when Parliament prorogued or dissolved, it is certainly my hope that you will find disposition in the House when the question is put that members would unanimously support this bill.

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak just a very few words to follow my hon. friend in connection with Bill S–14 which has come to the House of Commons after many years, approaching seven or eight years of attempts to create a bill which would improve the general law dealing with the prohibition of marriage for individuals who are related at various degrees.

My friend has mentioned that 30 or so couples are waiting pending a resolution of this bill in the House of Commons and in the Senate. It appears as though the many years of waiting have been worth it and we on this side of the House are pleased to acknowledge the work of the several individuals in the Senate and the House of Commons who have finally made this bill a reality and will firm up the federal government's jurisdiction in the field of marriage.

We are pleased to support this bill at third reading.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** 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.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I would like to seek unanimous consent of the House at this time, as I see that members are present, to call it six o'clock and to proceed with the adjournment motion.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

In accordance with Standing Order 38, a motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been moved.

### FOOD BANKS

**Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam):** Madam Speaker, on October 16, 1989, I rose in the House and put a question to the Minister of Finance on the matter of poverty. The question pointed out that the Vancouver food bank provides 3,200 bags of food weekly; Edmonton's food bank feeds 11,000 people each month; Regina's food bank provides 5,500 meals, and 6,000 boxes of food a month come from Regina's food bank; and Toronto's food bank feeds 84,000 people a week. A Montreal study shows that one in five kids are hungry in this country. Food banks in Canada are becoming institutionalized.

I asked the minister if he was planning to wait until food banks in Canada bar their doors to force this government to act or is the government going to provide adequate financial support for Canada's hungry.

The response was:

> —during the course of the last five years we have demonstrated—

We, meaning the government.

> —a very clear commitment to addressing the problems of those in lower income brackets.

The minister went on to say:

> Let me enumerate some of these matters.

He said, referring to the government again:

> We have increased the size of the child tax credit quite significantly from what it was in 1984. We were the first government to bring in the refundable sales tax credit. That sales tax credit has been increased on two occasions since its introduction in 1986.

He also went on to talk about:

> —changes that resulted in 850,000 low income Canadians being put in a position where they would not have to pay tax—

So, in each of these three areas he feels that the government has addressed the problems and the cause of poverty in this country.

That was on October 16, 1989. Today is December 11, 1990. When I rose last October and raised the question that we are discussing today, there were 906,000 unemployed in Canada. The unemployment rate was 6.7 per cent. Today, the latest figures show that there are 1,246,000 unemployed workers in Canada. The unemployment rate is 9.1 per cent. Since June some 200,000 more have been added to the unemployment lines.

Since the finance minister has finally acknowledged that we are in a recession, he has to address this question in a far more serious and meaningful way than to just say we have introduced tax credits that assist the poor.

First of all, many, many of the poor already are not in a bracket where they are required to pay taxes. This is a recession of the government's making. These figures that I have just given do not fully convey the depth and breadth of hardship faced by hundreds of thousands of Canadians. Too often we talk in terms of numbers. In this case, I will give one more number. In the last year 1.4 million Canadians have depended on food banks to survive. This 1.4 million people represent the fall-out of a made-in-Canada recession, the fall-out of unemployment, and the fall-out of poverty that is becoming deeper and deeper in this country.

We have to look at those families who are visiting the food banks.

• (1710 )

We have to look at what the dramatic and difficult realities are in their lives, the reality of going from a family that is in full productivity in terms of being part of the community, a family that has pride and dignity in work, that lives in a home and participates fully in the community, that becomes unemployed or under-employed and, in fact, finds itself living in a situation of poverty, that because of lost employment must move to another home, moves down in terms of the cost of living and in many cases loses their home. Such a family may indeed be in a position now—and many families who are not unemployed during this recession and have been living the recession throughout the period since I raised this question—of having to deny their children full participation even in the school system, in the kinds of things that their peers and classmates need to do, who are not allowed to participate in extracurricular school activities because of poverty. This makes a difference in a child's life. I guess the most important part is that the increase in demand in food banks is escalating and children in this country are hungry.

As we look forward to going home to join our families for the Christmas season, again we have hundreds of thousands of families in this country who cannot think in terms of Christmas but only getting through one more month until the cheque comes, who must go to a food bank to ensure that their children get the basic necessities. Yet, Canada is a signatory to the UN's commitment to the UN Children's Bill of Rights which states that children shall have a home, shelter, food and an education and, yes, even the right to play. Yet, in Canada 1.4 million Canadians are dependent on food banks to survive.

All estimates point to a dramatic increase in the demand for service and that demand has no place in a country like ours. Four more food banks have opened in Newfoundland. Food banks in Surrey are receiving 200 new applicants a month and a further 100 people a month are being turned away. In Toronto, food is being rationed because of the high demand. One hundred thousand people in metro depend on a food bank each month.

It is no longer acceptable for the minister to get up and tell Canadians that all these jobs have been created because people cannot live on incomes from McDonald's, Kentucky Fried Chicken or service industry jobs. People in Canada need decent paying jobs and they need full employment.

**Mrs. Pauline Browes (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State of Canada and Minister of State (Multiculturalism and Citizenship)):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member has asked if the government is going to provide adequate financial assistance for Canada's hungry. Her question shows quite clearly that she simply does not understand the programs that the government has done and is doing to help the disadvantaged in this country.

The hon. member should know that the federal government actually shares 50 per cent of the provincial expenditures on welfare under the Canada Assistance Plan. It is true that the government has proposed in the last budget that the three richer provinces of Alberta, British Columbia and Ontario be subject to the 5 per cent ceiling under CAP. However, the lower-income provinces are not subject to that ceiling. In those provinces the federal government matches dollar for dollar whatever the province spends.

Under our Constitution, the federal government cannot interfere in an area of provincial responsibility. Responsibility for setting welfare benefits at an adequate level rests with the provinces, and I therefore invite the hon. member to point her finger at the provinces, not at the federal government.

While provinces are responsible for the welfare system in this country, the federal government has indeed not shirked its duty in areas where it does have constitutional responsibility. The government has implemented a number of social initiatives to help those Canadians with low incomes.

One of the first things we did upon coming into office was to extend eligibility for spouses' allowance to all widows aged 60 to 64, and more than 50,000 low-income Canadians, many of them who are women, benefit from this provision.

We have taken steps, in collaboration with the provinces, to help social assistance recipients get off welfare. We are spending some $1.8 billion, as part of the Canadian Jobs Strategy to help people find jobs.

The government has also announced a new human services strategy to help Canadians take advantage of job opportunities. The government has implemented tax initiatives to help low income Canadians. The child tax credit has been increased. The federal sales tax credit was introduced. A new supplement to the credit has been introduced for pre-school children. The credit is now delivered twice a year, which we are very pleased about, and some 850,000 low income Canadians have been dropped from the tax rolls, as a result of tax reform.

The federal government has therefore already acted vigorously to meet the needs of low income Canadians, because Canada must be caring and compassionate to those who cannot help themselves. The federal government is quite prepared to do its fair share.

## IMMIGRATION

**Mr. Dan Heap (Trinity—Spadina):** Madam Speaker, on the previous occasion when I asked the minister why the Toronto backlog office had decided to bring Caribbean backlog claimants to the front of the line, although they were distinctly the last to come in, mostly just two years ago at the end of the backlog period, I was told that this was not happening.

Some of the evidence that this is happening was presented to some of us today at an informal meeting with some members of the Black Action committee. Some described their experiences as consultants accompanying a client and the client being asked: "Are you from Trinidad? Yes, okay, we will hear you. Are you from Jamaica? Yes, we will hear you. Are you from Iran? Yes, we will hear you another day". This was definitely sorting out people from the Caribbean as against people who had been here years longer.

In fact, in a meeting on September 9 with representatives of the bar association, Mr. Pirie, a senior official of the department of immigration in Ontario, was quite frank and said: "Yes, we have changed the rules three or four times, since the minister said first come first served. We are bringing in the Caribbeans first". Now the reason he gave was because they speak English and they do not need to take time for translation or to find translators.

Partly as a result of that, yes they have increased the rate at which they are reviewing the backlog cases, but they are still going to have to take up those Iranians or Sri Lankans or Salvadorans. It will take just as long to do these cases six months from now as if they took them in the proper order that the minister directed. The department is not speeding it up; it is only manipulating the statistics, in order to look as if it was being speeded up.

In fact, in the two months from the end of July to the end of September the number of cases that was reviewed increased by 20 per cent. For Iranians it was 5.7 per cent, for El Salvadorans it was 4.8 per cent and for Sri Lankans it was 3.6 per cent, all under 6 per cent, but for Trinidadians there was a 197 per cent increase in the number of cases they brought in and for Jamaicans there was a 35 per cent increase. Clearly, the program is not being run the way the minister directed it should be run, the way the minister has said it is being run, both in this House and when she came to meet with the Standing Committee on Labour, Employment and Immigration. This is a very serious matter.

There are three possible explanations as to why they are bringing the Caribbeans first. One is the given one which does not wash because, as I say, it will take them just as long to do them all together when they have done the Iranians and the others who cannot speak English.

• (1720 )

Another is that practically all those people are black skinned, more or less black; not white anyway. The minister finds it offensive to suggest that there could be a racial prejudice there. I find it offensive there is evidence of racial discrimination there.

Finally, in fact what Mr. Pirie said is that we are bringing the manifestly unfounded cases first. Contrary to law, Canadian law and the United Nations law, which says that each case will be judged individually if they have claimed refugee status, they are saying that all the Trinidadians are cheaters, all the Jamaicans are cheaters, and "we will whistle them through like that".

Seven Trinidadians have been found by the panel to have a credible basis. By the minister's rules they should be landed. Oh, no. No, the minister has appealed all seven of those Trinidadians cases found to have a credible basis and should be landed, according to the minister's rules.

In other words, the minister does not want it to appear that anybody in Trinidad has a credible basis or a credible claim to refugee status.

I can understand the minister does not have time to sit in hearings rooms and see what is going on. I understand that some of her Ottawa officials have, at best, very little time. But if the minister does not know what is happening in her city—she has a riding just north of me, St. Paul's riding—there are people she can ask, such as reputable lawyers in private practice, some of whom have appeared successfully at the Supreme Court.

This government lauds private enterprise for privatizing all kinds of public industries because private enterprise, according to this government, is the way to go. They regularly condemn lawyers in private enterprise who represent refugee claimants. Most of these refugee claimants have very little money. No lawyer is going to be a millionaire by representing refugees.

Only in refugee law does the government—and I have heard this more than once from officials, from the ministers and from the chairman of the Immigration and Refugee Board—constantly blame private lawyers for slowing down the process. They constantly overlook the adjournments caused because the department has not brought the translator or the case presenting officer or the adjudicator, or does not have a board room for them to meet in.

There are all kinds of delays. It is about half called by the representative of the department and half called, according to their figures, by the representative of the client. Yet the minister and others only talk about the one side. They are too defensive in trying to defend the indefensible. They had better admit the truth of what is going on, even if it is not what the minister directed.

**Mr. Bill Kempling (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Madam Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to expand upon the reply given by the hon. Minister of Employment and Immigration to the hon. member for Trinity—Spadina on October 30.

We met earlier this afternoon. In fact we rushed from the meeting here. We probably could have exchanged papers there and saved some time here.

First of all, processing of backlog claims has not been specifically directed toward those from the Caribbean. The ordering principle for processing backlog cases has generally been to deal with the oldest cases first.

As the hon. member knows, claimants from the Caribbean countries form a large part of the backlog population. The time has now come, as everyone knew it would, to process those claimants. Any suggestion that this or any other group has been singled out for special attention is simply wrong.

Although the backlog clearance program was slow to start, in recent months the processing rate has improved considerably. As of October 26, 54 per cent of the backlog of 85,000 cases has been opened and 31 per cent has been decided.

Furthermore, the Toronto backlog office is attempting to maximize operational efficiency by scheduling panel hearings according to language, interpreter availability being considered, background and any other relevant factors.

However, other backlog processing activities continue in the meantime, as does regular immigration program delivery.

It should be noted that backlog processing activities are resourced and staffed separately from the regular immigration process activities. These are temporary resources allocated specifically to deal with the backlog.

To those who want an amnesty or an administrative review, we say that neither is a solution. Canadian experience and that of other countries has demonstrated that such measures simply do not work.

With respect to the new refugee determination system, Bill C–55 is in fact working quite well. Three of the major goals of the new legislation were to reduce the amount of time that it took to render a decision, to render fair and consistent decisions, and to reduce—if not stop—the flow of manifestly unfounded claimants. All of these goals have, to a large extent, been accomplished. There have not been any large scale movements of manifestly unfounded claimants such as was seen with the old system.

There has been some difficulty in moving to maximum efficiency, but this is normal for a new and very complex law. In the first nine months of 1990, 27 per cent more cases were opened than in all of 1989, and 20 per cent more cases were terminated than over the same period the previous year.

While there has been an unfortunate build–up of cases in the system, it must be remembered that cases are being decided in a number of months rather than a number of years, as was the situation under the old system.

The refugee determination system has seen the intake of new claimants almost double in the second year of its operation. Given the results to date, it is apparent that the system is coping quite well with what is coming before it.

The Auditor General has recently proposed a number of changes, and many had already been acted upon. For example, when the Auditor General suggested that steps be taken to reduce the number of adjournments and improve the scheduling of hearings, the department sent out in August, 1990 detailed directives outlining a modified approach which reduces the number of adjournments, and increases the efficiency and effectiveness of scheduling. In December, scheduling supervisors met to analyze the progress in scheduling and to work out improved procedures to reduce the number of adjournments.

The Auditor General proposed that the first hearing process for cases not contested by the Minister of Employment and Immigration be streamlined. Employment and Immigration undertook two pilot projects in Vancouver and Niagara Falls. It evaluated and simplified the inquiry process, in which all cases conceded that first level hearings would be dealt with by means of a paper process only. Following these pilots, Employment and Immigration moved to implement the process nationally. This is being done right now.

Finally, the Auditor General stated that Employment and Immigration should consider having medical examinations and security and criminality checks conducted promptly following the time a person claims refugee status, given the high percentage of acceptance experienced to date. Procedures are in place to conduct criminal checks on persons arriving at ports of entry whose identity is in doubt. Efforts will be made to speed up medical and security checks.

## HAMILTON HARBOUR COMMISSION

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West):** Madam Speaker, to follow up on numerous earlier questions to the Minister of Transport, I would like to take this opportunity to reflect on the conduct of Burlington realtor, Peter Lush, in his conflicting roles as Chairman of the Hamilton Harbour Commission and agent for the vendor of pieces of property the Hamilton Harbour Commission was interested in purchasing. Most importantly, I would like to summarize the government's actions which perpetuated the conflict.

Realtor Peter Lush, who resigned his position with the Harbour Commission on October 2 of this year, was initially appointed to the Hamilton Harbour Commission in December of 1986, and subsequently re–appointed in 1989 by Orders in Council.

It was widely known that Mr. Lush had several close friends in cabinet, such as the Conservative member for Lincoln, who, it is reported, encouraged and supported Mr. Lush into becoming chairman.

It is also known that, at the time of his appointment to the Harbour Commission, Mr. Lush declared that he would not have become a harbour commissioner if it meant giving up his real estate listings with J.I. Case that

the Harbour Commission was interested in purchasing. However, the appointment was made anyway, despite the conflict of interest that would have been glaringly apparent to all in 1986 when the present Deputy Prime Minister, in his capacity then as Minister of Transport, made the appointment. Mr. Lush had to swear an oath in relation to the Hamilton Harbour Commission's policy guidelines. The objective of the guidelines are clear:

> The object of this policy is to conserve and enhance public confidence in the integrity of the Hamilton Harbour Commissioners by establishing clear rules of conduct respecting conflict of interest and to minimize the possibility of conflicts arising between private interests and the public duties conferred upon commissioners."

• (1730)

Not only were sections of the policy breached by Mr. Lush, but the objectives stated above were not even considered by Mr. Lush until three years after his appointment, and only then because the matter was raised in this House. However, his business associations in connection with the harbour commission should have been dropped at the outset of his appointment, as is prescribed in the conflict guidelines. Guideline (d) provides that: "On appointment to office, Commissioners shall arrange their private affairs in a manner that will prevent real, potential or apparent conflicts of interest from arising." In short, Mr. Lush should have either given up those listings that the harbour commission was interested in and for which he was the broker, or Mr. Lush should not have accepted the appointment in the first place.

The law firm engaged to report on the conduct of Mr. Lush, commissioned by this government, reported to the minister in connection to this very point:

> In order to comply with guideline (d), Mr. Lush had an obligation to arrange to have Lush Realty Corp. cease acting as the vendor's agent for J.I. Case, in its dealings with the Hamilton Harbour Commissioners as soon as he took office as a commissioner in January, 1987, and not over three years later on March 13, 1990. Mr. Lush did not, by simply declaring his interest and abstaining from decisions, avoid or withdraw from the situation that was giving rise to the conflict. By continuing to have his company act as agent for J.I. Case, he was in a position of constant and continuing conflict.

Mr. Lush advised the Minister of Transport on March 13, 1990 of his decision to dissociate his group of companies with J.I. Case lands in Hamilton, which he should have done much sooner. However, evidence has shown that Mr. Lush did not sever those ties. Notwithstanding, it was convenient for him to declare a dissociation because the final deal on the $10 million property in question was made on March 9, 1990, just four days earlier.

During those crucial days, I drew to the attention of the Minister of Transport that Mr. Lush was in a continuing conflict of interest in his capacity as Chairman of the Hamilton Harbour Commission. The minister merely challenged me to make my allegations outside of this House, which I eventually did, but he did not address the substance of my concerns. The minister said that there was an allegation made at an earlier time, which was vetted by the counsel for the Hamilton Harbour Commission.

I would like to know how two so diametrically opposed and dissimilar reports could have been issued with regard to the affairs of Peter Lush. The first report into the affairs of Mr. Lush came as a result of one of the commissioners requesting the commission's lawyers to give an opinion as to Mr. Lush's position.

The law firm noted that Mr. Lush was in a conflict of interest, but that he had declared so and refrained from decisions with respect to the properties as a commissioner. The firm also noted that with respect to section (j) of the policy guidelines, that "a commissioner should not —enter directly or indirectly into a transaction of a pecuniary nature either with himself or any other member of the commission", and that, "purchase of land by the commission was not a transaction of a pecuniary nature with Mr. Lush, either directly, or indirectly. The transaction is with J.I. Case, and while Mr. Lush will clearly benefit from the purchase, he is not a party either directly or indirectly to the purchase of the land."

Subsequently, after I asked numerous questions in the House last March, the harbour commission again consulted its lawyers in regards to those accusations and was given the same opinion.

The most recent legal opinion of November 5, 1990, goes completely contrary to the advice given to the harbour commission in 1989. The law firm which the Minister of Transport commissioned set out the conflict in precise terms:

> There can be no question that in the negotiations for the sale of lands, the interests of J.I. Case, represented by Lush Reality Corp., were in conflict with those of the Hamilton Harbour Commissioners. J.I. Case naturally wished to sell its lands at the highest prices and on terms most favourable to it. The Hamilton Harbour Commissioner, on the other hand, wanted to buy the lands at the lowest possible prices and on the terms most advantageous to them.

That is the crux of the problem, Madam Speaker. To whom does Mr. Lush owe a greater allegiance? To whom shall he act in the best interests?

Obviously, that was a dilemma of which Mr. Lush did not rid himself, and when I pointed it out to the Minister of Transport, he scoffed. The minister should have known, as a lawyer and former Attorney General of Canada, that it was impossible for Mr. Lush to carry out his public duty when, on the one hand, he stood to gain financially by his position and, on the other hand, he could not have acted in the best interests of the Hamilton Harbour Commission.

The law firm concluded on this point:

> —the commissions to be paid to Lush Realty Corp—were to be a percentage of the ultimate purchasing prices. It was, therefore, in the interests of Mr. Lush to reach agreements for the sale of the lands at the highest possible prices. This put his personal interests—in direct conflict with the interests of the Hamilton Harbour Commissioners.

I submit in conclusion, Madam Speaker, that first and foremost the government and the Minister of Transport are responsible for their actions as the appointees, whether they like it or not. The government must make every effort to reclaim over half a million dollars paid to Mr. Lush since those moneys were ill-gained.

Second, I conclude by saying that there must be a better way to ensure that this type of activity does not happen again, including remedies for wrongdoing that result in the termination of the appointment, and if the wrongdoing involves monetary gain that the moneys must be reclaimed.

Finally, if a request is made by a public body to their counsel requesting an opinion as to a conflict of interest by any of their officers, that the opinion be submitted to the Governor in Council for a second reference to ensure government and ministerial accountability.

**Mr. Ross Belsher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Madam Speaker, I would like to say for the record that this government, under the leadership of the Prime Minister, in September, 1985 brought in the most comprehensive conflict of interest and post-employment code for public office holders ever brought forward by any Canadian government. The aim of that code was to ensure that public office holders conform to a number of principles that would ensure the integrity, objectivity, and impartiality of government agencies.

As with any new ground-breaking initiative of this nature, the process and application were put forth without complete benefit of past experience.

As we all know, with the benefit of hindsight our decisions would be a lot easier to make. However, with some experience in the field now, we have a greater understanding of the inherent difficulties that are encountered in the day-to-day application of the conflict of interest guidelines. The guidelines are meant to provide a balance between the need to enlist the assistance of competent and experienced appointees to government agencies and the need for those agencies to live up to the highest standard of public scrutiny.

If the criteria were to be so stringent as to exclude anyone with outside business interests, you would agree that we would be hard-pressed to find qualified individuals to sit on many government agencies, boards and commissions.

When Mr. Lush was reappointed on December 16, 1989 to the Hamilton Harbour Commission, all parties were aware of his business interests. During the time of negotiations for the purchase of the parcel of land from J. I. Case by the Hamilton Harbour Commissioners, Mr. Lush declared his conflict of interest in accordance with the commission's conflict of interest guidelines and was not a party to the ratification of the purchase and was absent from all commission discussions pertaining to the transaction.

Notwithstanding previous legal opinions which stated that there was no conflict, when the minister became aware of the situation in March, 1990, as the hon. member opposite has alluded to, he immediately moved to ensure a severance of Mr. Lush's interests in the land dealings and was assured this had happened.

The hon. member opposite professed himself to be satisfied with the action taken.

**Mr. Keyes:** I believed it.

**Mr. Belsher:** When the issue was raised again in October and the minister became aware that there may not have been total severance, he requested and received the resignation of the Chairman of the Hamilton Harbour Commission, Mr. Peter Lush.

With respect to the question raised by the hon. member, the minister gave his word to this House that a thorough and impartial review of the facts would be carried out, and he kept his promise. The law firm that conducted the review submitted its report and in accordance with the commitment made to this House by the minister, the report was made available to the public. In addition, the minister has written to the heads of all federal agencies that report to him and asked them to review the opinion of the independent law firm and to bring it to the attention of all persons subject to the conflict of interest guidelines in their respective agencies.

Furthermore, the Harbour Commissions have also been instructed to seek the guidance and advice of the Assistant Deputy Registrar General when ambiguous situations render the interpretation and application of the guidelines difficult. In view of all the above, the government now considers this matter closed.

[*Translation*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** 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 5.41 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Wednesday, December 12, 1990**

The House met at 2 p.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*English*]

### NATIVE LAND CLAIMS

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk):** Mr. Speaker, our system holds that justice delayed is justice denied.

Justice is being denied to native Canadians who have filed some 580 specific claims with the federal government. In Ontario alone, there are currently 94 outstanding specific land claims. Since 1985, only four Ontario claims have been fully processed.

The Six Nations of the Grand River Indians in my riding of Haldimand—Norfolk currently have 17 specific claims in the system. They are experiencing in excess of a seven-year waiting period in having each claim addressed.

This government's native claims policy is a failure. It operates contrary to the needs of all parties involved. The people of the Six Nations have waited long enough. Some of their claims are well over 100 years old.

I call upon the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to make a serious attempt to settle these land claims, and I call upon this government to summon the political will necessary to address these land claims with justice and with efficiency.

* * *

[*Translation*]

### VIETNAM

**Mr. Fernand Jourdenais (La Prairie):** Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of informing the House that for the first time in 45 years, a senior member of the Communist Vietnamese government has called for a new, democratically elected National Assembly and a government of national reconstruction, headed by people who are capable, people of integrity. The Vietnamese government in exile is represented here today by Hoang Viet Cuong, president of the coalition of democratic Vietnamese political parties for the liberation of their country. Canada should be proud it is able to participate in the emancipation of a country that, like countries in eastern Europe, will at last be able to look forward to democratic renewal and the liberation of its people from oppression.

Speaking on behalf of all Canadians, we hope that our friends will succeed in their mission and that, with their members and the other political parties in Vietnam, we shall see this democratic election materialize.

Mr. Speaker, speaking on my own behalf, I wish Hoang Viet Cuong the very best and I hope a democratic election will be called as soon as possible for a free and independent Vietnam, so that all Vietnamese refugees throughout the world will finally be able to go back to a free country. We, in Canada, will be proud to have been able to contribute to the emancipation of a people.

* * *

[*English*]

### HEALTH CARE

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Mr. Speaker, members of this House know that medicare is under attack.

In this latest report issued yesterday, the National Council on Welfare asks—it almost begs—that the federal government strengthen the presence and financial support for medicare. Instead, the federal contribution is now below 40 per cent, and will continue to drop further as the Wilson budgets take hold.

How have we reached this medicare crisis? Through the Liberal bloc funding arrangements of 1977, through the Liberal's six and five program of 1982 and through the continued cuts of the present Minister of Finance.

Now, Conservative and Liberal provincial governments, led by the Liberal government of Quebec, want to destroy medicare through the introduction of user fees and extra billing. The federal NDP has rejected the dismantling of medicare. So has the Ontario NDP government, and so have the four western NDP leaders which issued a statement yesterday in Saskatoon. Only the New Democrats will protect medicare for all Canadians.

* * *

## AIR CANADA

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Once again Atlantic Canada has borne the brunt of another one of this government's disastrous, ill-conceived private sector mania policies. Just a week ago over 140 Air Canada employees in the Atlantic region found that their jobs were disappearing as the Atlantic reservations office was being relocated to central Canada.

With no consultation, these jobs and over $5 million were sucked out of the Atlantic economy. Remember, Air Canada used to be Canada's national airline with a mandate to serve every region in this country, a mandate that was destroyed when this Tory government insisted on delivering it into the hands of private enterprise. At that time it was the Liberals who predicted that this very thing would happen and it is now the Liberals who will fight with the Atlantic employees of Air Canada against this ill-conceived centralization of this once great airline.

We serve notice to Air Canada head office that we will fight these cuts with all means at our disposal. We remind them that they are not the only player in the field, that Atlantic travellers do have an option. If Air Canada refuses to alter this decision, members of the Liberal caucus will urge our travelling public to exercise that option.

## CANADA'S GREEN PLAN

**Mr. Stan Wilbee (Delta):** Mr. Speaker, when Simon Fraser and his voyageurs first navigated the Fraser River almost 200 years ago, they could dip a wooden ladle into the river whenever they felt thirsty. Along many stretches of that same river today one would be loath to put their hand in the water, much less drink it.

The government's commitment to clean up the Fraser River as part of the green plan is a welcome announcement to the citizens of British Columbia. The Fraser River Basin Action Plan combined with new regulations to restrict pulp and paper mill effluent and initiatives to double the fish population in the river will help to reverse the damage that has been done over the years.

It will be a long time before we can take a drink directly from the Fraser and it will take a lot of hard work, but I am confident that by working together the federal and provincial governments, communities, industry, and individuals can clean up our past mistakes to restore the mighty Fraser.

* * *

## IMMIGRATION

**Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint-Léonard):** Mr. Speaker, for many Canadians this will be yet another Christmas without their spouses and families.

**Ms. Copps:** Shame.

**Mr. Gagliano:** I would like to read a letter to this House which is addressed to the minister of immigration:

> I am writing this application in absolute desperation and frustration over the way the department has been handling my wife's visa application. I got married to my wife—on January 29, 1989. On my return to Canada I asked for an appointment to file an application. Application was filed on April 24, 1989.
>
> Since then another 20 months have passed and she is still awaiting for a visa. You may kindly note that she didn't get any appointment yet for an interview or a medical. Repeated inquiry bore no results. At a pace this case is being handled it looks like this visa is going to take another few years before I can be united with my wife. Long separation is already taking its toll and only I know, before I have a total nervous breakdown. Since no one seems to care in your esteemed organization I am writing for your help to obtain a visa for my wife to be with me doesn't matter what type—

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member's time has expired.

[*Translation*]

## SEXIST PUBLICITY

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert):** Mr. Speaker, on December 6, Hallmark announced it was withdrawing one of its greeting cards whose message ended with: If you see her, shoot to kill. Two years after the card was released, Hallmark realized that although the card was meant to be humourous, it was in fact a pretty sad commentary.

Mr. Speaker, Hallmark's decision to withdraw this card from the market shows that attitudes are starting to change and that there is no more room for products that denigrate women. Although I want to congratulate Hallmark on this decision, one wonders why the company overlooked this text during all that time.

* * *

• (1410)

## FUTURE OF QUEBEC

**Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil):** Mr. Speaker, on Monday, December 10, I had the privilege of receiving more than 400 guests at my fundraising supper in Longueuil. It was the most important political event since my election in 1984. People from all parts of the community—business, professionals, the arts—came to support my work and my efforts to promote Quebec's political autonomy and prosperity. I want to take this opportunity to thank them publicly here in the House for demonstrating their confidence in me and in Quebec's future.

* * *

## AIR TRANSPORT

**Mr. Vincent Della Noce (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, the global situation as a result of the events in the Persian Gulf is a boon for some and a disaster for many others. On a $359 plane ticket, a $112 fuel surcharge is added to the price. Today, I wish to express my disapproval of the fuel surcharges imposed by large carriers like Nationair, Canadian International and Intair, who have just filed a third application with the National Transportation Agency for permission to charge travellers an additional $30 to $50. The National Transportation Agency, which is now screening the carriers' third surcharge application, should simply say no.

Mr. Speaker, these are the same companies who in 1986, when we had a price drop of 11 cents per litre, remained suspiciously silent. I condemn their behaviour and I repeat: You are a bunch of profiteers with no respect for your travelling customers.

* * *

[*English*]

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair):** Mr. Speaker, few in this country have a stronger sense of their Canadian identity than those of us who live in Windsor.

For us, it is a constant struggle to preserve our identity in the face of the omnipresent and powerful American influence. Thus, we cling fiercely to the symbols, institutions and values that make us uniquely Canadian because we know that to lose them would be to lose the Canada we love.

But we are losing them, all because of a government which believes the American way is better than the Canadian way. Now it is the CBC, the medium of our community and our connection to the rest of the country, which has been taken from us. It is another nail in the coffin of Canada. We are doomed to become a mere suburb of Detroit and no one seems to care. But we care.

On Sunday, at 4.30 p.m., we, the Canadians of Windsor, will demonstrate how much we do care. We ask the Prime Minister to join us and tell us why the Canada that we love is not his Canada. We will ask him to restore the vision of Canada that most Canadians share, or resign, so that we can have our country back.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## MEMBERS' STAFF

**Mr. Jean-Marc Robitaille (Terrebonne):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to stress the dedication of those men and women without whom my work as a member and that of all my colleagues in this House could not be accomplished. I am, of course, referring to my assistants on the Hill and in my riding and to the political staff of all members of this House. Mr. Speaker, their support and hard work, whether they are managing files or

dealing with special problems and God knows there are plenty have made me proud to represent my riding, and I am sure this applies to all of us.

Our assistants work long hours and are a credit to us, both in our ridings and in Ottawa. I know my fellow members will agree they earn every penny of their modest salary, considering their responsibilities and dedication.

Today, I would like to express my gratitude and say that I am proud to be able to count on their competence and dedication. On behalf of all my colleagues, I wish them the very best during the holiday season.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

[*English*]

### NORTHERN BENEFITS

**Mr. Réginald Bélair (Cochrane—Superior):** Mr. Speaker, last week the member for Abitibi indicated to this House that he was going back to his riding with good news on the new tax benefit plan for northern and isolated areas.

I am unable to say the same thing. Thirty-six communities in my riding of Cochrane—Superior will lose the northern tax allowance in 1995 as a result of the decision of the Minister of Finance, who is also prolonging the injustice that he created in 1988.

The towns of Longlac and Geraldton are side by side. Longlac receives the benefit but Geraldton does not, yet Geraldton is as isolated as Longlac. The same situation occurs with Marathon and White River, Kapuskasing and Valrita, Hearst and Mattice.

These towns share the same lack of services, the same high transportation and fuel costs, the same inclement weather. I would have preferred, by far, seeing all of northern Ontario qualify for the tax benefit. This would have been fair for everyone.

[*Translation*]

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Clément Couture (Saint-Jean):** A little over two years ago, Mr. Speaker, our government introduced legislation on drug patents, Bill C-22. It was stalled in the Senate for several months on the pretense that the drug manufacturing industry would not feel compelled to increase its research and development budget, and that drugs prices would quadruple.

Mr. Speaker, research and development expenditures in that sector have almost doubled since 1986 and, at worst, drug prices have only kept pace with the rate of increase in the cost of living. We knew we were on the right track with Bill C-22, just as we know we are on the right track with the GST. The senators must end their charades and unwarranted efforts and pass the GST legislation.

---

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

### CANADA'S GREEN PLAN

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment.

Just about every environmentalist has attacked the government's green plan as being nothing more than empty rhetoric. Even its so-called action plans and targets are in most cases nothing more than vague generalities.

For example, if we look at goal 1, clean air, water and land, it speaks when it comes to a target of protection and enhancement of the quality of our water resources. Not one word about specific dates for action, not one word about specific legislation, not one word about specific funding.

Isn't it a fact that the minister's green plan is looking to most Canadians more and more like nothing else but a green scam, and that is all?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, first of all it appears that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has recycled his question from yesterday. I commend him on that, because they were not very good yesterday.

I would like to quote a few environmentalists on the green plan. I would like to start with Mrs. Janine Ferretti, Executive Director of Pollution Probe in Toronto, who says: "The green plan is a worth-while effort moving Canadian society in a more environmentally responsible direction. All in all, we are further ahead today than yesterday."

**Mr. Fontana:** How much?

**Mr. de Cotret:** Quite a bit.

My hon. colleagues opposite should read the green plan and acquaint themselves with the 120 specific recommendations that we made.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, last night on national television, the minister said that he was going to sign a Great Lakes program with the United States before Christmas but gave no further information.

Will this plan include funding from the federal government for cities along the Great Lakes, like Windsor, Ontario, to upgrade their sewage and water facilities? Doesn't the minister realize that if this program does not include such funding, the program will be nothing more than an empty shell, no better than his already discredited green plan, or should I say again green scam?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I did say that we were getting very close to an agreement with the U.S. on cleaning up the Great Lakes. It is a very important project.

One has to understand that when we talk about the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence River and the tributaries to both, we are talking about a whole ecosystem. We want to clean that up. We have been negotiating with the U.S. At our insistence, as was the case following our Prime Minister's insistence on an acid rain agreement, we are very close to reaching it. I firmly believe that agreement can be signed before Christmas.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the minister very carefully avoided answering my direct question as to whether that plan will contain funding to help cities along the Great Lakes to upgrade their sewage and water facilities. I think people will note the specific absence of a direct answer.

• (1420)

[*Translation*]

Again I have a question for the minister concerning his green plan. Experts have been saying that the minister's green plan should be referred to as the "vague plan" or the "empty plan". In his green plan, why is there no specific date as to when these new goals will be implemented? Why no specific information?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about a green plan involving an injection of $3 billion in new federal funds, when we are talking about a green plan whose eight chapters contain 120 new recommendations designed to come to grips with our environmental problems—remember that for years on end the previous government contributed to the problem rather than to the solution—I would suggest that such a plan would indeed rally the enthusiastic support of all Canadians. That is the plan which Canadians have asked for when we consulted them. The plan meets our environmental requirements for the next five years, it will still be in force long after that, and it provides us with the assurance that a clean and safe environment will be our legacy to our children and grandchildren.

**Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard):** Just a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, I was in a meeting with the major environment groups that came here to fade some of the green off this plan. These people were very specific, as my notes indicate: no implementation program, no precise timetable, no funds committed. It is already being described as a public relations document. The minister will disagree, of course, but the proof rests with him.

We are two weeks away from the beginning of 1991. If the minister is ready to make his move, would he tell us just what he has in mind for next year? And my question is this, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister now in a position to table a definite and specific plan of action for 1991 to prove that he is serious, to show us that he knows what he wants to do?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I did have the impression that my colleague had read the document I tabled yesterday. There is no need for me to table another one today. The detailed timetable for 1991 is in the document. The timetable for 1992 is in the document. The timetable for 1993—and

1994 and 1995—is in the document. And the funds authorized by this government, by the Cabinet of this government, are also shown in the green plan. I strongly urge my colleague to read it because I think that would enable him to learn quite a few things.

[*English*]

**Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard):** Mr. Speaker, I read it. So did every leading environmentalist. If the minister thinks that 1991 is in here, then he has not read it himself. The only part of this document which is fully funded is the public relations part. Nothing else.

If the government wanted to know what a decent green plan might have looked like, then it could take a look at what they did in the Netherlands. It could take a look at Canadian green print. It could take a look at the Water Quality Act. There is a great deal in there.

I am asking the minister a simple question. Will he stand here today and give us the precise plan, the funding and the schedule for 1991? If he cannot do that, then why should anybody believe that he knows what he is going to do over the next five years?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, after decades of neglect of the environment by the former government, we have come in with a total comprehensive plan that is time targeted, a plan that is costed, a plan that is funded, a plan that will move us over the next five years toward a healthier, cleaner and safer environment. That is what the green plan is all about.

The green plan proposes some very specific measures, very specific money. The green plan, with the help of all Canadians, will be the road map to get ourselves out of the kind of environmental difficulties that the former government never cared to bother about.

* * *

## HEALTH CARE

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

This government is taking this country apart piece by piece: first, VIA Rail, the CBC, rural post offices, and now Canada's medicare system is in danger of crumbling and falling apart. These are the institutions that are at the heart of Canada. They are the institutions that represent Canadians' commitment to one another.

In the interests of the nation, will the Prime Minister state today that universal medicare is part of Canada, that it is a right of all Canadians, no matter where they live, no matter how much their income is?

Will the Prime Minister commit today that national universal medicare will not be frittered away by this government as has every other program of trust? We are losing trust in this government. Will the Prime Minister stand up for Canada?

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may have missed it, but this question was asked several times over the course of the past seven days. In every single instance what the government did was to indicate its full commitment to medicare. We will this year be transferring to the provinces some $14 billion. That is evidence of good faith in terms of maintenance of the national health care system.

Our determination is to ensure that the principles that underscore Canada's medicare system are maintained and that our system remains one of the best in the world.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** I have a supplementary question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare, Mr. Speaker.

What has this government done to show Canadians any trust in its programs? First of all, the minister knows that this federal government has reduced funding to health care in Canada. In the last 13 years, by Liberal governments and by Tory governments, funding has been reduced from 50 per cent to 40 per cent. This minister knows that in 1997 Ontario and Quebec will not receive any federal funding.

Will the minister show real commitment today and state that he will reinstate the 50/50 funding with the provinces? Will he state that today to show that this government has some real faith in the future of national medicare?

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member indicates is simply that she does not understand the way in which the system is working. The hon. member should be aware of the fact, first of all, that it was not this government which brought in EPF. It was the Liberal government back in 1977 that moved away from 50/50 cost sharing to

block transfers to respect the role of the provinces in terms of the delivery of health care services in Canada.

Additionally, it is simply false to suggest that federal contributions to medicare will end. This year alone the federal contribution to medicare both through tax points and through cash transfers amounts to some $14 billion. Mr. Speaker, $14 billion to a socialist does not represent much money, but to the people of Canada, the taxpayers of Canada and the users of Canada's health care system, $14 billion is a very substantial amount of money.

Third, the hon. member says that we are reducing money going to the provinces. That again is false. The amount of money transferred to the provinces this year increased over last year. What we have done is to put a freeze on per capita contributions, but in each province the total contributions continue to increase. Nationally, the federal contribution to health care in Canada continues to increase year after year.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

The minister knows and the Prime Minister knows that there are provincial ministers who are now saying that they would like to get rid of the Canada Health Act. I have seen nothing that this government has done to counter those statements, to say that it is going to stand up for national medicare.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, this government like the Liberals before them is not lifting a finger to stop the erosion of a sacred institution in Canada: our Medicare Program. Will the minister finally do what he ought to do and write to the health ministers of each province and territory today to tell them that a universal medical insurance program is a right for every Canadian, no matter what their income is?

[*English*]

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think the right to a universal health care system is something that needs to be conveyed privately by me to somebody. It is something which has been stated here on the floor of House of Commons of Canada publicly. The commitment that this government has made repeatedly on medicare speaks for itself.

Now what we hear from the hon. member is that some provincial ministers from some provincial governments would like to collapse Canada's medicare system. The response of the federal government has been clear and unequivocal. The answer is no.

• (1430)

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. The National Council of Welfare informs us that, in Canada, the poor die younger than the rich and have eleven years less of good health than higher income earners. The government recognized that such a difference existed between rich and poor. That was three years ago. Will the minister tell us now why the Council says this government did nothing to improve the health of our poor?

[*English*]

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, it is quite wrong to say that this government has done nothing to improve the health of all Canadians. What we have seen in indices, in terms of the health and longevity of Canadians, is that Canadians are living longer and are healthier than ever before in the history of this country.

We continue to be concerned about the discrepancy between those people who are poor and those Canadians who are wealthier. We continue, through a range of programs, to try to address the problems of those Canadians who are poor and we will continue to do so. One of the things that the report of the National Council on Welfare highlights is that there is a whole range of factors including the health care system, and a range of social and other factors as well, that have an impact upon the health of Canadians. We are determined to do everything that we can, in conjunction with our partners, the provinces, and with those in the private sector as well, to improve the health of all Canadians.

**Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East):** Mr. Speaker, true to form, the minister must think he is running the department of corporate health. The same report, I might add, written by the government's own council, declares that babies born to poor Canadians are twice as

likely to die before their first birthday than those born into more privileged homes.

As the minister knows, one of the cures for child poverty recommended by the council, the government's own council, is a national child care program. Quite simply, why does the minister continue to deprive working parents and why is he postponing action on child poverty until the next election?

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has a practice of asking questions which are virtually impenetrable or of making comments which are hard for any reasonable person to follow. What suggestion she proposes to make about corporate Canada and what relevance that has to the issue she raises remains to be seen.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. member about child care. Since we came to office, this government has substantially increased the amount of money spent on child care in Canada, well above the level that was provided by the Liberals. Indeed, contributions under CAP have been increasing at the rate of about 20 per cent per annum. At the present time, we are spending about $1 billion on child care.

When members of the opposition, particularly the Liberal Party, talk about the need for child care, let them never forget that it was the Liberal senators who prevented Canada from having a child care program today.

* * *

## CANADA'S GREEN PLAN

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Mr. Speaker, every summer, when the atmospheric temperature reaches 26 degrees centigrade and higher, the children of my riding of Parkdale—High Park flock to the Sunnyside beaches on Lake Ontario to swim, only to find that the waters are polluted with sewage and other pollutants.

Can the minister guarantee the children of Parkdale—High Park and all the children living along the beaches of Lake Ontario that the green plan will make the beaches of Lake Ontario swimmable this summer? Because if he cannot, how can the government call this report, *Canada's Green Plan for a Healthy Environment*?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I believe it is quite clear in the green plan that one of our goals is to make sure that our water, as well as our air and our land, is clear and healthy for Canadians. I mentioned in answer to a question from the hon. Leader of the Opposition a few minutes ago that I was very much hoping that we would be in a position to sign an accord with the U.S. to move forward on the de-pollution of the Great Lakes system and essentially, at that point, be able to have an approach for the whole ecosystem of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River.

Yes, we are moving ahead; yes, we are committed; yes, the money is there and yes, the agreement is forthcoming.

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the same minister. Destruction of rain forests, ocean pollution, emissions of $CO_2$ and CFCs contribute to global environmental destruction. The green plan does not set specific objectives to address global environmental issues.

Why does this so-called comprehensive green plan not demand that our publicly funded Export Development Corporation produce environmental assessments before dispersing or leveraging project funds which may have other environmental consequences?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer my hon. colleague opposite to pages 97 to 128 of the green plan where we do, in fact, address the questions of global warming and emissions of greenhouse gases.

Yes, this government has made commitments internationally on CFCs, and we have made commitments internationally on $CO_2$. Those are very clear.

We are going to phase out CFCs totally by the year 1997, well ahead of most industrialized countries. We are going to stabilize $CO_2$ emissions by the year 2000 at 1990 levels. We are committed to further steps. We are committed to helping the LDCs in terms of research so that they can be at the table and this agreement can be a meaningful international agreement.

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of the Environment.

The green plan establishes as Conservative federal policy the right of corporations to pollute Canada's fresh and salt water and rejects the right of Canadian citizens to have unpolluted fish to eat, to have unpolluted water to drink and to have unpolluted beaches for swimming.

Would the minister explain to this House why he chose to agree in cabinet with the minister responsible for privatization and tore up the chapter on water rights when the green plan was before cabinet?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to underline for my hon. colleague that there was no chapter torn up in any way, shape or form.

We are dedicated to moving towards a healthy environment. I would like to say that there are some rather potent tools to do that if we do not get the co-operation that I believe we will. I would like to remind my colleague that under some legislation I believe he supported, that should we not, there are fines of $1 million a day for somebody who goes against the environmental regulations that we have in place.

There are potential penalties in terms of jail sentences of five years per infraction. That will ensure, if everything else fails, that we will go ahead and ensure a healthy environment for all Canadians.

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the same minister.

I am sure he is aware that he is required, by law, to report annually on the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. He is in violation of the law right now while he sits here in this Chamber. He has not got a job.

However, my supplementary is for the Prime Minister who solemnly signed a treaty with the United States with his friend, President Reagan, three years ago regarding Great Lakes water quality which called for and required zero discharge of toxics into the Great Lakes.

The quality of the Great Lakes has continued to decline from the discharge of toxics from both sides. Will the Prime Minister tell this House and Canadians when the principle of zero discharge will be extended to all Canadian waters, and when will it be enforced even in the Great Lakes?

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Minister of the Environment has already responded very fully to that and other questions raised by my hon. friend. He has provided very detailed answers.

With the exception of some people who are really captives of interest groups in this country, most Canadians recognize the tremendous job that the Minister of the Environment has done.

Inasmuch as my socialist friend made reference in a comment on an involvement with President Reagan on the environment, perhaps I could refer him to another comment made by the socialist Prime Minister of Norway and chair of the Brundtland commission.

• (1440)

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**An hon. member:** You're not a captive?

**Mr. Mulroney:** Mrs. Brundtland is recognized as one of the leading environmentalists in the world. The NDP does not want to hear it, but Mrs.—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. McCurdy:** How about answering the question.

**Mr. Langdon:** Answer the question.

**Mr. Speaker:** The right hon. Prime Minister.

**Mr. Mulroney:** Mr. Speaker, I, along with my colleagues on the other side, are somewhat astonished, but having made such a big deal of the environment today, and having raised President Reagan, my hon. friends do not want to hear one of the world's leading environmentalists, Mrs. Brundtland, who was speaking to the issue that is before the House.

Here is what Mrs. Brundtland said. The socialists should listen to a fellow socialist.

> There is the leadership role that Canada plays in international affairs and in particular in the ongoing work of sustainable development.
>
> There is Mr. Mulroney's personal commitment to the issues and the unique way he has mobilized industry, science and private organizations in his own country to work together, creating a strong cross-sectoral movement in Canada.

I always believed there were some socialists who knew what they were talking about.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. Catherine Callbeck (Malpeque):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment. Yesterday the minister said that his green plan represents fresh new money. Yet this government has cut funding to alternative energy by approximately 90 per cent since 1984.

How can the minister stand there and say that this is new money? How much money will be spent on alternative energy under the green plan? More specifically, how much will be spent in my province of Prince Edward Island?

**Mr. Andre:** I'll spend the old money.

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to reassure my colleague the $3 billion that was announced yesterday within the framework of the green plan is all new money. It is money that was committed by cabinet. It is money that is there for the environment over the next five years and it is money that is designated to fulfil 120 recommendations that are put forth in the green plan.

**Mr. Joe McGuire (Egmont):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of the Environment concerning the green plan. As the minister knows, one of the environmental time bombs waiting to go off is the sunken oil barge, *Irving Whale*.

In 1970, the *Irving Whale* with its cargo of 4,200 tonnes of bunker–C oil sank off the northwest coast of Prince Edward Island and has been slowly leaking ever since.

Recently, oil similar to that of the *Irving Whale* washed up on the north shore of P.E.I. I and the fishermen of my riding want to know when the federal government will remove the *Irving Whale* or its contents, and why isn't there money in the green plan to diffuse environmental time bombs like the *Irving Whale*?

**An hon. member:** They had a long time to do it.

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to say that I am concerned about all these issues as much as my hon. colleague is.

I cannot give him a precise answer to the questions that he has just raised. I would like to take it under advisement for a day or so in order to get the exact information.

We have a section of the green plan which deals exactly with emergency preparedness. I must say that is an area that was neglected over the last decade.

The government is now taking action to make sure that we have the emergency measures in place to respond to issues like the one my hon. colleague has just raised.

* * *

## ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. The four western provinces stand to lose the RCMP through the government's insistence on transferring more policing costs to the provinces and the municipalities.

The RCMP is one of the strong symbols of Canada and it is truly a force for national unity. Yet the four western provinces may be forced to establish their own police forces if the federal government does not back off. We have already lost too many of our national institutions and this haemorrhaging must stop.

Will the Solicitor General reconsider the federal government's proposal to ensure that the Mounties are kept in the west?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Solicitor General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everybody here knows that the exercise we are going through right now is to make sure that the RCMP does remain in the west. We are discussing the cost–sharing that was established 10 years ago. Obviously, I will continue to discuss those issues with the representatives of the provinces and the territories.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the same minister. I do not think I have to tell this minister that the RCMP is one of the best police forces in0z the world. Surely the minister must know that if the western provinces lose the Mount-

ies any replacement force would be very hard pressed to match the RCMP. The west would be the loser. It would smack of discrimination and add further to western alienation.

We in the west cannot afford to lose the RCMP. Will the Solicitor General put a fair offer on the table, a fair offer that is acceptable to the west, and save the RCMP?

**Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Solicitor General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend was doing very well in his question at the beginning of it. Obviously the RCMP is one of the best police forces—if not the best—in the world. I am looking forward to agreeing with the provinces that it is and that they will keep it.

* * *

## PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister. The government has put a lot of its credibility on the line with privatization.

On *Fifth Estate* last night we saw the reality of that philosophy. At Terminals 1 and 2 at Pearson Airport, the Canadian people get $5 for every passenger who goes through a turnstile. At Terminal 3, handed over to the government's corporate friends, another one of those special interest groups, the taxpayers get only 20 cents for every passenger. Worse yet, the government wants to do to Terminal 1 and 2 what it has done to Terminal 3—turn it over to the private sector.

Since the government claims to be so concerned about the deficit, why is it giving up so much valuable revenue to its corporate friends, instead of using it to improve the aviation system?

**An hon. member:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Labour and Minister of State (Transport)):** Mr. Speaker, to answer my hon. friend opposite, it is simply ridiculous and almost crazy to think that Pearson International Airport will be less profitable because the construction will be handled by the private sector. The Pearson Terminal will be operated according to the terms of a lease. That lease provides that the owner of the terminal must make regular payments to the Government of Canada. Now, that will indeed prevent the deficit from increasing, since the $500 millions required to build the terminal are to be paid by the contractor and not by the taxpayers. I think the government made a very wise decision.

[*English*]

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the answer may be far simpler than the minister suggests. Last year Huang and Danczkay upped their donations to the Tories from $3,000 to $30,000.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Angus:** In light of the decrease in revenue, in light of the fact that many smaller airports in Canada rely on Pearson to generate the funds to keep our system running, and in light of the cuts to flight service stations, air traffic control, and aviation weather reporting across the country, is it too much to ask that the government provide services to people instead of their corporate friends? Will the minister abandon the government's plans to turn Terminals 1 and 2 over to the private sector?

• (1450)

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Labour and Minister of State (Transport)):** Mr. Speaker, I think that for the sake of all Canadians, it was fortunate the Conservative government was elected for two terms since 1984, because first of all, this got rid of a Liberal government that put the country in debt to the extent of mortgaging the futures of our children and grandchildren. Fortunately, Canadians were well inspired not to elect a socialist government, because the socialist mathematics don't pass the test: They say the government is losing money because the Pearson Terminal was built for $500 million, without a cent of taxpayers money. If the same terminal had been built with taxpayers' money, it would have cost at least $10 per passenger to pay off the debt alone on that amount.

So I think this is one more example of the excellent decisions made by this government to restore confidence in the economy.

* * *

[*English*]

## AIR–INDIA FLIGHT 182

**Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General.

For over five years, the RCMP has been investigating the 1985 Air–India jumbo jet crash which caused what everyone could well be knowledgeable of as one of the worst single mass murders in Canadian history. Of the 329 passengers who had their lives snuffed out, 295 of them were Canadians including 82 children and six infants.

Because of the long delay in this behind–closed–doors investigation, would the Solicitor General now call a public inquiry, or better still, would he allow for a parliamentary inquiry? At the minimum, would he place a time limit on the RCMP to report back to the government?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Solicitor General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, although I cannot agree with the entire terminology used by my hon. friend, I want to reassure my hon. friend and all members in the House that the crash of Air–India flight 182 is still under investigation by the RCMP, and that the RCMP is planning another mission to the North Sea this summer in order to try to get further evidence from the wreckage.

In addition, there is a civil suit that is ongoing. Therefore, I think it would be inappropriate right now to agree with the suggestion made by my hon. friend, but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am kept informed with respect to this ongoing investigation and hopefully it will be terminated as soon as the RCMP can get the additional evidence it is seeking.

* * *

## IMMIGRATION

**Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint–Léonard):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

Today, Canadians had to come to Parliament to protest against the Minister of Employment and Immigration for the delay of the reunification of their spouses. Five years ago it used to take nine months. Now, it takes two and one–half years to be reunited with loved ones.

In the spirit of Christmas, will the minister intervene and have hundreds of Canadians spend Christmas with their loved ones in Canada?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, one of the things that we have tried to do in our new immigration plan is to move forward the processing of spouses.

I would point out to him that we are very much in favour of having families reunited as quickly as we can and, indeed, we know that larger numbers of family members will be coming in the future under our new plan.

The difficulty, of course, is that the demand is so extraordinarily high. We try to keep up with it as best we can. We have put in improvements for processing. We have given it a higher priority, and I would hope that in the future we could do better. It is important to us and we know that people want to be reunited with their families.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Alfonso Gagliano (Saint–Léonard):** Mr. Speaker, the minister sounds like a broken record.

Would the minister grant a visitor's visa to a newly–wed spouse so that the couple can be together while waiting for the documents to be processed in Canada? Would that not be an easy way?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I understand the dilemma that the hon. member is describing. It is difficult to say whether a newly–wed is in a more difficult and lonely situation than someone who has been married a long time.

Let me say that we are looking at ways to ease the situation for spouses and that I will be reporting back to the House when we have new regulations and our new processing in place. I think the hon. member will be pleased.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## HEALTH CARE

**Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Quebec has established one of the best health care systems in the world. A number of American experts, including Senator Ted Kennedy and experts from other countries have recognized this fact. At the present time, the Government of Quebec is making

major reforms in its health care system. Its aim is to improve access and quality of care for all Quebecers. Does the minister intend to let the Government of Quebec run its health care system as it sees fit?

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, the Canada Health Act gives Canadian provinces all the powers they need to revamp their health care systems. Canadians expect the federal government to continue to play an active role in the area of health care and ensure that national standards are met throughout Canada. The basic concept is simple: universal access for everyone across Canada. Mr. Speaker, this is a concept that is important to all Canadians and it is supported across Canada.

**Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil):** Mr. Speaker, in Quebec, respect for rights and freedoms is part of a long democratic tradition of which we are proud. We have reason to believe that the Canadian government has been guilty of violating those rights. Quebec is perfectly well able to protect the rights and freedoms of its citizens, including those they have in the health care area. Quebec Minister Rémillard is asking you to withdraw completely from health care in Quebec, which in fact falls under provincial jurisdiction. What are you going to do?

[*English*]

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is well aware of the fact that within the confines of the Canada Health Act the basic principles of universal access and equity of treatment in Canada are set out. The provinces have full discretion in terms of the organization of their health care systems.

My colleague in Quebec has indicated that he believes that his reforms can be done within the context of the Canada Health Act. I have had my officials write to his, seeking more information with regard to proposals made by the Government of Quebec. If it can be done within the law, he has the right to do that.

The principle of universality and the principles of universal access and of equity of treatment that are contained in the Canada Health Act are principles that are supported by all Canadians and are to the benefit of all Canadians.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Communications, my question is directed to the parliamentary secretary.

Gérard Veilleux said yesterday at the Communications and Culture Standing Committee meeting: "There was so little political will on the part of the government to support the CBC that I—" that is, Mr. Veilleux, the president "—was never able to get through the Minister of Communications' door to ask for help." He was told the minister was too busy.

Why was the minister too busy to deal with this question that strikes at the very roots and the very heart and soul of national unity, one that has negative impacts on the economic, social, cultural and linguistic fibre of every community affected by this decision?

**Mr. Jim Edwards (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Communications indicated to the House on Monday, there have been constant discussions with the CBC since the budget of April, 1989.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, since the minister has refused to meet Mr. Veilleux, will he meet representatives from Sydney, Rimouski, Windsor, Sudbury, Winnipeg, St. Boniface, Calgary, Saskatoon, Vancouver and other cities affected by the 1,100 job cuts, and let these representatives tell him about the negative impact on regional English and French programming? Will he take the time to meet employees who were laid off, which was a nasty Christmas present?

• (1500)

[*English*]

**Mr. Jim Edwards (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, the minister is always available to consult with Canadians.

*Point of Order*

I should also point out to the hon. member that there are many other appropriate avenues for the affected people to pursue. For example, it is already set in train that the Canadian Radio and Television Telecommunications Commission will be involved in this issue.

* * *

## WESTRAY MINING

**Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister.

It involves the awarding of an $85 million loan guarantee and a $9 million gift to Westray Mining in the riding of Central Nova, a project which was opposed by federal bureaucrats.

We know that the Prime Minister was lobbied personally regarding this project by the Conservative MLA for the area on behalf of the three companies involved, which just happened to have contributed $33,000 to the PCs in 1988, the year in question.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister why he ignored the advice of his bureaucrats and became involved in the making of this gift to supporters of his own party?

**Hon. William C. Winegard (Minister for Science):** Mr. Speaker, every member of this House knows that the government contracts for products and provides assistance to all kinds of industrial producers from one side of the country to the other.

As far as Westray is concerned, our department, Industry, Science, Technology Canada offered assistance to the project, otherwise it would not have gone ahead to open an underground coal mine in Pictou County, Nova Scotia.

We have that arrangement. The Nova Scotia Power Corporation will use the coal from that underground mine. I do not know what the NDP have against sound regional economic development.

* * *

## PRESENCE IN GALLERY

**Mr. Speaker:** I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of the United States House of Representatives Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## POINT OF ORDER

### PRESENCE OF ASBESTOS IN PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to seek some assurance from the Chair with regard to a matter of great importance to members of Parliament, and also to their staffs and to the individuals who work on Parliament Hill.

For quite some time the issue of asbestos has been given great media attention. There are legitimate concerns being expressed by employees, by members of Parliament and their respective staff persons.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that you, in your capacity as the presiding officer of this Chamber, have information that perhaps if shared with this House and with the employees and the members of Parliament would shed some light as to what is taking place. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that you would give careful consideration to full disclosure of any and all information which comes into your purview in terms of any tests which have been done on any of the premises here in the House of Commons.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo the concerns raised by my hon. friend, who is aware that earlier today a press statement by Greenpeace on behalf of the environmental working committee of all those employed on Parliament Hill indicated a concern about alleged concentrations of asbestos and the use of asbestos on Parliament Hill.

I wonder if you, Mr. Speaker, as the presiding officer of this House and as the presiding officer of the Board of Internal Economy would make a statement in terms of the release of all pertinent information at some appropriate moment.

**Mr. Speaker:** I should say to the House that there may be members of Parliament wishing to rise on this issue under questions of privilege.

Strictly speaking, questions of privilege should be heard at the first opportunity. It may be that if there are members wishing to rise on this matter, they would agree to me referring their application until I have had a

chance to respond to the suggestions of the hon. member for Kamloops and Cape Breton—East Richmond.

If I have agreement with that, I would proceed with advising the House of what I think I can advise it of at the moment. If hon. members wish to pursue, of course, I shall hear it.

There is another question of privilege which I have received notice of arising out of a question of privilege that has already been argued. I will, of course, hear that in a few minutes. It does not take quite the same priority precedent as the other.

Further to the interventions of our colleagues, the hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond and the hon. member for Kamloops, I wish to inform members of the House of recent action taken by the Board of Internal Economy in response to ongoing concerns regarding the presence of asbestos in the workplace, and the potential harm to employees on the Hill.

I think I should point out that the board reviewed the matter at a meeting on May 3, 1989, and approved the following steps to deal with the situation. I am reading here from the board minutes and I will table these:

> 1. That the situation report and plan of action regarding the asbestos abatement program on Parliament Hill which was requested of Public Works Canada by the administrative committee on March 17, 1989 be presented to the board as soon as possible.
>
> 2. Where work is required to be performed by House employees in areas where asbestos is known to be present and suitable protective equipment or procedures are not available to such staff, the work be contracted out by the House to a qualified contractor who can safely perform the work within the standards prescribed by Labour Canada, Health and Welfare Canada and Public Works Canada.
>
> 3. Where services are required to be performed by Public Works Canada staff or its contractors, or other contractors engaged by the House, in areas known to have asbestos, the work be done by qualified staff who will be required to follow regulations, policies and procedures set out for such work by Labour Canada, Health and Welfare Canada and Public Works Canada.
>
> 4. That House staff and outside contractors be informed prior to commencement of any work on Parliament Hill of the locations of any known asbestos in the area where work is about to be performed.
>
> 5. That an official of the parliamentary accommodation unit of the Sergeant-at-Arms sector establish appropriate monitoring procedures to ensure that all work referred to in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 be carried out in a manner consistent with regulations, policies and procedures determined by Labour Canada, Health and Welfare Canada and Public Works Canada.
>
> 6. That the House officials continue their practice of calling upon Labour Canada, Health and Welfare Canada and Public Works Canada officials to assist in monitoring the safety of the work environment.
>
> 7. That the Speaker write the Minister of Public Works Canada to communicate the board's decisions and request his department's continued assistance in this regard.

That is the minutes of the meeting of May 3, 1989. Of course, certain matters have flowed from those minutes.

In addition, I would like to advise members that the Board of Internal Economy met last week, on December 5, 1990, with officials from the Departments of Health and Welfare and Public Works to discuss the situation further.

I would like to read for the benefit of the members an extract from the minutes of that board meeting. This is a meeting only one week ago:

> The board received a briefing from officials of Public Works Canada and Health and Welfare Canada concerning the presence of asbestos in the Parliament Buildings.
>
> Members of the Board were assured by officials that no asbestos fibres had been found in any offices tested. It was agreed, however,—

I should say to members that this was a very lengthy meeting, and after much discussion and many questions:

> —that the board would seek further assurance by contracting the services of an outside expert to advise on the situation. It was also suggested that a communication plan should be developed in order to reassure employees working in the parliamentary buildings.

• (1510)

Those are the minutes of a meeting held last Wednesday night. I can assure members that we will be selecting a consultant within the next few days who will be requested to make a preliminary report to the board by January 14, 1991, the contents of which will be made available to all members of the House as soon as possible thereafter. All additional reports will also be presented to the members of the House.

I am tabling for the information of the House extracts from the minutes of the Board of Internal Economy meeting of May 3, 1989, to which I have just referred, and from the meeting of last week, December 5, 1990. Just so that members and the public understand, the

government department which is charged with the actual work with respect to asbestos is, of course, the Department of Public Works, with the help and assistance of the Department of Health.

There was a meeting of the Board of Internal Economy today at noon, and I think that I have the support of all members to say to the House and the public that the board, as the employer of all the employees on the Hill, considers that it must take with very grave concern suggestions that there may in fact be difficulties, and the board is proceeding to do so.

I will, of course, make arrangements as soon as our first report comes in from our consultant to make that information available to hon. members and to make available from then on subsequent information which is important and which goes to convey to all hon. members and to our employees what is being done, first of all if there is a danger, second, what that danger may be or the extent of it and, third, what is being done about it and what can be done about it.

The hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond. Just a moment, perhaps before the hon. member proceeds, I could deliver to the Table the documents of which I just spoke.

The hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond and then I will hear the hon. member for Kamloops.

**Mr. Dingwall:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for your statement and your assurance that you will provide additional information come mid-January with regard to this important issue.

The hon. Minister of Public Works is in the House at the present time, I know it is unusual to make this request since Question Period has expired, but I wonder if the minister would undertake to provide to the House and to members copies of all of the various tests with which his department is now seized to in regard to the issue of asbestos within the Parliament Buildings so that we can have full disclosure and a full examination of all of the facts. Thereafter, of course, these would be given to the independent individual who will be retained by the Board of Internal Economic in order to make a final and complete assessment and to give assurances, not only to members of Parliament and their employees but, indeed, all people who work on Parliament Hill.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member has put a question to the minister who has, of course, been listening carefully to the statement by the Chair. Strictly speaking, unless the House agrees, I would have to say that I am in the hands of the minister. The minister may want to respond.

**Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gravity of the situation and the desire of all colleagues to be fully apprised of the situation. I will take the request very seriously. I do not know if there are procedural reasons or any other reasons why I could not comply with this, but I will undertake to report back.

I might say that precautions have been taken. Members might like to know, for example, that one sensitive area, the attic of the West Block, has been sealed off. Security officers have been instructed to make sure that access to the attic, which has steel beams covered with asbestos, is not readily available. I am advised that the security service of the House has agreed to keep the door of this area locked in view of any possible risks, and that the access door was completely weatherstripped to make sure that the asbestos is totally contained within the attic space. The House also knows that where renovations are undertaken to the parliamentary precincts, such as in the Wellington Building, asbestos is removed at that time with appropriate precautions.

I also understand, although I am no expert on the matter obviously, that in an inert form, that is to say, not in viable form, asbestos is not generally regarded as particularly hazardous. However, if it is disturbed around service areas, this is not the case.

I think, Mr. Speaker, you also mentioned that when the issue was raised by a colleague in the House last month, on November 19, I believe, several tests were undertaken with the co-operation of my colleague, the minister of health and welfare, as to air quality, and there was no evidence at that time that there was any hazard. But our department is anxious to carry on with this inspection. Of course we will act as the servants of the line departments and the House and carry out whatever instructions you see fit to give us.

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, you indicated that you would be acting expeditiously in terms of identifying an independent firm to evaluate quickly the situation. I would simply like to add that perhaps in your deliberations at the appropriate time, and as soon as possible with the firm in question, that you would encourage the firm to be

in contact with the environmental working group of employees who are working on Parliament Hill so that they are fully apprised of the progress as well.

**Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina—Qu'Appelle):** Mr. Speaker, I also rise on this same point of personal privilege. I was dismayed when I heard your report, Mr. Speaker, that the board of internal economy, if I heard you correctly, discussed the matter of asbestos in the West Block in the spring of 1989. I am dismayed because as an occupant of West Block certainly I was not informed, nor was my staff, that there might have been potential problems concerning asbestos in the West Block. I would have appreciated had I known that.

This morning we received a copy of a report that was made and submitted to the government in December 1988. I quote: "In the presence of strong lights necessary for the videotaping it was possible to see large particles of asbestos fireproofing adrift in the air stream. These particles were moving toward mechanical room No. 6 at the same rate as the smoke particles."

Another part of the report states: "There exists a strong possibility that airborne asbestos migrates from the attic to occupied areas of the building via the air handling system".

If this was the same report that the Board of Internal Economy was looking at in March 1989, I am wondering what has happened in the meantime.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have probably bent the rules a little to allow this matter to be dealt with now because frankly I think it is an important matter. So does the board and so do hon. members. But we are not here to debate what particular piece of paper the board was looking at at that time.

I am sure the hon. member realizes that the board is retaining independent outside advice to advise us. Beyond that and beyond bringing to the attention of the hon. members the fact that the matter was discussed with great seriousness a week ago, action is taking place, but I do not know that I can transgress the rules by turning the afternoon into a debate on asbestos. I think that is going too far.

## PRIVILEGE

### PRESENCE OF ASBESTOS IN PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS

**Mr. Lyle Kristiansen (Kootenay West—Revelstoke):** Mr. Speaker, in line with your earlier remarks I do not intend to pursue it at any length. However, in the light of exposure of this two-year old report today, a three-volume report prepared by independent consultants and released presumably through the Department of Public Works in December 1988, I do believe that at least the members of Parliament and their staff who work in the conditions outlined in that report in the conduct of their duties as members of Parliament and their staff have a right to know what the Department of Public Works knew two years ago about the deterioration of asbestos. On a six-hour videotape which accompanied that report it is shown flowing through the air ducts and throughout the system into the control rooms and throughout that building.

• (1520 )

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that you are taking strong and early action now, but the fact remains that there was an independent consultant hired who reported two years ago to the Department of Public Works. This report laid out, in broad terms, a plan of action that sounds remarkably similar to the plan of action that you are now requesting another independent consultant to draft a report on and to make recommendations.

I believe it is a matter of privilege in that no members of Parliament and their staff with offices in the West Block—and there are many of them, particularly on the fourth floor—are in fact prevented from carrying out their duties as MPs and staff of MPs without placing their health at what appears to be serious risk. The tone that is placed in that three-volume report is of a nature that any school building in the province of Ontario would have been closed down months ago if they had known that their buildings were in the same apparent state as the West Block.

The least these members of Parliament and their staff require now is the release of that report and the accompanying six-hour videotape so they can form a conclusion for themselves in light of whatever experts they may choose to hire to determine whether or not

that building has to be evacuated or whether they in fact should continue to work in it in order to carry out their duties.

Perhaps the only alternative is to shut the building down and either have MPs find alternative accommodation and submit the bills to the House of Commons, or the House should consider immediately whether or not we can find them alternative accommodation.

**Mr. Speaker:** I appreciate the intervention of the hon. member. I also appreciate the fact that I had notice of his question of privilege. The matter has been brought back to the House. I think it is now appropriate for the Board of Internal Economy to proceed as we are.

I will take into account the particular matters raised by the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

## ACCESS TO RESEARCH FACILITIES

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I rise again today on a question of privilege concerning a serious and important matter that should be worthy of your attention and give you cause to reflect.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, I raised a question of privilege about access to research facilities. Mr. Speaker, there have been new developments since then, and I think it falls very much within the purview of this institution to be aware of certain events outside the House that have a considerable impact on the privileges of all members. I am referring to the fact that the services of research staff on the House of Commons payroll have now been made available to individuals in the private sector.

Let me explain, Mr. Speaker. I was astonished to read in the *Montreal Gazette* on Wednesday, November 28, that two members of this House, the hon. member for Papineau—Saint-Michel and the hon. member for Outremont, had decided to make available free of charge the research facilities of their parties, and probably their personal staff, to people in the private sector. I would like to quote, Mr. Speaker, from the article signed by Philippe Authier, which reads as follows:

[*English*]

They have agreed to share researchers and newspaper clipping services.

[*Translation*]

There is more, Mr. Speaker. This group of members of the business community includes Marcel Beaudry, an eminent Hull lawyer, Sheryl Campbell-Steer, vice-president of the Montreal Board of Trade, Charles-Albert Poissant, president of Donahue, and Sébastian Allard, of the Conseil du patronat du Québec.

[*English*]

Each has been assigned an aide to sort through briefs and prepare questions. The help comes courtesy of Ouellet and Hogue.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I am astonished to see that public funds are now made available to individuals in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a serious matter when one sees a resident of Hull, Mr. Marcel Beaudry, given access to research services while the hon. member for Hull—Aylmer, who was elected by the people of Hull—Aylmer, is denied access to the same public funds to do his research.

Mr. Speaker, I think you should take a long, hard look at this matter. For instance, tomorrow, the Liberal Party, the Progressive Conservative Party or the New Democratic Party might decide that they support the principles of the Conseil du patronat or the FTQ and decide to transfer their staff to these organizations. Mr. Speaker, I hardly think this is in accordance with the Standing Orders and practices of this House. All the more so since it amounts to discrimination with respect to our political convictions, realizing as we do that we have been denied these privileges, whereas citizens who have not been elected by anybody and who sit on the boards of major corporations are given access to research services paid for by the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, I refer you to another article published in *La Presse* of that same day where it is alleged that the group pools their resources and their staff and that from here on in they will follow a specific strategy where somebody would suggest such or such question to the witnesses just to make sure that all bases are covered. And, according to Mr. Ouellet, there is nothing wrong with that kind of arrangement.

From my standpoint, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that all this should prompt us to raise basic questions as to whether the rules of justice and fairness are respected in this House. Should a few private sector individuals who happen to share the political convictions of certain traditional parties in this House be given ready access to research services, a privilege we have been denied because our views are different? I am not sure that the private sector should have access to the resources of the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker. I think that is a fundamental question because today it has to do with constitutional matters, tomorrow it might be immigration, and the day after it might involve another issue where the resources of the House of Commons would be put at the disposal of one interest group or another.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Charter of Rights and Freedoms for which everybody is grateful refers to freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression. I have every reason to believe that if we are denied access to some services, it is because of our political beliefs. But I will go even further, Mr. Speaker, for I have an even more serious case to report.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean who sits in the House of Commons as an Independent is a member in good standing of the Bélanger-Campeau Commission, just as are the hon. member for Papineau—Saint-Michel and the hon. member for Outremont. Both these members have access not only to the research services of the House of Commons, but also to a new staff of four people who claim they are there to collect objective data. Well, Mr. Speaker, these objective data are not made available to the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean, in spite of the fact that he has the same right as both our colleagues on the Bélanger-Campeau Commission and should have access to the same services provided by government staff from the Privy Council. Some hon. members of this House are discriminated against because of their political beliefs.

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing against the old parties behaving like great bedfellows, but when they get special treatment, they or their party should pay from their own pocket. In this case, public funds, which are provided by the Canadian people and Quebecers, whether they be in favour of the federalist or sovereignist option, are now used simply to promote one side of the issue. I suggest that, as members of the House, we should ask ourselves serious questions, namely: How come Marcel Beaudry can have access to the research services of the House of Commons while Gilles Rocheleau cannot? Why is it that Privy Council staff prepare briefings for all hon. members except the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean? That is my question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

• (1530 )

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** I listened with interest to the hon. member. Part of his complaint is the subject of a matter which the Chair is presently studying and with which the Chair must deal and respond to the House.

I will consider the other matters. I must say that I will have to look at it very carefully to see privilege. A breach of privilege is when the hon. member is unable to carry on his duties in the House. The hon. member is speaking of research work which is available to parties in this House, ultimately paid for by the Canadian public, but that research is the property of the members of that particular party. It certainly would not be the first time in the history of this Parliament that research work that has been prepared by research groups for any individual party, or for that matter, the Library of Parliament, has been released to all kinds of people across this country to assist them and their groups in various matters that they might wish to do.

I will look at the hon. member's intervention and I will try to take it into account before I bring down the ruling on the other matters that he raised. I thank the hon. member.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### PUBLIC SERVICE

FEDERAL POLICY STATEMENT

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour, on behalf of the Prime Minister, to table in both official languages a government policy statement on the future of the federal Public Service.

*Routine Proceedings*

## PETITIONS

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 20 petitions.

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

* * *

[*Translation*]

## COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS—PRESENTATION OF FOURTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Ken Hughes (Macleod):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs.

[*English*]

This report is entitled, "You Took My Talk: Aboriginal Literacy and Empowerment". Members of the committee have worked in the best traditions of committees of this House to achieve this unanimously endorsed set of recommendations. The report issues a challenge to the Government of Canada, ministers of education of each province and territory and to aboriginal leadership.

In the closing month of this year, the United Nations International Literacy Year of 1990, the committee challenges governments and aboriginal leadership to seize the momentum, focus on this issue and put in place the means to deal with the literacy challenge over the longer term.

As a closing comment I should note, that this is the first time a committee report has been presented to this House with the recommendations translated into three of Canada's aboriginal languages, namely Cree, Inuktitut and Ojibway. There are some 53 aboriginal languages in Canada. All have equal value, but for practical reasons only the three most commonly used inscripted languages could be included in this report. The inclusion of these languages is a symbolic recognition of the value of all aboriginal languages. It also recognizes the important relationship between the aboriginal language and literacy.

I also submit the full report in both official languages.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response within 150 days.

[*English*]

### INDUSTRY, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, REGIONAL AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT—SECOND REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Calgary Southwest):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour today to present the second report of the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology, Regional and Northern Development in both official languages.

Canada must compete, and this is exactly to what the report refers. We have to compete to trade and we have to trade to exist. All of the witnesses who appeared before the committee made a clear statement that science and technology are the driving force to create jobs here in Canada, jobs to improve our productivity, to sell smarter and to maintain our standard of living.

In this report, we have made recommendations for improved education at all levels, better training, a sound, stable economic environment, clearer tax provisions and increased technology transfers. We also want to see strong alliances among governments, industry and educational institutions.

There were some important items such as literacy, sustainable development and labour adjustment areas which we did not study. We have not given a report on those areas, mainly due to the fact that we had time limitation and the membership of our committee was changing quite rapidly.

In conclusion, pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests a comprehensive response to the report within 150 days.

[*Translation*]

### BILL C-223—LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

**Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Miramichi):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the report of the Legislative Committee on Bill C-223, an act respecting a Day of Mourning for Persons Killed or Injured in the Workplace.

There is one amendment, Madam Speaker.

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

* * *

[*English*]

## PETITIONS

### RAFFERTY-ALAMEDA DAMS

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased and honoured to present a petition on behalf of 87 students and staff of St. James Collegiate located in my riding of Winnipeg St. James.

This petition relates to the environment and specifically the Rafferty-Alameda dams project in Saskatchewan. The petition reads as follows:

> Whereas the courts have ruled that a full environmental review must be conducted on the Rafferty-Alameda dams project in Saskatchewan;
>
> Whereas construction on the Rafferty-Alameda dams project should have stopped during this environmental review;
>
> Whereas construction has now resumed upon this project without an environmental assessment having been completed; and
>
> Whereas this project may have serious repercussions upon the environment, including fish, migratory birds and the lands of the province of Manitoba and the federal government;
>
> Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take every possible action to stop construction on the Rafferty-Alameda dams project and to ensure that a full environmental assessment is conducted.

I would like to congratulate the students and staff of St. James Collegiate on their initiative. I thank them for caring, and we are all very proud of them.

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James):** Madam Speaker, I have one other batch of petitions. This batch of petitions comes from the city of Edmonton. It is pretty straightforward. It says:

> The Government of Canada has seen fit since Confederation and without hiatus to apply a zero rate of tax to magazines, books and newspapers, and now proposes to include them in the goods and services tax.

The petitioners from the city of Edmonton humbly pray and call upon Parliament to reaffirm the historic principles embodied in tax free status for the printed word by retaining the zero rate in the GST legislation and regulations.



### GASOLINE ADDITIVES

**Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex):** Madam Speaker, I rise today to table nearly 1,000 names on these petitions gathered by CJBK radio station in London, Ontario.

These petitioners are calling on the government to withdraw MMT from the gasoline in Canada and replace it with ethanol, an environmentally friendly additive and octane enhancer.

These petitioners are aware that the use of ethanol would reduce carbon dioxide emissions rather than increase them. It would be a much more positive move than the proposals presented in the green plan yesterday.

### FISHERIES

**Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition which is from many people, particularly in the Chinese Canadian community in British Columbia, who are concerned about the diminishing supply of live codfish, which is an essential food for their community.

• (1540 )

They state that live codfish is a commodity of high cultural and economic value as a staple fresh food to Asian Canadians and for millions of tourists who visit Canada. It is always in demand by Canadian families, restaurants and stores. The petitioners further state that because of negligent management of the commercial fishery and the unfair allocation to the sport fishery sector, there is a trend of increasingly seasonal and area closures.

This is disrupting what was formally a year-round fishery. If this trend of federal government negligence towards the live cod fishery continues, these fish soon will not be available especially to some 200,000 Canadians of Chinese descent who live throughout B.C.

Therefore the petitioners demand that the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans recognize the special value of these fish to the Asian community and to visitors to Canada, and immediately initiate management action that will ensure that a year-round supply of live codfish is available. This must include adequate federal attention to the long-term sustainable management of these fish and their fair allocation.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

**Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox–Alberni):** Madam Speaker, I have a petition from a number of people in the communities of Victoria, Port Alberni, Nanaimo, and Qualicum Beach, British Columbia who express concern about the way the federal government conducted the negotiations with the people at Oka during the crisis this summer.

The petitioners stated that they expect the Government of Canada to immediately act upon its authority and responsibility and deal in a just manner with the struggle of all aboriginal peoples in Canada to have their land claims and rights properly addressed. Inaction on the part of the federal authorities will only continue to antagonize race relations in Canada, and provoke dangerous and ignorant acts of racism.

This petition is circulated by the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs and the Manitoba Coalition Organized Against Apartheid.

VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENTS

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure today to again present petitions from two volunteer fire departments in Nova Scotia; one from Stellarton, Nova Scotia, and the other one from the Hantsport Fire Department in Hantsport, Nova Scotia.

The petitioners say that since fire departments provide a vital service in protecting lives and property of all citizens, and whereas the federal Department of Communications has imposed huge fee increases for radio telecommunications which include radio licence fees, and since these prohibitive costs could place a severe burden on these fire departments, and since these fire departments are operated by volunteers who give freely of their time to protect the community, they call upon the government to see the folly of its ways and to live up to a commitment made back in 1986 by the then Minister of Communications to exempt fire departments. They are asking that these fire department exemptions be reinstated as was promised by the former Minister of Communications.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** I have another set of petitions. It is appropriate that these are being presented today. Again these are petitions from my riding of Dartmouth. Many people in the Dartmouth–Halifax area are fundamentally, absolutely, 100 per cent irrevocably opposed to this government's crazy goods and services tax.

They are petitioning this government to come to its senses and scrap the tax and not do what it was going to do perhaps today or tomorrow, and that is to use the tyranny of the majority in the other place to push forward this unpopular tax.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Madam Speaker, it is my honour to present a petition pursuant to Standing Order 36, regarding the proposed goods and services tax.

The petitioners make two points, one that the government ought to reconsider proceeding with this unfair regressive tax and also to point out that the Liberals in the Senate had a number of occasions when they could have actually defeated the tax, but for some mysterious reason, chose not to do so. Presumably they wish to give the impression that they are opposing it. On five different occasions they could have defeated the tax, but they chose not to.

* * *

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 389 and 400.

[*Text*]

SOLICITOR GENERAL FOREIGN TRIPS

Question No. 389—**Mr. Nunziata:**

Since February 23, 1990, has the Solicitor General taken any foreign trips and, if so (a) what was the itemized cost of each trip including (i) airfares (ii) accomodations (iii) car rentals, taxis/limousines (iv) hospitality (b) was the Minister accompanied by (i) members of his staff (ii) officials from the Ministry of the Solicitor General (iii) family members (iv) others, and if so, who were they (c) what were the dates of departure/return from/to Canada (d) what was the purpose of each trip (e) was a follow–up meeting held to discuss the results of the trip (f) was a written report produced on the results of the trip?

**Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Solicitor General of Canada):** As of October 22, 1990, the Solicitor General represented Canada on two foreign trips since February 23, 1990.

1. Organization of American States (OAS)—CICAD Meeting Ixtapa, Mexico.

**PURPOSE**

The acronym CICAD comes from the Spanish language title of the *Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission*. CICAD, an agency of the OAS, was established in 1986 to implement the Program of Rio (Inter-American program of Action of Rio de Janeiro against the Illicit Use and Production of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances and Traffic/therein).

The ministerial meeting was proposed through a resolution of the OAS in October, 1989 for the purpose of re-evaluating the current status of the drug problem in the OAS region and the re-establish priorities for inter-American action in the context of the Program of Rio.

**COST** $2,614.25. The Solicitor General departed Canada on April 16, 1990 and returned on April 21, 1990.

He was accompanied by:

Commissioner Norman D. Inkster
Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Mr. D. Ian Glen, QC
Assistant Deputy Solicitor General

Ms. Janis Gardiner
Special Assistant to the Solicitor General

Inspector François Hummell
Executive Assistant to RCMP Commissioner

Inspector V. Casey
Royal Canadian Mounted Police

A follow-up meeting was held to discuss the results of the trip, and a written report was produced.

2. *TREVI Meeting* in Dublin, Ireland, with related bilateral meetings in London, England.

**PURPOSE**

TREVI is a grouping of European Community ministers responsible for security issues and law enforcement. Concern over the threat of terrorism prompted a decision to form the Trevi Group in 1976. Canada, along with the United States and other nations, is an observer country. Canada, however, participates formally in a meeting with the "Troika", the three European Community ministers responsible for the TREVI meetings. Canada takes advantage of the occasion to dialogue on a bilateral basis with international counterparts on issues of mutual concern.

**COST** $8,528.48. The Solicitor General departed Canada on June 12, 1990 and returned on June 19, 1990.

He was accompanied by:

Mr. Jim Allan,
Senior Advisor to the Solicitor General

Mr. Ross Christensen,
Director General, National Security Coordination Centre (NSCC)

Ms. Michèle Veilleux,
Director, Police and Planning, NSCC

Mr. J.R. Morden,
Director CSIS

Mr. Paul Séguin,
Executive Assistant to CSIS Director

Commissioner Norman D. Inkster
Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Inspector François Hummell
Executive Assistant to RCMP Commissioner

Mr. Cliff Garrard,
Director, Emergency Coordination Division, External Affairs

Mr. Kirk Bell,
Attache to Executive Director of Immigration, CEIC

A follow-up meeting was held to discuss the results of the trip, and a written report was produced.

AIRCRAFT CRASHES

Question No. 400—**McGuire:**

Since 1964, during Canadian military training and operations in North America, for the (a) CC130 Hercules aircraft (b) CC115 Buffalo aircraft, have there been any fatal crashes and if so (i) how many (ii) how many deaths were incurred?

**Hon. William Hunter McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** a) Yes.

i) 6

ii) 35

b) No.

[*English*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The questions as enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered.

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, if Question No. 388 could be made an Order for Return, the return would be tabled immediately.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House that Question No. 388 be deemed to have been made an Order for Return?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Text*]

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES OF CANADA

Question No. 388—**Mr. Nunziata:**

Since June 7, 1988, how many employees within the Correctional Services of Canada have been appointed or promoted without competition and in each case (a) what are the names of the employees (b) what was their old group and level (c) what group and level were they promoted to?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

**Mr. Cooper:** I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

* * *

## MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, Notice of Motion for the Production of Paper, P–31, in the name of the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands is acceptable to the government and the document is tabled immediately.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

That a Humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before the House copies of records detailing the total cost of the deployment of Canadian Forces personnel to Oka, Quebec, at the request of the Attorney General of Quebec, pursuant to Section 277 of the National Defence Act.

**Mr. Cooper:** I ask that the other Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers be allowed to stand.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Will the other notices stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

---

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

## FISHERIES ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Tuesday, December 11, consideration of the motion of Mr. Valcourt that Bill C–74, an act to amend the Fisheries Act and to amend the Criminal Code in consequence thereof, be read the third time and passed.

**Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough):** Madam Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to rise and discuss Bill C–74. It is an honour to speak to it because it not only affects many of the residents of my riding of Hillsborough, but it affects all residents of Prince Edward Island and indeed many Canadians who are involved in the fishing industry.

The fishery has undergone a tremendous amount of change in the past number of years and I am sure that in years to come change will become a very integral part of this industry. Much of it has been and will continue to be painful. This fact is confirmed by various reports and recommendations such as the Kirby report, the Harris report and the Haché report. Members of this House and of the other place have also studied the fishery and have attempted to make recommendations to this government.

The major feature of the bill we are debating today is a response to some of these recommendations. It would impose a substantial increase in penalties for violations of fisheries law, such as illegal dumping, discarding or misreporting of fish, fishing in enclosed areas, or damaging fish habitat.

A study conducted by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans on the management of groundfish in the Scotia–Fundy region of the east coast, the Haché task force, revealed that the maximum fines provided for in the act

are regarded by many in the industry simply as a cost of doing business. Therefore, this bill will introduce substantially increased penalties for general fisheries offences.

The bill also attempts to establish proper means of collecting and verifying catches and data. The Haché task force observed that motivation to misreport the areas of species fish is high, and that industry participants had repeatedly claimed that such data was flawed. As a result, the accuracy of information received by the department is questionable due to large scale misreporting and enforcement problems.

In February of 1990, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans released the Harris report on the state of the northern cod stock. The report, written by Dr. Leslie Harris of Memorial University, concluded that a vital goal of management strategy must be the improvement of data used in assessment. It noted the misreporting of catches, disregard rates, and other significant inaccuracies in commercial catch data.

It is now obvious that the industry must be better managed by imposing stiffer penalties for violations and by more effective enforcement. If the government is indeed committed to such initiatives, then it must also ensure that representatives of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans are well trained and well-equipped to carry out their heightened duties. It is in all our interests to see the industry better policed, but mere words will not accomplish this. I hope the government will follow up with action.

It is also in all our interests to see the fishery better managed over all. I am afraid that we seriously doubt the government's commitment to doing so. We question the government's commitment to the fishery and to the people who depend upon it, directly or indirectly, to survive. We question the government's commitment to the people and to the economy of Atlantic Canada in general. The mismanagement of our primary resource, the fishery, provides a tragic metaphor for this lack of commitment.

• (1550)

Stiffer penalties and better enforcement, while admirable, are mere band-aid measures for an industry that is being neglected to death by the government. The government's only action, thus far, has been to cut quotas in the name of stock preservation and to attempt to silence the industry with its inadequate fishery aid package of last winter. I will not discuss in detail the many criticisms of such actions, but I will say that the government's response must go beyond such band-aid measures and must use federal resources of funds, expertise, and information to bring about a fundamental restructuring of the economy, both regional and national. Economic development and diversification must be part of the response to the crisis in the fishery, to the crisis that is facing Atlantic Canada.

The east coast is extremely dependent on the fishery. In Prince Edward Island, the fishery is one of three major areas of the economy. Prince Edward Island has approximately 2,500 fishermen, 2,500 plant workers, and 1,400 ancillary workers. These people make up about 10 per cent of the provincial work force and the fishery makes up about 30 per cent of the province's total export market.

It is a sad fact of human nature that when times are good we tend to ignore such imbalances. We fail to acknowledge, or we do not let ourselves acknowledge, the potential for problems. Well, the good times are over. Why can the government not admit that some fundamental mistakes have been made, and why does it not have the guts to correct them?

As I said before, violations of fishery laws by Canadian fishermen and the lack of effective enforcement by DFO are only part of the problem. The plundering of Canadian fish stocks by foreign vessels has to stop if there is to be any hope of replenishing our fish stocks. Fish in Canadian waters must go to Canadian fishermen first. We must not delude ourselves that the Europeans, for example, care about the state of the northern cod stock or the crisis facing Atlantic Canada. When there are no more fish, either for the Spanish or Portuguese ships, they are not going to be too upset about Atlantic Canada. They will go back home, leaving chaos in their wake. Why will the Canadian government not stand up for its own resource and for its own people?

Every time we ask the government what has been done to convince the European community of the damage it is wreaking upon the east coast and of our sovereignty over our own resource, we hear that the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Minister for International Trade are talking. And, yes, I will agree that they do a lot of that, as does the government, but nothing happens. If the results of the agricultural talks at the recent GATT negotiations are any indication, the government can talk the ear off anybody. But, again, nothing happens. The Europeans, like any other nationalistic or economic bloc, are looking out for their own interests and they are

making no bones about that. If only Canadians felt that their government was doing the same.

But they do not. How can they when every move the government makes seems calculated to do as much damage as possible at a time when further strain on the economy is disastrous? The Atlantic fishery, which is the corner-stone of our regional economy and the livelihood, directly and indirectly, of so many Atlantic Canadians, is under siege. What does the federal government do at this time of crisis? Does it come forth with long-term strategies, or does it come forth with even meaningful short-term measures? No, Madam Speaker, instead, it guts the unemployment insurance system, the one thing that could carry these people through the long, cold, mean, miserable, recessive year that is to come.

The people of Atlantic Canada do not look upon the UI system as a form of social welfare, as some members opposite are fond of claiming. The seasonal and the fragile nature of the regional economy, such as the fishery, as well as agriculture and tourism, have dictated that the UI system is a vital safety net for our people. Although positive reform is not a bad thing, the government's slash and burn approach to reform is thoughtless at best, cruel at worst, and regressive for certain.

The government claims that its withdrawal of funds from the UI system, its toughening of qualifications, and its shortening of benefits will, in fact, be of greater benefit to the unemployed worker than before. I have not time now to explore the government's amazing mental and economic gymnastics, fascinating as this would be. All I will say is that right now, having mismanaged the fishery almost to death, the government has pulled the rug out from under Atlantic Canadians. So, funds will be allocated to retraining programs. Members from throughout the Atlantic have been saying for months that retraining is not the only answer. The regional economy also needs a sustained, realistic commitment from the federal government.

The past Minister of Fisheries and Oceans said it himself. He admitted that it is tough in Atlantic Canada to talk about retraining or restructuring entire communities. The Atlantic economy, the fishery in particular, is not like a factory in Toronto. But I say, with some commitment from the federal government, vitally needed restructuring need not be impossible for Atlantic Canada. The people of Atlantic Canada, the fishermen, and residents are waiting.

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Madam Speaker, I am delighted to rise to debate Bill C-74. The fishing industry is a major concern in my riding of Surrey North. I would like to talk about some of the reasons why it is so important to my riding.

As most people will know, the Fraser River is one of the borders of my riding and, of course, the Fraser River is the home of the world's largest salmon run. It is vital to the riding. We have a major Fraser River salmon fishing fleet that is tied up within the Fraser and the New Westminster docks, and the importance of that resource to the riding in economic terms is well known within the community.

We also have within Surrey a large number of offshore or deep sea fishermen who fish for cod, halibut, herring, and shellfish. The offshore fishermen established themselves in Surrey as a good family-oriented community where they could raise their families and invest in the future of the community. They have played a major part in the economic and cultural well-being of the riding.

In addition, we have a large number of people who work in the fish processing industry, both in the landing and processing of fish. Some of them work within the municipality and others work in Vancouver, Richmond, and particularly at Steveston.

Fourth, we have a large retail industry that is dependent upon the fishing industry by supplying gear and clothing and in terms of boat building and boat repair. All up and down the Fraser River there are small marinas that work on boats, both on the Fraser River boats and boats that go out into the Pacific Ocean.

Fifth and sixth, the Fraser River and the fishing industry is very important in terms of food supply. Increasingly Canadians have been turning to fish for a source of dietary protein. The consumption of fish in nearly all communities has increased dramatically over the last several years and as my colleague from Vancouver East mentioned earlier, there are certain types of fish, particularly cod, that have a great deal of importance to

the Asian community, not only as a food source for themselves but to the restaurant industry.

• (1600)

The Asian restaurant industry is a vital part of our tourist trade in Vancouver and on the lower mainland, so the community of Surrey has a vital stake in the fishing industry. It is important that that industry survive, prosper and grow.

Surrey is a family community. It does not have a large industrial base. It relies on small industry, on fishing, and it is in may ways a bedroom community for metropolitan Vancouver. The families there need the stability in order to ensure that they are able to pay their own mortgages, to provide the necessary income for the municipality in the form of taxes to operate our schools, and recreation facilities. Anything that threatens the viability of the fishing industry threatens the viability of Surrey itself.

We have a number of issues that right now are critical to the viability of that industry. Some relate to things that are taking place directly in Surrey. I will give one example called the Surrey Bend. It is a fish habitat area on the Fraser River. It is the last freshwater marsh on the Fraser River estuary and covers several hundreds of acres. It is a habitat for young fish fry coming down the Fraser River before they go out to sea. It is a source of nutrients. It is teeming with other wildlife and it is being threatened by industrial development that simply wants to backfill it for cheap industrial land.

The fisheries department has started to look at it, but even at this late date has not ordered a full environmental impact study. The municipality is desperately trying to rezone the land as environmental and recreational to prevent it.

This type of fish habitat is what Bill C–74 must protect. There are some good parts of this bill because it does talk about increasing the fines and getting better information necessary to protect the fish habitat. We also have a major problem of pollution on the Fraser River as it relates to fishing.

The quality of the water in the Fraser River by the time it reaches Surrey is no longer suitable for agricultural purposes. It threatens, according to people within the fisheries department, the survival rate of young fish stock.

The quality of water is damaged by upstream sewage being dumped into it. Some of that sewage is raw. Some has at least been given primary treatment. It is being polluted by pulp mills upstream at Prince George and Kamloops. At places in the Fraser River 2 per cent of the water is pulp mill effluence.

It is being threatened by lumber practices on the Fraser River, including log haulage and the dumping of hog fuel near it or along its banks with the leakage going into the Fraser River.

We have other major environmental threats to the Fraser River, including the diversion that Alcan is now undertaking on the Nechako River. This government, combined with the provincial government, has given them permission to go ahead without an environmental impact study on a diversion that is going to drop the level of the Fraser River three feet at Hell's Gate.

The damage to the fishing industry is totally unknown. We are threatening the whole viability of the Fraser River fishing industry by allowing Alcan to divert without an environmental assessment. It is all very nice for Bill C–74 to talk about the fact that it is going to increase penalties and allow for the collection of better information.

What we have seen repeatedly is this government and the provincial Socred government in British Columbia—which in B.C., we have learned, is what you get when you amalgamate the Tories and the Liberals—not enforcing the existing legislation that they have.

Under the B.C. Water Act, fish and wildlife are not even recognized as users of water. We have the federal government simply not even enforcing the powers that it now has.

Clearly, we have had examples in B.C. of the existing legislation not being used. I would like to quote from my Department of Fisheries and Oceans memo of November 1988:

> We—

This is DFO officials:

> —have determined that DFO friendly corporations enjoy relative immunity from the Fisheries Act.

The memo went on to state:

> It must be appreciated that DFO habitat enforcement has reached an all time inconsistency.

> Finally, it could appear that Alcan, amongst others, are given immunity from the law, and we are just going after the little guy.

Madam Speaker, they will go after somebody who has had a spill of minor proportions into the Fraser River and, at the same time, will allow Alcan without an environmental impact study to drop the level of the Fraser River three feet. You begin to realize why the people in the Department of Fisheries and Oceans became frustrated.

The federal government brought forward its much awaited green plan. We have been told that one of the priorities that was going to be addressed in the green plan was the Fraser River.

The green plan came forward. It has three quarters of one page that talks about in general, vague terms, doing something about the Fraser River in 1992.

This is in contrast to the NDP caucus report on the Fraser River that we brought forward on November 30 under the chairmanship of the member for Okanagan—Shuswap, which contained 50 pages on what had to be done immediately, and how it could proceed in terms of the Fraser River.

One wonders: Where is the commitment of the government when on three quarters of a page it talks of generalities and platitudes like monitoring, compliance and increasing enforcement measures.

• (1610 )

They do not even talk about when, how or where. It says that by 1992, mechanisms will be established for co-ordination.

In the NDP Fraser River task force recommendations were some details of how it could be done. We talked about an integrated management structure because that is one of the things that has to happen between provincial bodies, federal bodies and municipal bodies.

**Mr. Reid:** How much is that going to cost?

**Mr. Karpoff:** I do not care what it is going to cost. It is going to be a hell of a lot cheaper than losing that salmon industry.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Karpoff:** That is one of the things you guys over there better understand. The cost is not just simply in maintaining—

**An hon. member:** Tell the Tory to be quiet.

**Mr. Karpoff:** So you spend a billion dollars to save an industry that is vital to this country.

**An hon. member:** I don't mind. Do you?

**Mr. Karpoff:** No. One of the other things that the report by the New Democratic Party talked about was the need for a regional water management authority. There are a number of basins along the Fraser River. You cannot just talk about the Fraser River as if it is the lower estuary. You have to talk about a number of the other sub-basins along that river. You have to get water management authorities in each of those basins that have some co-ordinated plan.

**An hon. member:** How do you plan to do that?

**Mr. Karpoff:** Pollution abatement. This report goes into detail about how you have to get systematic pollution abatement going. It is simply not good enough to issue a three-quarter page statement that contains no content or clear picture of where they are going, and that certainly leaves people in British Columbia with a sense that there is no commitment from this government.

Another area that it talks about is industrial discharge. This is a serious problem. Yes, the cost is going to be high. There is no doubt of that, not only probably in direct money by the government, but to industries. Profitable industries are going to have to meet pollution standards. They are going to have to do it with enforcement.

The green plan presumes they are going to go along and everybody is going to co-operate. We have seen repeatedly in British Columbia where companies have simply looked at pollution fines as a licence to pollute. They are quite willing to pay the fines because they know that they are cheaper than putting in the pollution equipment.

**An hon. member:** Business as usual.

**Mr. Karpoff:** Sewage treatment. This government has been requested repeatedly by the Union of Mayors and Municipalities to make money available for municipal infrastructures, including sewage treatment. Many of the municipalities simply do not have the financial resources to bring sewage treatment up to the level necessary to save the Fraser River.

Habitat enhancement. I noticed this nice little statement in the green plan by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. He does not say when he is going to announce a

plan to increase the fish population of the river. He said: "The objectives will be achieved through stock rebuilding, protection of the habitat base". There is no talk about how they are going to protect the habitat base.

I at least hoped they would mention the Surrey Bend in there as one of the major habitat areas under threat. I do not even think that the government knows about the Surrey Bend and what the threat is or what impact it will have.

In conclusion, the New Democrats support some of the things in Bill C–74, but we are frightened that unless there is a change in the will of this government, something far more forthcoming than what has been vaguely outlined in the green plan, this bill is not going to protect the fish in the Fraser River or elsewhere. What is really needed in this country is the political will. I have not seen the political will in Bill C–74, or certainly not in the green plan.

**Mr. Cooper:** Madam Speaker, you will find consent for the following motion:

> That tomorrow at 5 p.m. debate on government business No. 25 and on any amendment thereto be deemed completed and voting on such be deemed deferred to 7 p.m. Monday, December 17.

**Mr. Dingwall:** Yes, Madam Speaker, there have been some discussions with the various House leaders of the respective parties, and we would grant our consent both to the introduction of the motion as well as its contents.

**Mr. Gardiner:** Madam Speaker, our party agrees with the motion as well.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Madam Speaker, I compliment the hon. member for Surrey North for putting some excellent comments on the record in terms of his concerns about Bill C–74, respecting fish habitat protection, and about the Fraser River, a major river in British Columbia. I know all members of this House are aware of it and how it relates so importantly to the questions we have been debating in this legislation.

The question or comment I would like to put to the member is actually a reference from a document to which I referred yesterday, I believe it was, in the House when we started debate on Bill C–74. This document has been prepared by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans on the Fraser River. I would like to read briefly from it and ask the hon. member to comment on it. I think it is an indication of what many of the witnesses had to say in committee on this bill and a lot of the comments members are making about the political will to ensure that the good deeds we are likely to pass today in this bill are in fact followed and carried out.

Page 18 of the report reviews the Fraser River. It takes a look at productivity in terms of salmon production of all species. It reviews from top to bottom some of the concerns of the department about the river. In fact, as I said yesterday, it is a very controversial document and actually a very revealing one.

I would like the hon. member to comment on the reporter wherein it refers to the Fraser River and the lower Fraser from Hope to New Westminster, that part of the river. It comments on the present status and reads: "The lower mainland supports over 50 per cent of the B.C. population and the impacts of constant industrial and urban development have taken a significant toll in production in many urban streams and the Fraser River foreshore. Past diking of rivers and hydro development has caused great losses to the resource".

There is the comment about the future of the river: "With present development practices a loss of salmon production in the urban areas will inevitably continue and the streams will eventually cease to be productive. Urban development, land use practices and technologies must change. All streams must be protected by buffer zones and not be considered storm sewers. Urban run-off must be treated".

Could the hon. member comment on that in relation to his experience with issues in his riding related to the Fraser River, on what the expectations may be arising out of Bill C–74, and if there are some hopes that the announcement of the green plan, if and when we get some specifics, may in fact result in some action from this government?

**Mr. Attewell:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I compliment the member for the way he spoke. It was very calm and I could hear. However, when the member for Surrey North replies, I wonder if he might just think of some of us. I must say, without any offence, that my ears are sore from his shouting. We have a very good sound system here. I went outside and turned down the TV when the member was speaking because it was too loud. He should feel free just to speak in a normal

tone, and we can listen. This is the season to be generous.

• (1620)

**Mr. Karpoff:** Madam Speaker, if that is the way to get the attention of Tories over there, I will speak even louder. It is time they started to listen. Once they start to listen, then maybe we can calm it down. One of the things that happen is that you guys don't listen unless someone somehow knocks you on the head.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order, order. The hon. member may want to address the Chair and not other hon. members directly.

**Mr. Karpoff:** Madam Speaker, one of the things I think my hon. friend from Prince George—Bulkley Valley mentioned is the question of political will. We in the New Democratic Party wonder about the political will, particularly when we look at the fact that on November 23 again there were cuts to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans amounting to $11 million, which certainly distract from its ability to carry out enforcement procedures.

My friend asked about problems in Surrey. When I first moved to Surrey many streams in Surrey municipality were salmon spawning streams. Salmon came up Bear Creek and some of the other small streams. Now it is very uncommon to see any salmon coming up those streams. They are lost in terms of salmon fishing.

Another thing that has happened is the loss of habitat. The habitat has been overtaken predominantly by industrial development along the foreshore of the Fraser River. Nearly 90 per cent of the foreshore has been expropriated by the CNR. It expropriated everything along the Fraser River from the Patella Bridge almost up to the Langley border, including putting in an interval yard adjacent to Surrey Bend, again without any assessment of the environmental damage.

The whole question of how to protect the habitat systematically, which has to be done stream by stream and foreshore by foreshore, is vital. As well we have to look at it industry by industry all the way from the headwaters down in terms of pollution.

**Mr. Lawrence MacAulay (Cardigan):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to participate in the third reading of Bill C–74.

We all know the troubles facing the fishing industry in this country. In Atlantic Canada there is a constant fear that tough times will become even tougher as we wait for the 1991 management plan. On the west coast many fishermen are terrified by the damage being done by the individual transferable quotas or ITQs.

The people of Atlantic Canada know what hard times are like. We had many hard times through the years, but in the last six years this government has certainly contributed to them, particularly in the fishing industry. When we look at the government cuts we look at ACOA, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and Marine Atlantic. A prime example of the government's inconsiderateness was the closure of CFB Summerside, a very important part of our economy and a way in which the government could stimulate the economy in Prince Edward Island. Without any thought at all it removed CFB Summerside, which was also used to patrol our coastal fishery.

Members of the Liberal Party welcomed the government announcement that it would increase penalties for fisheries offences. The minister of fisheries committed himself to stiffening the fines for people who violated the act by overfishing. The bill before the House today was a long time in coming, and we are glad to see it here. The bill goes a long way in addressing the needs of fishermen in all parts of the country. Despite this, the bill does not go far enough.

One of the biggest problems facing fishermen in my riding is the state of the wharfs and harbours in Prince Edward Island, and in particular in Cardigan. A wharf to a fisherman is like a hammer to the carpenter. If one removes the hammer, the carpenter cannot work. In this situation, we are not keeping the wharfs in shape and therefore we are hampering the fishermen in making a living in Atlantic Canada, particularly in Cardigan.

What are fishermen to do when the wharf walls and the cribbing are rotting away? This is the situation with many wharfs, like those at Beach Point, Fortune, Georgetown, Graham's Pond, Launching, Montague, Murray Harbour, Naufrage, and Savage Harbour. In Savage Harbour, two years ago, there was a problem with the breakwater. If $25,000 could have been spent in that area

at that time, the situation would have been rectified; but it has been let go on and on, and of course the bill has escalated. At Graham's Pond, we have the same situation. At that wharf the bill has now escalated to $1 million or $1 million plus. It is time that the government put some funding into wharf repair in Atlantic Canada.

When I was elected in 1988, I made it a priority to help fishermen get work done on their wharfs. I have to admit that we had very little success. As I said, a job which at that time would have been worth about $25,000 has now escalated to $300,000. If fishermen are to prosper in Prince Edward Island and in the rest of the country, we simply have to put more money into wharfs.

Something else which this bill does not address is the entire question of enforcement. True, there are clauses dealing with the power of the fisheries officers, but there is nothing dealing with the question of staffing. During the committee hearings on the bill there was almost total agreement among the witnesses that DFO was not adequately staffed.

One witness, Mr. Jim Rushton of United Fishermen and Allied Workers, said:

> There has been a consistent cutback over the last 10 years in the percentage of the budget for enforcement. That needs to be strengthened. A fine will not deter someone who believes they will not be caught.

It is obvious to all that the Department of Fisheries and Oceans is understaffed. There are fisheries officers working 20 hours a day. One witness told us of an area where there were two fisheries officers taking care of seven wharfs. I am sure that is the problem in many areas. There is just not enough staff to take care of doing the job properly.

If that were not bad enough, DFO is now faced with more budget cuts as a result of the government's poor fiscal management. A sum over $11 million has now been cut from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. Capital expenditures, travel costs and, more important, overtime may be cut back. Fisheries officers have a difficult enough time doing their jobs without more restraint. Fisheries officers truly know how important their jobs are but, if they cannot be paid, they cannot do their job.

Witnesses told the committee that problems also exist in our judicial system. Simply put, judges and Crown prosecutors do not place enough emphasis on crimes that occur off our shores. Many judges do not view fisheries violations as being crimes, but to me no other word fits.

What do we call it when a logging company drives a CAT tractor through the headwater of a river where salmon are spawning, destroying a rich and valuable resource? What do we call it when an outlawed fisherman catches 100,000 pounds over his quota, or when a boat captain assaults a fisheries officer who boards his vessel?

• (1630 )

Still others believe that Fisheries Act offences are victimless. What happens when a fisherman from Georgetown, Prince Edward Island has his quota cut simply because somebody else has overfished? In this situation, the fisherman from Georgetown is paying the penalty for the crime.

Also, in this situation there is less fish. The fish plant workers are cut back and, it is a direct slam on the economy of eastern Prince Edward Island.

Some witnesses questioned why there was not a whistle blower provision in the bill that would protect those people who report violations of the act. This would be especially true for employees of companies that break the law. Some protection should be given to these people. Even fishermen need protection when they report and testify against their fellow fishermen who have overfished or used undersized mesh. One witness, Mr. Evan Walters of the Scotia–Fundy Seashore Fishermen's Association suggested:

> Something that might do well is the Crime Stoppers system. We have been advocating this for two or three years now. We like this system of some financial reward. There is nothing like money to move the wheels of justice.

Mr. Walters pointed out a number of cases that he knew about where fishermen had sugar poured into their gas tanks or had their tires slashed. He told of one situation where a fisherman had his boat set on fire. These people need protection, and there is nothing in this bill to provide it.

During the committee hearings there was much talk about minimum fines and the like. A number of witnesses from the west coast suggested that they had no

problem with the idea. However, fishermen from the east coast were almost unanimous in their dislike of minimum fines.

It was suggested that Fisheries and Oceans should make better use of its power to suspend or cancel the licences of violators. It was believed that this was a much fairer way of dealing with the situation. Suspending a licence could be useful in dealing with the person who breaks the law just once, and the person who brazenly breaks the law every chance he can get. Basically the system would work like this.

A fisherman overfished his cod quota in 1990 by 5,000 pounds and is convicted. In 1991 his licence would be suspended for a period of time that would be equivalent to fishing that amount of fish or more, which would include a fine above the total amount of the catch. This punishment would fit the crime. If a fisherman catches too much this year, then he loses it the next year.

As we all know, this bill is part and parcel of the fisheries aid package that the Minister of Fisheries announced back in May. It is a part of the government's over-all plan of helping the Atlantic fishing industry, flowing from the Haché and Harris reports. The studies done by these two men have been helpful in outlining some of the many problems faced in the Scotia-Fundy and Newfoundland regions of DFO. However, there has been no study done in the Gulf region.

The fishery in the Gulf of St. Lawrence is in a desperate state. In some parts the groundfish stocks have all but disappeared, leaving fishermen and communities in a desperate state. This government has not taken any action to help find solutions to the problems in the Gulf fishery. Until something is done, the situation will only get worse. While the government should help those communities suffering from the declines in the northern cod, it also should be working on the prevention of a total collapse in the stocks of the Gulf, including groundfish and crab.

I certainly would not want to give the impression that there was nothing positive about this bill. There are some giant steps forward, especially in the area of fish habitat protection. Before this bill, the maximum penalty for the destruction of fish habitat was $10,000. This is less than the cost of doing business. To put it another way, a $10,000 fine would be equivalent to the cost of a few paper clips for the government. Those sections of the Fisheries Act were basically not adhered to at all. However, the fines have been increased to $1 million for some serious charges. This is certainly going to show the violators that the government is serious in protecting the fish habitat and that their actions certainly will not be tolerated.

The provisions for the charging of company officers for the violations of their employees is also an important advance. With this new section, corporate officials of Nat Sea, British Columbia Packers or MacMillan Bloedel will have to deal with the possibility that they can be charged if they allow for the destruction of fish habitat, or allow a fishing captain to overcatch his quota.

This bill also allows the courts to impose what are called alternative measures at the time of sentencing. The court can order a person to perform community service, have the person publish the details of the offence or order them to restore a disturbed site. In the fish habitat area, if someone goes in with a bulldozer or whatever, he will be forced to repair the damage. This is a very positive part of the bill.

These provisions will allow the government to properly manage our valuable fish resources. However, if the government is truly committed to preserving our fish stocks, and a way of life for hundreds of thousands of Canadians, it must give Fisheries and Oceans the dollars to do the job. Cutting $11 million from the budget is certainly not the way to help Fisheries and Oceans do their job. Fines are very important. We must show that we are going to stop the violators but we also show the violators we have the means to stop them. We are putting the funds in the area and we will have the officers and enough equipment to patrol the coast. But in this situation we do not.

The government has to be prepared to educate the judiciary so that judges are aware of how serious violations of the Fisheries Act are. If the government does not act on this and the recommendations of committee witnesses, then it has to be prepared to deal with the total destruction of a 400-year old way of life in Canada.

I urge the government to put the necessary extra funding back into DFO. Let us repair the wharfs and put them in a proper state. I mentioned Savage Harbour. At Fortune it is not safe to drive a fishing vessel alongside

the wharf. There is debris sticking out and a vessel could be destroyed. It is going to get worse as time goes on. We need to spend the dollars now. If a window blows out of a building and we do not repair it and a door blows off, after a while the building will fall down. If we put a few dollars into wharf repair now, we will have the wharfs in a proper condition and the fishermen of Atlantic Canada will at least be able to fish.

**Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment my colleague from Cardigan for a very balanced and comprehensive overview of this legislation and of many other matters affecting fisheries policy.

I would also like to pay tribute to his excellent work on the committee studying Bill C–74. As other members who participated in that committee will know, he was a very diligent and hard working member. He spoke well on behalf of the fishermen in his riding and indeed, of all the Gulf of St. Lawrence region.

• (1640 )

I would like to note as well that he moved an amendment to this legislation which would have provided additional protection for lobster fishermen. That amendment, had the government seen fit to accept it—I still do not understand why they would not—would have benefited not only the fishermen in his area but the lobster fishermen in my area as well.

Indeed, the member mentioned a number of points of concern in his remarks on which I would ask him to embellish if he would. As he said, we support the principle of higher, more stringent fines for fisheries violations, particularly in this time when the resource has been declining and where the consequences for this industry are dramatic.

There remains a concern, particularly with the resource declining, of the application of these fines and especially of the fact that it seems that those most vulnerable will be the inshore fishermen. I want to ask the member, particularly with his great knowledge of the inshore fishery in his area, whether he believes that the act by itself will be sufficient to protect those inshore fishermen.

Also, in his opening remarks he mentioned the individual transferable quotas, which was a recommendation of the Haché task force, concerning the licensing for a large segment of the fishery. He made a point that I think is very relevant not only to the immediate debate of Bill C–74 but to fisheries policies in general. These individual transferable quotas, if not properly regulated, can have a devastating effect on the smaller fisherman who will be facing reduced catches. The quota will not be enough for the small fisherman to survive. Consequently we will see a gradual buying out of the smaller fisherman by larger fishing firms. I would like to ask the member for Cardigan if that is not a fear that he has about the fishermen in his area with respect to this individual transferable quota and other policies of this government.

Finally, the hon. member made a plea for greater expenditure on wharf construction. I could not agree with him more, but I also want to note that part of this government's plan has been the fisheries adjustment package which if my memory serves me right has not been of great value to the fishermen of Prince Edward Island. Perhaps he would like to comment on that as well.

**Mr. MacAulay:** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague from Cape Breton. Of course we are very concerned about individual transferable quotas and that the fishery will be swallowed up by larger companies. Fines are adequate, but the problem is that we do not have DFO properly staffed to take care of the offshore. One of the prime examples would be in our area when Summerside air force base was closed, and the Tracker aircraft removed. This was something that should not have happened.

Concerning wharf repair in my district, I could go on for the day. It is a continuous battle to get a small amount of wharf repair, even general maintenance, in Cardigan in particular. For example, a $25,000 job after just one windstorm can become a $300,000 job. Shortly after that it becomes a million dollar job. If the fishermen do not have wharfs, there is no fishery.

Without a doubt we support the bill. But we need money for DFO and we need more wharf repair.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Madam Speaker, I am delighted to have an opportunity to participate in this rather rare moment of support for government legisla–

tion, in this case regarding this very important bill, Bill C-74.

At the outset I want to say that my colleagues and I certainly do support this legislation in terms of recognizing the advantage of increasing the level of fines associated with convictions for general fishing offences as well as fisheries habitat offences. This is a move in the right direction, particularly when we look at the evidence. It is actually quite staggering. I have often wondered when one offends fisheries habitat, what is the cost? Is there a cost attached to it, if one is offending the fisheries generally?

The statistics that we were presented are from 1988, but it is fair to say that today it would be somewhat similar. In 1988, for the Pacific region alone, the convictions totalled 1,959, amounting to $320,000 in fines. The average fine for a general fishing offence was $266 and for the average sports fishing offence, the fine was $90. This seems to be rather weak. The telling aspect was that habitat convictions totalled 11, with an average fine of $3,135. In other words, out of all of the convictions of nearly 2,000, only 11 were the result of habitat problems. This comes at a time when we are concerned about the environment and reminds us all of too many scenes that we have seen.

I, for one, time and time again, have wandered up streams or canoed along lakes, only to notice that logging shows have been clear-cut in terms of whole mountainsides. We can argue the merit of that on a site-by-site basis, but we all know that when one logs a mountainside or a hillside down into a lake where fish are found, a band of trees is supposed to be left along the edge in order to protect the fisheries habitat. Often that is not the case. The logging takes place right into the river, right into the stream bed, or right into the lake.

The company then is caught. It is fined $3,135 if it is caught. Of course, that is the cost of one good B.C. tree. When a mile of lakefront is harvested, we can see very quickly that a company would reap literally hundreds of thousands of dollars from that resource and in the process destroy what could be a very important fisheries habitat.

This legislation moves us now in the right direction. I think my colleagues would agree by saying that if one carries out fisheries habitat destruction, was caught, and had to pay a hefty fine, then so one should.

I want to congratulate my hon. friend for Prince George—Bulkley Valley. He put forward two very thoughtful amendments in the discussions in committee. They were some of the most thoughtful amendments I have ever witnessed while I have been a member of the House of Commons.

The first, for example, is an amendment that would fine an individual or a company guilty of a habitat infraction. Not only would they be fined appropriately—that is the minimum—but, if the court so ordered, but they would have to pay for the promotion of proper management and control of fisheries or fish habitat. We would be saying to the company: "Listen, you have carried out a dastardly deed in terms of the fishery habitat. While you probably should be serving 15 years in jail for this horrible offence against the environment, we as a court are going to say that you need to go out into the community and carry on a process to educate and demonstrate that you clearly understand what the offence of which you have been convicted." In a sense, it would help educate the public generally. I think it is an excellent amendment and I congratulate my colleague for that thoughtful interjection.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

• (1650 )

**Mr. Riis:** While I am dealing with the excellent amendments that my colleague from Prince George—Bulkley Valley made, I will go on to one other very important issue which is the requirement that of the government, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, file with the Parliament of Canada on an annual basis a report that lists all of the convictions that have occurred in the previous year in terms of convictions regarding fisheries habitat destruction so that we, as members of Parliament, can be appraised annually of the work being done.

It is not because we do not trust the government. Probably we do not trust the government, but in terms of individuals within the cabinet, we can say, sure, there are honourable people there. We are going to look to the minister responsible for the fisheries habitat and say, on an annual basis, we will be waiting with bated breath—no pun intended—for this report so that we can see that things have changed. If we find out that in a year only 11 convictions occurred as a result of the fisheries habitat, we will be very disappointed. We would then like to point

out that in fact the minister and the department have not lived up to the obligations of this legislation.

I think it is a nice watch-dog situation. This of course will be ongoing from government to government in the future. Again, it is an excellent initiative by the hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley.

Once again, Madam Speaker, I want to refer you to the work that has been recently completed by the federal New Democrats in terms of a task force on the Fraser River. We recognize this as the jewel in the British Columbia crown. Here is a river that makes sense for so many reasons, not least of which is the sports and commercial fishery attached to it, but of course the fact that it is the unifying ecological element that provides life for so much of the province of British Columbia, draining about one-third of that province.

Under the chairmanship of the hon. member for Okanagan—Shuswap, a number of New Democrat colleagues who have been studying the entire watershed of the Fraser. This has been done for the first time. An excellent job was done by some very dedicated members of Parliament holding hearings throughout the region. This is on an ongoing basis. It will occur in the future as well to try to understand clearly all the implications in terms of the problems and challenges associated with that watershed.

Part of the hearings revealed an excellent presentation by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans from the Pacific Region. It presented a paper entitled, *The Fraser: A River of Opportunity*, in which it points out throughout the entire drainage some very serious concerns. I want to raise these today briefly, if I have time.

For the Thompson-Nicola system, mainly of course recognizing the production of chinook, coho, and pink salmon, the officials indicate in the paper that its present status is:

> An area of severe-water use conflicts that significantly impacts production due to physical destruction of the habitat (e.g. water diversions, channelization, etc.) low flows and high temperatures.

The paper continues:

> Water management legislation does not recognize fish as a legitimate user of water. Water quality impacts originating at Kamloops (i.e. sewage and pulpmill) make this area one of the three largest water quality hotspots on the entire Fraser River (in addition to the Prince George-Quesnel and [the greater Vancouver regional district areas]). Recent co-operative efforts have been made on the Bonaparte, Nicola and Deadman Rivers to restore or develop production through habitat improvement and better water management. Impacts of the Coquihalla Highway have been mitigated.

I want to take this opportunity to recognize the superb work being done by the tribal council and the Indian bands in the central interior in terms of taking the leadership in providing enhanced habitat for the fishery to the extent of developing their own nurseries. The native people of the area need to be commended for the leadership that they provided in developing fishery stocks of one kind or another in the area.

The report continues:

> This is an area where greater water use conflicts will occur. The inadequacy of water rights legislation must be addressed. Encroachment of linear facilities (highways, pipelines and railways) into habitat and salmon migration pathways are of concern and must be closely controlled.

Now, this becomes very scary. It continues:

> A large unstable rock cliff will eventually result in a slide at Black Canyon on the Thompson River. This is a special concern due to its inevitability and the potential to block the river.

This is almost a shocking revelation and something we have to address very seriously.

You will recall, I am sure, Madam Speaker, being a student of geology, that back in geologic time that particular part of the river was actually dammed off as a result of a major shift of glacial till into the valley and the entire system reversed and ran down through the Okanagan Valley. Over time, erosion occurred and the Thompson River now flows into the Fraser River and becomes part of that great drainage basin.

In passing, I should also mention that with regard to the North Thompson-Shuswap system, again recognizing the production of sockeye, chinook, coho and pink, the report states:

> The habitat basin in this area is under very great pressure from forest harvesting, wood processing, urbanization, recreation, agriculture, water diversion and flood control. Low flows, high temperatures and water quality are constant limitations to fish production in many streams. Shuswap Lake is one of the most important sockeye production lakes in B.C. However, it has been subjected to the greatest developmental pressures of all B.C. sockeye producers. The invasion of the aquatic nuisance plant Eurasian Milfoil into this system is also of concern to salmon habitat.

With regard to the future, the report states:

> In that logging, industrial and urban development has advanced in an unplanned manner—

—in other words, haphazard and chaotic—

> —this area could greatly benefit from a comprehensive land-use plan.

**An hon. member:** A SoCred manner.

**Mr. Riis:** Well, my hon. colleague says that this is often the way the Socreds approach development throughout the province. I am pleased to say that the regional district of that area has now taken the task upon itself to ensure that comprehensive land use planning occurs in a thoughtful manner in the future.

The report continues:

> Resolution of water conflicts and removal of the very old and obsolete Hydro Dam on the middle Shuswap River would increase fish production substantially. Intensive large scale agricultural activities with major water demands or effluent production must be isolated from the streams. Many opportunities exist for habitat restoration.

Anyone from that area would be very familiar with that.

Last, I want to refer to the North Thompson system. This is a system that is valuable in terms of the production of sockeye, chinook and coho salmon. Of course, I am just referring to the salmon. I could refer to the great and famous Kamloops trout that is found throughout this entire area. It is important particularly in terms of the sports fishery.

With regard to the present status of the North Thompson system, the report states:

> Streams flowing into the lower North Thompson River are under water-use pressures—from agriculture. Logging is the most widespread concern in the watershed.

This is particularly as a result of some clear-cut practices that are open to some serious question. I am pleased to say that the Canadian National twin-tracking impact has been mitigated.

For the future, the report states:

> Forest harvesting practices must be improved in order to protect the [fisheries] habitat. Water-use conflicts in the lower basin area must be resolved with the Province.

I could go on and on in some detail, Madam Speaker, but I simply want to say that this aspect of the report by the New Democratic Party Fraser River Task Force entitled, *The Fraser River Under Siege* and chaired by the hon. member for Okanagan-Shuswap makes these points. Of course, if anybody is interested in copies of this, they are certainly available.

I would be remiss, however, if I did not refer to the serious challenges facing steelhead in the Thompson Basin, particularly north and south of the Spences Bridge area. Not many years ago there used to be 20,000 or more steelhead in the area which, of course, was the basis for a major sports fishery. I have had the experience and pleasure of participating in steelhead fishing in the past myself and must say today things have changed dramatically. There are not 20,000 steelhead in the river any longer, there are fewer than 1,500. Just a few weeks ago, the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans allowed commercial salmon fishermen to set their nets during the height of the Thompson River run and an estimated 600 steelhead were killed in the fishery which was meant to harvest surplus chum salmon in the lower Fraser Valley. They assumed that only 15 steelhead would be lost but 600 were lost. There is a real fear now in the area that the steelhead run itself may even face extinction as a result of this unfortunate incident.

• (1700)

As a result, much of the interior hospitality industry which is dependent in this season on the steelhead run is literally going out of business. Many places have had to close because the fishermen and fisherwomen simply are not there because the fish are not there. I am disappointed personally because, not being the greatest fisherman, and because of the number, I will probably not catch any this year.

In closing, I want to say that we support Bill C-74 and will vote in favour of it. We will be watching the government closely to ensure that this whole matter of enhanced convictions, if you like, in terms of fines for general offences and especially fisheries habitat offences is an important step in the right direction. We will be watching the government as a result of my colleague's amendment, which will require annual reports to Parliament, in terms of the number of convictions associated with habitat destruction. I hope this will ensure that the Canadian fishery will advance in terms of increasing stocks and a more sophisticated use in terms of fisheries management.

**Mr. Rex Crawford (Kent):** Madam Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise in the House today and give my comments on Bill C-74, an act to amend the Fisheries Act. I am also pleased that, as a member from southern Ontario, my colleagues have given me the

opportunity to speak on this bill, which affects our major fishing resources on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

We must not forget the fishing areas of our Great Lakes. Indeed, Lake Erie is well known for Olmstead Fisheries, which is the largest inland freshwater fishery in the world. Mr. LaVerne Kelly is just one person keenly interested in this bill. He is a fisheries inspector. As well, I am no stranger to fishing, Madam Speaker. The St. Clair River, the Chenal Ecarte, Mitchell's Bay, and Lake St. Clair are excellent areas for fishing, in fact the finest fishing in North America. I have been on the water many, many times.

In dealing with Bill C–74, as my Liberal colleagues from the maritimes have noted, we generally support the principle of the new penalties contained in the new legislation. But there are areas of concern. For example, most of the current surveillance effort is concentrated on the inshore sector. And the new resources provided for in the adjustment program are geared toward the inshore sector as well.

It stands to reason that those who will be caught will be overwhelmingly from the inshore sector. Let us look at the penalties. For a general fisheries offence and obstruction of a fishery officer, there is a fine of up to $100,000 on summary conviction and up to $500,000 on indictment, with options of jail terms for one and two years. The alteration of a fish habitat and pollution of a fish habitat are liable to a $300,000 fine, and up to $1 million on indictment, with options of imprisonment for six months to three years.

As well, Madam Speaker, the failure to provide habitat information could mean up to a $200,000 fine on summary conviction, and a court option of six months in jail for a second and for later offences.

These fines and penalties are important. Everyone would agree. Both the Harris and Haché reports recommended amendments to the Fisheries Act to increase fines and penalties for such violations.

These proposals were also part of the Atlantic Fisheries Adjustment Program released on May 7, 1990.

Those documents stated in part: "all the surveillance and enforcement in the world will not contribute to rebuilding the fish stocks, if those who break the law face fines that are considered the cost of doing business."

That says it in a nutshell. There must be a deterrence factor involved here. These higher fines and penalties will bring the Fisheries Act in line with deterrents contained in the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act and the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

As an aside, I could go on for hours about the Tories' Environmental Protection Act and how weak and feeble and gutless it is.

As we have seen from the minister when he presented his green plan to the House, the only thing good about it is that it is recyclable.

As we have seen, because I raised it in the House with the former Minister of the Environment, only 3 per cent of polluters were charged last year, and there is only one lonely Environment Canada inspector for all of Ontario.

Meanwhile, the government opposite will hire 4,000 new bureaucrats for the GST to make sure that ordinary Canadians comply with the tax rules.

And yet our environmental rules are not being enforced. It is my sincere hope that the new Fisheries Act does not follow the poor lead of this government's Environmental Protection Act. It is all words and no action. Let us hope that the legislation is followed to the letter.

Indeed, during committee hearings on this bill, Mr. Jim Rushton, of the United Fishermen and Allied Workers Union stated: "There has been a consistent cutback over the last 10 years in the percentage of the budget for enforcement. That needs to be strengthened. A fine will not deter someone who believes they will not get caught."

I have stated how most of the surveillance effort will be concentrated on the inshore fisheries. What about offshore?

We saw the embarrassing example last year of an American trawler ramming one of our navy ships in the Atlantic, and then hightailing it back to the east coast of the U.S.

Let us hope that never happens again. I know that my colleague from Bonavista—Trinity—Conception has very strong views on that particular matter.

Overfishing is a chronic concern; the government never seems to put its money where its mouth is.

While tougher penalties are necessary, will the proposed legislation accomplish what it is intended to do? If we use the Environmental Protection Act as a guide, as an example of this government's commitment, then the new penalties in the Fisheries Act may just be words, just rhetoric, just promises.

Fishermen and all Canadians want action, not just public relations. While the government blows its horn on how wonderful the fines are, the proof will be in the results.

The government still lacks a comprehensive strategy to apprehend foreign violators, particularly American fishermen on the Canadian side of Georges Bank.

The proposed act will also require fishermen and processors to keep more detailed records. As well, fisheries officers will be given new powers to verify and seize such information. Penalties will be levied against those who fail to produce this information on request.

The bookkeeping requirements of Bill C–74 are extremely stringent.

For instance, Section 61(2) states that fishermen and purchasers may be required to keep records of the number, sex, size, weight, species, product form or other particulars of any fish caught.

Other information required will include the time and place of landings and type of gear, buildings and other equipment.

At first glance, that requirement seems overly draconian for our small, independent fishermen who are just trying to make a living in difficult circumstances.

Section 49 provides for inspection powers for fishery officers to examine records and books of account to verify information, but that is overkill for our fishermen.

I wonder if it is not too much to ask from them. It can be very time consuming for small companies to be audited in such a manner. Sections 78(2) and 78(3) could be seen as unreasonable. The terms of these sections must protect the innocent parties and convict with the full force of the law the guilty ones.

• (1710)

The current resources and personnel needed to enforce the new Fisheries Act are greatly lacking. As Evan Walters of the Scotia–Fundy Seashore Fishermen's Association told the committee: "There are 7 wharfs in my area, and they have 2 fisheries officers. We're back to 20 hours a day."

The government must commit new funds, more surveillance vessels and additional personnel to ensure that the provisions of this new act are executed.

While the increase in maximum fines will discourage illegal fishing, such a measure remains incomplete without the proper enforcement resources. It is unclear as well that given the hike in fines, minor offences could put small fishermen out of business. Many small operators are worried about the unequal treatment of enforcement.

Will they be fined as much as the big companies for the same offence? For large companies, a fine may just be the cost of doing business. The bill only points out the maximum penalty possible. There should also be a minimum fine.

Judges have a tendency to give lower fines; without any guidelines, the minimum practice is likely to continue. We must make sure that the fines are superior to the licensing fees. I quote Mr. Walters again: "The deterrent effect on this bill is and will only be as good as the determination and dedication of the judicial system."

On another issue, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans is proposing that his new act will be part of the solution to many of the fisheries' current problems. He then concedes that more must be done for the conservation of stocks. Surveillance is a step in the right direction, but it is not the only answer to all of the problems for the modern fishing industry.

I would like to conclude by stating again that we on this side of the House, led by our fisheries critic, are in general support of the principles of Bill C–74. My only hope is that the new enforcement regulations, such as the three charter patrol vessels announced on October 2 of this year, do not follow the poor lead of the current Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

Our fishing industry is in dire straits. The maritime provinces and the west coast depend on a successful and productive fishing industry. We need leadership on this issue. We have a lot of work to do.

As a member from southwestern Ontario, my riding knows the importance of the fishing industry. Fishermen are the "farmers of the sea", who have to deal with not only mother nature, but varying prices and depleted stocks.

Let us support our fishermen.

**Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls):** Madam Speaker, this bill before the House of Commons does a lot of things that have not been mentioned in the House. One of the things is that in clause 3 of the bill, it removes sections 10 and 11 of the Fisheries Act. It throws that out. It removes it. It takes it out of the law of Canada.

For the record, Madam Speaker, I would like to tell you what these two sections are. The first section reads: "No one shall, with boat or vessel or in any other way during the time of hunting for seals, knowingly or wilfully disturb, obstruct or interfere with any seal hunting area or prevent or impede the shoals of seals from coming into that area or knowingly or wilfully frighten those shoals."

That is section 10. That has been taken out. Section 11 in the act—it is the law of Canada—is now being removed by this bill before the House. The first section reads:

> Clause 3: The heading preceding section 10 and sections 10 to 16 of the said Act are repealed.

There is no reference to what is in those sections. The House has heard about the first section that is being removed. The second section reads:

> Clause 3: The heading preceding section 10 and sections 10 to 16 read as follows:
>
> 11.(1) Disputes between occupiers of seal hunting areas concerning limits and the method of hunting or setting nets shall be decided summarily by an fishery officer or justice of the peace.
>
> (2) A fishery officer or justice of the peace may appoint arbitrators to assess damages in respect of a dispute—

Then it goes on and on. The NDP should be very happy that this is being removed from the bill, because it was the NDP that objected in 1977 when it was included in the bill. It was its critic, Mr. Stuart Leggatt from New Westminster whom we all remember—

**Mr. Reid:** Justice Leggatt. He was appointed to the bench.

**Mr. Baker:** The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans tells me that he has been appointed to the bench in British Columbia. He spoke on behalf of the NDP at that time. He said, as reported at page 7157 of *Hansard* for June 28, 1977:

> I am opposed to the amendment, not because I am opposed to the seal hunt but because we have nothing to hide and it seems to me the amendment is designed to prevent complete media coverage of the hunt.

That is the first point that should be made about this legislation. I do not now how to describe my dismay in reading this bill before the House.

The gentleman who was pushed for and tried to help the poor people all along the east coast of Canada is the member for Labrador. He is in the House today. He was the one, over all those years, who would stand and move amendments to legislation. Although the government of which he was a part had a bill before the House, he would stand to protect those people who needed income from the seal hunt. It was gratifying to see. He had his motions seconded by an hon. member from the west coast, Senator Marshall, a Tory. They joined forces.

• (1720)

The only objectors were of course members of the NDP. The only people who would not support the motions were members of the NDP. That is why they can stand in this Chamber without mentioning how delighted they are whenever a change is made that will sweep the seal hunters out into the cold, all those people in northern areas of Canada.

I do not know how the government can increase fines for Canadian fishermen when it has given in five different ways this year licences to foreign nations to fish our fish stocks within the 200-mile zone. I have here the foreign allocation summary of Canadian managed stocks, published this month by the department of fisheries: cod, 2G and 2H, Labrador, Faro Island, 2,000 tonnes; France, 4,500 tonnes; German Democratic Republic, 450 tonnes; Norway, 1,820 tonnes; Poland, 725 tonnes; U.S.S.R., 1,635 tonnes.

It goes right down the coast, and then we can go to 4Vn. That is an interesting area. That is Cape Breton Island. We see allocations for redfish and for cod, because of the special agreement with France. We have

redfish and Greenland halibut which is the same as turbot.

**Mr. Reid:** It is not the same as turbot.

**Mr. Baker:** The hon. gentleman says: "It is not the same as turbot". I might take a little time to explain to him. The scientific name for Greenland halibut is reinhardtius, and that is spelled r-e-i-n-h-a-r-d-t-i-u-s. The scientific name for halibut is hippoglossius, and that is spelled h-i-p-p-o-g-l-o-s-s-i-u-s. The scientific name for Greenland halibut caught off the east coast of Canada is reinhardtius hippoglossius, a combination of the two. It formed the basis of court challenges in Oregon, Massachusetts, Washington, and Alaska. It is defined today by the department of fisheries in schedule 1 of the Fisheries Act as No. 10, under groundfish, Greenland halibut (turbot). I will give the hon. member a copy of it. In fact I have it here, enlarged for him. One is a smaller copy and the other is an enlarged copy. I would like to table it so the hon. member can read it at his discretion.

As I was saying, according to Fisheries and Oceans, we have in Canadian managed stocks for December of this year a total in squid, capelin, Argentine, silver hake, grenadier, witch, Greenland halibut, turbot, redfish, and cod of 206,937 tonnes allocated to foreign countries inside the 200-mile zone, while the Canadian allocation is 637,000 tonnes, of which 109,000 is squid. Almost half of the Canadian allocation is assigned to foreign nations inside the 200-mile zone. As if that were not bad enough—and that is under Canadian managed stocks—let us turn to another way that foreigners get inside the 200-mile zone. That is 200,000 tonnes of groundfish under our management plan. They also got for 1991 from the Government of Canada another way of getting in under NAFO.

This has not been announced publicly, but here it is. I will table it. First, there is a new zone opened in Canada for codfish this year. It is called the Flemish Cap. It was always restricted fishing. There was a moratorium on the Flemish Cap outside the 200-mile zone because it is a spawning ground. But this year Canada has agreed to give on January 1, 1991 an allocation of 12,900 tonnes of cod for fishing. Of the 12,965 tonnes of cod, Canada has agreed that Canadians can fish 100 tonnes, 100 of 12,965 tonnes.

Canadians could not take any because Canadians would have been arrested. Canadians can now take only 100 tonnes, while Cuba gets 480 tonnes. This is agreed to by the Government of Canada. Denmark gets 2,900 tonnes; Canada gets 100 tonnes. The EEC gets 6,465 tonnes; we get only 100 tonnes. Norway gets 1,200 tonnes; we get only 100 tonnes. Poland gets 500 tonnes; we get only 100 tonnes. The U.S.S.R. gets 1,270 tonnes; we get only 100 tonnes. There is another specification that is called others. Others get 50 tonnes.

That is the second way that they get fish. 3L-N, that is a trans-border stock. That is inside and outside, 3L-N. Cuba, G.D.R., the U.S.S.R. 6,104 tonnes; others, 86. 3L-N-O, American place. It is a magnificent fish. Yellowtail, that sounds like the government. Yellowtail flounder, 3L-N-O, EEC; again other nations. 3N-O, capelin; Cuba, EEC, Japan, Norway, Poland, and U.S.S.R. Then squid in 3 and 4 along the coast of Canada, the coast of Nova Scotia mainly, a great province with great fishermen.

The squid try to get up that coast every year on July 1. Every July 1, Cuba, U.S.S.R. and other nations have the highway, the 401 of the squid, blocked off with nets assigned by the Government of Canada inside the 200-mile zone. The fishermen of Nova Scotia want that squid inshore for their fish. For the first time in Canadian history this year, this summer, in Sydney Bite, an area just outside Sydney, I suppose northeast or north north by east from Sydney to Newfoundland, that is the way the fishing zone was. Belgium was allowed to fish there this year. We have all those fishermen in P.E.I., New Brunswick, Quebec and Nova Scotia trying to sell mackerel and cannot sell it, needing mackerel for bait for their lobsters and everything else. This year for the first time in Canadian history in Sydney Bite and all along Nova Scotia, what did we have? We had four Bulgarian factory freezer trawlers catching mackerel. On what kind of a deal? The deal gave them 5,000 tonnes if they turned around and worked at 1,000 tonnes ashore. These are precedents. That is the second way they can get quotas.

• (1730)

There are five ways to get quotas. I am going to have to be quick about this. The third way is by international agreement. Every single fisherman in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland and Quebec is demanding more tuna licences. There is no problem getting a tuna licence in Canada. All that is

needed is a Japanese boat. Japan this year licensed 25 of their vessels in Halifax to fish tuna. They had a higher bi-catch of bluefin than we had total quota on the Virgin Rocks. That is by international agreement.

Then there are special agreements. We cannot get a capelin licence. I would be arrested if I went down and fished capelin. Any member of Parliament would, any Canadian would. There is a freeze on groundfish licences in 2J, 3K, 3L and 3Ps right now. Not a person, not even a fisherman, can get a groundfish licence if he does not have one. I cannot get a capelin licence but the Soviet Union this year by this special arrangement were not only given 32,000 tonnes of capelin in 3N and 3-O off the east coast and 21,000 tonnes in 3K off the northeast coast, but they were given an additional 50,000 tonnes. That is 100,000 tonnes. That is 200 million pounds inside Canada's 200-mile zone.

Here we are today talking about increasing penalties to Canadians for bringing in fish.

Madam Speaker, I can see that you want me to sit down.

**Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak in favour of Bill C-74, an act to amend the Fisheries Act and the Criminal Code.

It was interesting to hear the previous speaker from the Liberal side make comments about one of my predecessors, the Hon. Judge Stuart Leggatt who was a distinguished member of this Chamber and was a very well-known and well-respected British Columbian. I am proud to follow after him and after Pauline Jewett in the riding of New Westminster.

Amendments to the Fisheries Act are urgently needed and long overdue. In the past, penalty and enforcement provisions were sadly lacking. Fisheries is a very important industry in my province of British Columbia and Bill C-74 is a step towards protecting fisheries in B.C., as it does increase fines for those fishing illegally or those who contaminate our fish habitat. It strengthens the Department of Fisheries and Oceans' ability to collect data and broadens the investigative powers of fisheries officers.

I know of the hard and somewhat frustrating work of fisheries officers in enforcement and how frustrated they have been in the past when the enforcement mechanisms have not been properly used. Several clauses in this bill do address that matter. Of what use is legislation if there is no mechanism to enforce it?

We know that toothless legislation has often been tabled by this government, so we are pleased to see that Bill C-74 does have some strength. I only hope that it will be enforced. It is not just simply a matter of policing.

The changes also help in the collection of data. We all know that effective data is very necessary in the management of our fishing resources. This bill will improve data collection. We will have better records of the species of fish that are caught. They must now be given to a fisheries officer on request.

We are entering a new era with a different approach. Canadians want to approach our environment in a responsible manner. The people who make their livelihood from our seas and rivers are no exception. They have often been at the forefront in demanding effective environmental controls, because they know that without them the resources will not be there for future workers, and in fact, for themselves.

They also understand that the collection of data is important. Unfortunately, for many of the people who work on the seas and rivers this will be somewhat of an additional burden. We know that the fishing industry has been under a heavy burden lately.

There have been trade disputes that have been decided in favour of the U.S. There has been overfishing, as was so dramatically mentioned a few minutes ago. There have been cuts to the unemployment insurance program that have had a detrimental effect on those in the fishing industry. The additional cost may be a significant factor for some of the small fishermen.

My main interests are the clauses that affect protection of fisheries and the environment. This has been of special interest in my own province of British Columbia. Earlier this week we saw the Social Credit minister of the environment resign because he did not have the support of the premier in British Columbia to bring in controls over the pulp industry which is one of the main polluters of the rivers in B.C. Many of us wonder if this is the first statement in the opening of another leadership

contest in the province of B.C. in the Social Credit Party. I guess those events will unfold as they might.

Environment has always been a very key concern to British Columbians. Governments at the provincial, federal and even at the municipal level have not been keeping pace with what individuals want, what average British Columbians want, in terms of protection for our environment. We all know and understand that people are leaving government on the issue of a safe and clean environment.

Clause 10 in this bill increases the penalties for harmful alteration, disruption or destruction of fish habitat caused by the carrying on of any work or undertaking. A summary conviction rises from $5,000 to not exceeding $300,000 with subsequent offences carrying that fine or imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both. The penalty for the first indictable offence is also increased to a fine not to exceed $1 million or a term not over three years, or both.

We see the maximum penalties being increased, and what we want to see further is that the provisions in this act will be enforced and taken seriously. We know that we have had regulations in place in the past that have not been adhered to. The penalties have not been used to ensure correct fishing methods and sense of caring about our environment.

In the New Democratic Party we say that polluters must pay for the damage they cause, so I am pleased that the government has incorporated two amendments to Bill C-74 for this third reading.

Both of these amendments were presented by my colleague, the member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley. I want to congratulate him for his effective work in the committee and his ability to bring the amendments through to third reading. It will make this bill much more effective.

The first amendment means that the minister must table an annual report on the administration and enforcement of the provisions of the act in relation to fish habitat protection and pollution prevention. A summary of convictions under the act must be given. I only wish, Madam Speaker, that the government had listed the number of non-compliances as well as the number of convictions. We all know that convictions are one thing but there are a lot of situations on the Fraser River and other areas of Canada where there are non-compliances that go on and on and on and people are very frustrated by this. The House is aware of this because of the actions of my colleague, the hon. member for Skeena, who has brought the matter to our attention, that many polluters have not been prosecuted.

• (1740)

The second amendment states that a convicted person must, if the court orders, pay for promoting the proper management and control of fisheries or fish habitat. Originally, fish habitat was not included in Bill C-74 and I am pleased that this oversight has also been corrected.

As I mentioned earlier, this proposed legislation has a very big impact on British Columbia as a whole and it also affects my riding of New Westminster—Burnaby. The Fraser River, which is one of the most important waterways in British Columbia, in fact one of the most important waterways in Canada, runs right through my riding. It is a river that is of historical importance. Settlements in British Columbia were, in the early days, along the Fraser and it remains a very important waterway in our province. The surrounding ecosystems, the fisheries, the fish habitat, and the marshlands are increasingly being hurt and destroyed by pollution. The salmon resource of the Fraser River is symbolic as an indicator of the well-being of that river.

Madam Speaker, the commercial fishery is the fourth largest industry in my province, with a wholesale value of over $800 million in 1987. The recreational fisheries are worth $186 million annually, and are an important component in B.C's third largest industry, which is tourism. The salmon catch makes up over 50 per cent of the commercial wholesale value of all fish products. The salmon fleet is made up of 4,500 vessels and has a shore-worker population, at peak times, of 26,000 people.

Salmon is also the basis for British Columbia's important tidal sports fisheries, worth $86 million annually, and generating 4,000 person-years of employment. The Fraser River system produces more salmon than any other single river system in the entire world. In addition, another 29 fish species reside in the river and 87 more in the estuary.

The Fraser River produces 66 per cent of the total B.C. catch of sockeye salmon. With present development practices, a loss of salmon production in the urban areas

will continue and the streams will eventually cease to be productive. Urban development land use practices and technologies must change. All streams must be protected by buffer zones. We have to stop treating the Fraser River as a storm sewer, with effluent coming from our cities right into the Fraser untreated. So many people are concerned about the river but no government has really acted effectively, and all levels of government share responsibility for the condition that the Fraser is in right now.

Our federal caucus of the New Democratic Party established a task force on the Fraser River this year. Part of the mandate of our task force has been to travel through the province to various areas along the Fraser River, and to listen to the people who live, work, recreate, and walk along the banks of the Fraser River and to get the input about their concerns about the Fraser River issues. I was pleased to host one of those meetings in my riding of New Westminster—Burnaby, and I was truly amazed at the expertise that is out there. This expertise comes from people who have been working in the environmental movement, people who have been working on the river as fishermen and fisherwomen, and people who work in the industry along the river. They all share a common thread; they are all concerned about the river and what is happening there.

Madam Speaker, what future is there for the Fraser River? What future is there for the fisheries, for the fish habitat, for controlling pollution, and for the polluters themselves?

The task force on that river that we had and the co-operation that we received from people who were only too happy and willing to share with us their views on what is happening on the Fraser River serves as a prime example for the need to co-operate to get an effective strategy.

We must concentrate on pollution abatement and cleanup. It is possible to clean up our environment. It is possible to clean up the Fraser River through tough standards. Bill C-74 is just one small step along that route. But it is an important step.

I want to urge this government to go further, and to go further with the green plan that we heard about today, so that our children and our children's children will be assured that when they fish on the Fraser River or on the east coast or on the seas of the Pacific, that they will be able to eat the products that they fish.

As a young child I dug for clams and oysters, and we went crabbing and collected seafood every summer off the shores of Vancouver Island. Today, many of those areas are closed to shell fish. You cannot collect the crab and shellfish there any longer.

We must make it clear to polluters through bills such as this one, through enforcement, and through the courts, that it is a serious matter. We must agree that the time for strict legislation is here. Some legislation is in place, but, unfortunately, it has not been enforced effectively.

Urban areas must also look at their impact on the Fraser River and the fisheries in general. Inland water should no longer be treated as sewers. Habitat must be protected. Fish, birds, and other forms of wildlife are entitled to our waterways. We need them. It is high time that we acknowledge that. We can no longer look at our environment in separate parts. Everything in our globe is inter-related.

Bill C-74 is an important first step for our fisheries. As my colleague, the member for Nanaimo—Cowichan has said, the increases in penalties will not help unless these penalties are actually imposed. He also noted that other acts have severe penalties. But enforcement has not gone near that amount, because the courts have treated these violations with lesser penalties. If Bill C-74 is to be worth while, there must be a strong emphasis on controlling, surveillance, and enforcement. I am concerned about this because the Department of Fisheries and Oceans is somewhat under-staffed and lacking the number of vessels to carry out proper enforcement.

If fisheries is as important to the government as it is to other Canadians, as it is to the members on this side of the House of Commons, this legislation, when passed, will be given full support.

**Mr. Dingwall:** Madam Speaker, I think there is a disposition in the House that the two remaining speakers, the hon. member for Labrador, who wishes to have the floor for approximately 10 minutes, and thereafter, I believe, the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans who wishes to have the floor for 10 minutes as well.

I do not really understand why he would want to speak in view of the fact that members of this party and, I believe, members of the New Democratic Party support the bill.

Perhaps to expedite matters, Madam Speaker, you might want to see the clock extended to approximately 6.10. Thereafter, we could terminate debate and there would be no necessity for us to proceed with any kind of a vote. I think it would pass unanimously.

**Mr. Gardiner:** Madam Speaker, on the same point of order, my party will agree to that, on the condition that it is not approximate, but that it is exactly at 6.10.

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Speaker, if I may comment, the reason that I will speak on this debate is because I made a commitment to my colleagues that I would speak on this debate. I intend to keep my word in the arrangements that I make in the House.

Second, I will agree that at 6.10 we will have that vote if my hon. friend from Labrador speaks no more than 10 minutes.

• (1750)

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** This puts the Chair in a difficult situation. I do not think "yes, if—" is unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent for the Chair not to see the clock until 6.10 p.m.?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** Precisely.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Precisely.

Agreed and so ordered.

**Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador):** Madam Speaker, I certainly cannot match the eloquence of my colleague for Gander—Grand Falls. I wish he had not left the Chamber, because I want to say that we have seen an example of something close to the ideal member of Parliament, that is one who is very knowledgeable. There is nobody either in this House or outside who is more knowledgeable than the member for Gander—Grand Falls, a member who has a commitment and a concern.

As I only have 10 minutes, and because the parliamentary secretary is going to speak after I do, perhaps I could simply lay out for him the difficulties that I have, and he can address those difficulties when he speaks.

The difficulty I have is not with the bill itself and not with the increase in penalties. An increase in penalties is fine for those who are breaking the law. There are people breaking the law. There are people who are raping a resource off our shore that is the sole means of livelihood of the people that I represent on the Labrador coast.

The bill does not go far enough. The problem is what is not in the bill. This is a band-aid to stop the haemorrhaging of not only a fishery, but a way of life. There are communities on the coast of Labrador whose sole means of support is the fishery and whose inshore fishery has gone down steadily year after year. The proof of that is the kind of response that the government has had to make. The emergency response is in answer to a failure in the inshore fishery and the fact that inshore fishermen and plant workers have not been able to quality for unemployment insurance—not just one year, but year after year.

Some of those people on my coast have not been able to get even the minimum qualifying period under emergency response. There are 100 people on a list in my office now who still do not qualify for the emergency response. Nobody wants emergency response. Nobody wants to qualify because nobody wants the program in the first place. What they want is some way of making a living. That is the difficulty.

If the inshore fishery has failed—and it has year after year—where will you get the wherewithal to fill those plants to give the fishermen and the plant workers work? Where? The only answer is in the offshore. Yet, the government has refused consistently to give Labrador an offshore quota. Here is a people who are closest to the best resource that we have. The northern cod is the richest, most lucrative, resource that we have off the shores of Labrador. Yet the government has denied the fishermen of Labrador a quota of offshore cod, in spite of the fact that the government policy lists proximity and historic use as fundamental to qualifying for an offshore quota.

These people whom I am talking about are, to a degree, aboriginal. In past years, through giving them an access to an offshore shrimp quota, for example, we have been able to create two co-operatives on that coast. Where the private sector has never gone or worked, we have created two native co-operatives, one in northern Labrador and one in southern Labrador, in which aboriginal people and others are making a go of their plants. A

government in the past saw fit to give out those shrimp licences and to use the policy of proximity and historical use which this government refuses to do.

There is no alternative for those communities. The only way that those communities are going to survive is if the people wanted to be moved, which they do not. They could not be moved because there are no alternatives there or elsewhere for them. But there is a possibility of making those communities work if we had the offshore quota.

That is what I want to see. Not simply penalties, but a management system which puts into place a long-term rehabilitation of that resource—not just the rehabilitation of the groundfish.

We also need some democracy in the allocation of quotas, because the allocation of groundfish quotas now in this country is a closed shop. Those people who are in there, the multinational companies who have the quotas now, have the right—as far as I can tell—to those quotas for all eternity. If one happens to be a co-operative on the coast of Labrador, there is absolutely no way to get in.

I understand that the resource has to be managed and I understand that quotas have to be kept in line. But I believe there should be some democracy built into the system whereby people who have not had access to that resource and yet people who are close to it and have historically used it should have some right of even a small quota. The quota that would satisfy the coast of Labrador would not be all that much. We are talking about something like 4,000 or 5,000 tonnes which is peanuts compared to what other large companies use. We have small plants on that coast and it would not take a great deal of fish to fill them.

Then there is the under-utilized species, the species to which my colleague from Gander—Grand Falls has referred to. Those could be allocated to those co-ops as well, and I believe that should be done.

My difficulty with this bill is not the bill itself, not the fact that there are penalties and not the fact that the penalties are going to be increased, but what the government has not done which is to bring in a sound management plan. The government has not built in some democracy to the allocation of quotas. What the government has not done is stand by its own policy of proximity and historical use in the allocation of those quotas. What the government has not done is say to aboriginal people: "You are equal to everybody else. You have equal access to those stocks off your shore."

I hope that when the parliamentary secretary gets up he can address some of these points because I feel they are legitimate. We do not get cable television on the coast of Labrador so nobody sees the House of Commons. None of my people are going to hear what I am saying today. But I hope when he gets up that he addresses those problems because they are important problems. They are important problems not just to the livelihood of a resource, but to the future of people and entire communities. There is no alternative for those people and it is up to the government to come in, not simply with this bill, but a bill that addresses management, quotas, and some democracy in the allocation of those quotas.

**Mr. Ross Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Madam Speaker, I shall try to be brief but, as I promised earlier in the week, I would on behalf of the government make a few comments on this legislation.

I am pleased, despite some of what has gone on in the last three months, that the House is supporting this piece of legislation. I think it is particularly important and it does some things that will be of significance to the fishery in the future.

It has to be recognized that the actions we have taken here in amending the Fisheries Act are just part of a larger effort about which my friend from Hillsborough made a few comments about. It is important to recognize that there has been a concerted effort on behalf of not only the government of this country, but the government of the provinces and the industry as well, to try to address some of the problems we face in the fishery.

With this piece of legislation we increase the fines and the penalties both for fisheries offences and habitat offences. We also provide for the gathering of information that will help us have better knowledge and understanding of the fisheries so we can make better and more secure decisions in the future. It takes away some of the antiquated parts of the legislation and puts in some flexibility.

It is very important to stress that the people who will come into contact with this legislation are people who commit offences against the people next to whom they work, next to whom they live, and who depend on the resource. We are talking about very few people. It is not

the lion's share of those who depend on the fishery, and let us keep that in mind.

Most people want to work with the fisheries officers. Most people recognize they have a substantial role to play in conservation. That is important to remember as we deal with penalties for fisheries offences.

We heard a number of things from some excellent witnesses. We had a very good week of very interesting, articulate, and perceptive witnesses. They told us a number of things and I think I summarize fairly, in general terms, when I say, first, hit the violators hard. "Nail them to the cross" was the way one group from British Columbia put it. Have the support of the courts. It is essential that the courts support not only the amendments to the Fisheries Act, but the fisheries officers and the peace officers who bring the charges.

• (1800)

If this House can send a message to the judicial system, I think all of us would agree that that message should be to make the penalties suit the seriousness of the crime. As we heard from witnesses, ensure that the penalties reflect not only the severity of the crime but the enterprise involved, recognizing that a $200 fine to one fisherman is nothing compared to another. Quite clearly, what we heard a lot was to have the fisheries minister use his or her power to lift licences, and to suspend or cancel licences.

As parliamentary secretary, I can tell the House that this Minister of Fisheries intends to do exactly that, because the suspension of a fisheries licence is equally applied. I was very impressed by the number of witnesses who told us to do exactly that.

I would be remiss and, frankly, quite frustrated if I did not respond to a few of the comments made here today. I will do so briefly. I think it is important to note the number of comments, particularly from my friends from Prince Edward Island, and also raised by witnesses, in terms of the department's ability to enforce the regulations, to provide the surveillance and management. It is a very legitimate question.

As we look at offences on both coasts and in the freshwater, as we think about the new quotas we will have to deal with in the next couple of weeks and the new regulations stemming from Hâché and Dunn, it is important.

There are 758 fisheries officers in 248 locations across this country and 17 other agencies can also enforce the Fisheries Act. We also have a number of ships. With the closing of Summerside, all that air surveillance disappears. To replace the DND surveillance we went to private aircraft. For the same money we got more hours. Today, DFO delivers over 7,000 hours of air surveillance at a cost of approximately $12 million. Our observer program is quite extensive and quite well known. We have new funding for surveillance and enforcement; in the Atlantic over $38 million over five years and in the Pacific almost $6 million. I think that is important.

We heard a fair bit about the Fraser River, and I think quite rightly so. Our friends in the New Democratic Party and, indeed, all the people of British Columbia are quite concerned about the Fraser River. I would draw their attention to the comments made in the green plan where quite clearly the Department of Fisheries and Oceans is committed to doubling the amount of salmon in that river. It is going to take a lot of work. The government also recognizes that it will take a co-ordinated approach, using the provincial governments, the support of the stakeholder groups, people who are knowledgeable and anxious and are willing to participate. We will deal with some of the habitat questions and some of the fish questions.

It is an important endeavour and I think it is fair to say that the success of the salmon enhancement programs that we have seen in British Columbia are due for credit, and that is because there has been a shareholder approach. It is not just the federal government throwing money at it. It is the federal government in co-operation with industry, user groups, associations and the provincial government. That is why we have such a fruitful and productive salmon fishery on the west coast, and hopefully we can see some of that on the east coast in the future.

On the question of live cod, I would have to pursue this question with my colleague from Vancouver. We may be talking about a different kind of cod than my friend from Labrador and I know.

Mention was made about cutting ACOA. ACOA's money was reprofiled. My friend from Charlottetown said the government does not pay any attention to regional development because it cut ACOA. This government introduced ACOA. This government intro-

duced $1.05 billion for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency If we want to reprofile that, it has to be done, the money is still there. But, the commitment came from this government and is maintained.

First of all, I was delighted to hear the hon. member for Kent speak. Quite often we forget the situation in the freshwater fishery.

Twice during the month of November I was in Europe. It sounds glorious and marvellous, but I made eight or nine presentations a day, Madam Speaker,—I had a few days off, I recognize—with one whole day in French, and for me that can be a bit of a challenge, particularly in Paris, both in the National Assembly and at the *Palais du Luxembourg* where the Senate is, and at the Brussels meeting with European parliamentarians and a number of other people. I will not go into it, but it included media and groups from all over.

I led a group of members of Parliament from the Liberals. Unfortunately, our New Democrat colleagues could not join us. I know they would have if they could.

The message that I brought on behalf of my colleagues and supported by my colleagues was that Europe and the European community should meet its commitments under the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization. The management system was set up by the users of the resources of the Northwest Atlantic following the imposition of the 200–mile economic zone by the Law of the Sea Conference.

That organization should be the basis for managing that resource along the principles of sustainable development.

In 1977, the Law of the Sea put the 200–mile limit in place. We, as a coastal state, made a commitment that in recognition that we manage what is inside as part of our obligation, we will allow countries to come and fish for fish we do not take.

For instance, cod in 2G and 2H. I hope I can find it. Unfortunately, I do not have it here. The cod that we heard about from my hon. friend opposite, Canadians have not caught.

One example I can give is the quota for turbot in 1989 in 2G and 2H, 11,000 tonnes. Do you know what we caught, Madam Speaker? Turbot, by the way is Greenland halibut. Canadians caught 18 tonnes of it either by choice or incapacity and capability of doing it.

Yes, we allow foreigners to come in, but the key there also is that we have NAFO, which I will not go into. We are short of time, and I want to get on.

The message that we had to all of them was that the European community should recognize its responsibility, manage the resource properly and get back in and comply with NAFO.

When my friend opposite from Gander—Grand Falls stands up and talks about 12,965 tonnes distributed off the Flemish Cap to a variety of European countries, then goes to Europe with me and our colleagues, tells the Europeans to comply with NAFO, then comes back here and complains about the quota given to the Europeans under NAFO, what am I to think?

It sounds great as we stand here and shake and shift. All his colleagues stand up and congratulate him, but if we are going to get the Europeans to deal with it, we have to be reasonable, responsible and insistent in the message that we send.

WE cannot stand on their home turf and tell them to comply with NAFO and then come back here and stand in front of a television and complain about NAFO.

Madam Speaker, I will sit down because I think you will find that we may be able to have the opportunity to have the vote on this question.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** 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.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** It being 6.10 p.m., the House stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow, pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 6.10 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Thursday, December 13, 1990**

The House met at 11 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 46 petitions.

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

* * *

[*Translation*]

### INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION

PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF NINTH CANADA-MEXICO INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

**Hon. Andrée Champagne (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot):** Monsieur le Président, I have the honour and the privilege to present to the House, in both official languages, the Report on the Ninth Canada-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference, held in Mexico City and Bahia de Banderas from November 12 to 19, 1990. Our delegation had the privilege of meeting with President Salinas of Mexico and the Mexican External Affairs, Trade and Finance Secretaries. Our work sessions centered of course on international trade, the Seasonal Workers Program, cultural exchanges and environmental protection.

I wish to thank all our colleagues for their cooperation and serious-mindedness and our special thanks to the secretary of the delegation, Mr. François Prégent.

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

* * *

### STRIKING COMMITTEE

PRESENTATION OF SIXTIETH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table the sixtieth report of the Striking Committee.

[*English*]

This report deals with the membership of a legislative committee. Pursuant to Standing Order 113.1, upon presentation such reports are deemed adopted.

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

* * *

### CANADA POST CORPORATION ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-346, an act to amend the Canada Post Corporation Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce in the House today a Private Members Bill which seeks to repeal subsection 13(5) of the Canada Post Corporation Act.

This subsection is discriminatory to rural route carriers in that it prevents them from the enjoyment of rights by excluding them from the employee status as provided for in the Canada Labour Code.

These route carriers provide a most valuable service to 1.2 million households in Canada by providing vital communication and contact to the people in rural and often isolated communities. I believe it is unacceptable that rural route carriers, whose hours after long and hard work, who often in our northern climate face the most treacherous of conditions, should be denied the most basic employee rights.

I therefore submit this bill in the hope that the House, in its wisdom and concern for justice, see fit to repeal an unjust and unjustifiable provision of the Canada Post Corporation Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

## PETITIONS

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I have a large number of petitions that I had hoped to present today but, in view of the fact that speeches with regard to a special motion will be taking place fairly soon, I wish to lay upon the table three petitions pursuant to Standing Order 36.

They are signed by residents from the province of Nova Scotia, namely, the city of Halifax and surrounding areas. These residents petition the Government of Canada in their opposition to the goods and services tax, in particular as that tax applies to books, magazines and newspapers. All petitioners on these three petitions call upon the Government of Canada to withdraw the goods and services tax as it is an impediment to small business as well as to Canadian consumers.

• (1110)

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to present a petition pursuant to Standing Order 36 on behalf of a number of residents of the great city of Kamloops. These petitioners point out their opposition to the government's goods and services tax, particularly pointing out that it is a very regressive tax in that it imposes the same tax on rich and poor alike. They also point out the fact that on a number of occasions the Liberal senators actually had opportunities to defeat the GST, but chose not to.

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I have a whole pile of petitions signed by residents in my riding of Ottawa Centre in opposition to the GST on everything, including in particular books and magazines.

I also have other petitions signed by residents of Oshawa, Don Mills, Scarborough, Mississauga, and Toronto, as well as from all over Ontario. All these people oppose the goods and services tax. They call upon the government to abolish this tax, to withdraw this terrible legislation as it relates to books and magazines.

### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough):** Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present to the House of Commons concerning violence against women and recognizing it as a serious Canadian societal problem.

The undersigned petitioners wish to have the House acknowledge their request that each year on December 6 there be an annual national day of remembrance in honour of the 14 women murdered in Montreal on December 6, 1989.

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk):** Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to Standing Order 36 to present some 20 petitions signed by hundreds of Canadians at the Norfolk County Fair and the Caledonia Fair in my riding of Haldimand—Norfolk. The petitioners call upon the government to get rid of the goods and services tax.

These petitions are just a few of the millions of signatures of Canadians from all across the country and call upon the government to get rid of the goods and services tax.

### FISHERIES

**Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, I rise again today on a matter that is a multicultural issue as well as an economic issue that affects in particular the Chinese community in British Columbia and perhaps other parts of Canada as well.

It concerns the dwindling stocks of live rock codfish which is a commodity of high cultural and economic value to Asian Canadians. It also serves many tourists and is a staple fresh food that is always in demand by families in restaurants.

People are very concerned that the sports fishery is overfishing this type of fish in that there is a very limited season for the Chinese community. They ask that the federal government change its policies and overcome the negligence toward the live rock cod fishery so that it will be available on a year-round basis to some 200,000 Canadians of Chinese descent who live throughout the lower mainland. They want to ensure that a year-round supply of live rock cod is available.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Gilbert Parent (Welland—St. Catharines—Thorold):** Mr. Speaker, I have four petitions to present today concerning the GST. Inasmuch as it is possible that this will be rammed through the Senate against all the practices that have been in play there for a number of years, I feel it is imperative that these voices be heard one more time. Once again, the plea goes out to this government; please rescind this very unfair tax it is imposing upon the citizens of Canada.

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, I too rise to table a petition which joins the petitions of thousands of other Canadians protesting the GST and, in particular, protesting the government actions both here and in the other place in ramming the GST down the throats of Canadian taxpayers.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to present a petition signed by numerous Canadians, many from the beautiful city of Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, who object to the goods and services tax and particularly its application to books.

They would be appalled at the actions of the government puppet in the chair of the other place who is seeking to ram this tax down the throats of Canadians.

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston):** Mr. Speaker, I too would like to rise and present to this House a number of petitions with respect to GST. There are hundreds of names in these particular petitions. Literally hundreds of thousands and into the millions of Canadians have signed petitions opposing the goods and services tax.

In this particular case, these petitioners indicate in the recital to this particular petition that the Conservative government has imposed since 1984 at least 31 new taxes or tax increases on Canadians. They also point out that since September 1984, when this government came to office, the manufacturers' sales tax has been increased by this government from 9 per cent to 13.5 per cent. Now the Conservative government wants to impose the goods and services tax.

These petitioners call on the government to rescind this regressive and unfair tax. I am sure that all these petitioners would be appalled and ashamed at the thuggery in the Senate by Conservative senators who in an illegal fashion are trying to ram the GST through.

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, I too have the honour to present a petition in opposition to the GST. It points out the hypocrisy of the government in increasing the FST by 50 per cent so that it can be replaced with a much higher than necessary tax on goods and services.

If these petitioners could, I know they would also be objecting to the breaking of the rules in the Senate to ram this through.

* * *

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 392 could be made an Order for Return, the return would be tabled immediately.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is it the pleasure of the House that Question No. 392 be deemed to have been made an Order for Return.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Text*]

SMALL CRAFT HARBOURS

Question No. 392—**Mr. McGuire:**

For the fiscal years (a) 1989-90 (b) 1990-91, were any expenditures made in the province of Prince Edward Island under the Small Craft Harbour Divisions and, if so, by (i) federal riding (ii) harbour location, what were they?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

*Government Orders*

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

## THE CONSTITUTION

ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (for the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons)** moved:

That a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons be appointed to consult broadly with Canadians and inquire into and report upon the process for amending the Constitution of Canada, including, where appropriate, proposals for amending one or more of the amending formulae, with particular reference to:

(i) the role of the Canadian public in the process;

(ii) the effectiveness of the existing process and formulae for securing constitutional amendments; and

(iii) alternatives to the current process and formulae, including those set out in the discussion paper prepared by the Government of Canada entitled "Amending the Constitution of Canada";

That twelve Members of the House of Commons and five Members of the Senate be the Members of the Special Joint Committee: such Members on the part of the House of Commons to be designated upon report of the Striking Committee no later than three sitting days after the adoption of this motion, which report shall be deemed concurred in upon presentation;

That the Committee have the power to appoint from among its Members such sub-committees as may be deemed advisable, and to delegate to such sub-committees all or any of their powers except the power to report directly to the House;

That the Committee have the power, to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House of Commons;

That the Committee, or a sub-committee, have power to travel, and hold public hearings, within Canada;

That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the Committee;

That the Committee be empowered to authorize television and radio broadcasting, as it deems appropriate, of any or all of its proceedings or of proceedings of its sub-committees, pursuant to the principles and practices governing the broadcasting of the proceedings of the House of Commons;

That the parties represented on the Committee be granted allocations for expert assistance with the Committee work in proportion to the representation of the said parties in the House of Commons;

That the Committee be empowered to retain the service of professional, clerical and stenographic staff as deemed available by the Joint Chairmen;

That the Committee submit its report not later than July 1, 1991, provided that, if the House of Commons is not sitting, the report will be deemed submitted on the day such report is deposited with the Clerk of the House of Commons and with the Clerk of the Senate;

That changes in membership of the Committee be effective immediately after notification thereof, signed by the Member acting as Chief Whip of any recognized party, has been filed with the Clerk of the Committee;

That the quorum of the Committee be nine Members, whenever a vote, resolution or other decision is taken so long as both Houses are represented, and the Joint Chairmen are authorized to hold meetings, to receive evidence and authorize the printing thereof, when six Members are present so long as both Houses are represented; and

That a Message be sent to the Senate requesting that House to unite with this House for the above purpose, and to select, if the Senate deems it to be advisable, five Members to act on the proposed Special Joint Committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to propose the establishment of a Special Joint Committee of the House of Commons and Senate on the constitutional amending process.

I wish at the same time to table a discussion paper that examines the current amending formulae, identifies some problems in their operation and sets out for consideration by all members of Parliament a number of options for substantial reform.

Recent events have demonstrated that our present amending process is not adequate to ensure that Canada's Constitution can meet the challenges of the 21st century.

• (1120 )

The initiative taken today by the government fulfils a commitment made last June, that before we try again to amend the Constitution we must find a better process to do it.

Amid the heat of Meech Lake and all the debate that surrounded it, there was a strong consensus on one thing: that we must find a better way to change the fundamental law of our land. Canadians want to be involved in the process of constitutional change. We in Parliament have an overriding responsibility to preserve this magnificent country. I know that members of this House of Commons and members of Parliament will do their utmost to ensure that Canada is preserved and enhanced for decades and generations and generations to come.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Mulroney:** Canadian citizenship brings extraordinary benefits to us all, whatever language we speak and wherever we happen to live. We have built on the northern half of this continent one of the most civil countries in the world. Our system of justice, which guarantees equality before the law, is widely respected around the world.

With a population of only 26 million people, we have overcome what is in many instances a very forbidding climate and geography to build the seventh largest economy in the industrialized world and the eighth largest economy in the entire world. This is a remarkable accomplishment for a small nation which has become one of the great trading nations of the entire world, 30 per cent of whose national wealth depends on our capacity to trade successfully into international markets.

While many countries struggle just to put bread on the table for their citizens, Canadians continue to enjoy, despite our economic problems, a broad range of social services and one of the best standards of living in the world.

Canada enjoys substantial international influence and respect as a middle power. We are the only country that is a member of the G–7, of the Commonwealth, and of the *Sommet de la francophonie*. Indeed Canada was a founding member of the Commonwealth and of the *Sommet de la francophonie*. I think that the Commonwealth and the *Sommet de la francophonie* reflect both our opportunities and the cultural and linguistic realities of Canada. It is a tribute to all members of the House that both of these very important international organizations are soundly supported by members of all parties. Canada has moved along, and those are things we have accomplished together.

Millions of people all over the world are lining up today to come to Canada because successive generations of Canadians have succeeded in building not a perfect society, God knows, but an open, democratic, peaceful, and very prosperous country. That is what we now have, and that is what we risk losing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, before you is an assembly of legislators, men and women who have a duty to adopt laws to ensure the unity and prosperity of our country. But above all, we are trustees of the hopes and aspirations of our fellow citizens. Our responsibility is to give Canadians a Constitution that reflects pride in their history and confidence in the future.

[*English*]

The Special Joint Committee will consult broadly with Canadians on the process for amending the Constitution of Canada. In particular, the committee will be asked to consult with Canadians on the role of the Canadian public in the process, on the effectiveness of the existing process for securing constitutional amendments, on alternatives to the current process. To fulfil its mandate, the committee will have the power to travel and hold public hearings across Canada.

The government has prepared a discussion paper entitled *Amending the Constitution of Canada* to assist public discussion of this important matter. The document reviews how the current process has operated since 1982 and is designed to stimulate discussion of key questions including public participation and alternatives to improve the framework that we now have.

If we are to devise a better process, a number of questions are simply going to have to be addressed very bluntly. At what stage in the process does it make sense for the public to involve itself: at the very outset, once agreement in principle has been reached among governments or, later, when agreement has been reached on the legal text of a proposed amendment?

How should groups or involved citizens, who now under the Constitution have no formal role in the amending process but who quite properly see themselves as very important stakeholders, seek to be involved in an effective and productive way?

Are the current time periods for adoption of amendments to the Canadian Constitution too long, considering that over the periods allowed elections can and do occur, governments can and do change and extraneous issues may intrude so as to derail the ratification process itself? How long can a country keep going with a process that is clearly beyond in many ways the capacity of human beings to deal with effectively?

Governments do change and always will change. We have 11 of them in Canada that are tied into the amending process. In the normal course of events one

sees this happen on a regular basis. This is a fundamental, important and very practical problem.

Should an agreement formally signed by first ministers for tabling in a legislature be considered a confidence measure on which governments can or should fall? It seems to me that is a very important question which should be considered.

The paper also discusses various alternatives to the current legislative model of constitutional reform. For example, the decision-making role of legislators could be shared with or transferred to Canadians across the nation expressing themselves through a referendum.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Mulroney:** Or Canadians might be called upon, for example, to select delegates to play a decisive role in proposing amendments or in ratifying amendments in a constituent assembly.

As the Australian experience has demonstrated, referenda can be used for constitutional amendment in a parliamentary federal system. Obviously all members of the House would have not only observations but serious questions in regard to this procedure itself. Some of them I think would probably be, if Canada decided to go that route, what sort of a majority would be needed for an amendment proposal to pass: a simple national majority; a national majority including a majority in a majority of provinces, such as some of the provisions we now have; a national majority with a majority in Quebec on certain issues or in other regions on others?

With respect to a constituent assembly model, a number of important questions automatically arise. Should there be equality of representation of the provinces, representation on the basis of population, or a compromise between the two? What should be the procedure within the constituent assembly for reaching decisions? Should its decisions be binding, or could its decisions then be altered by a subsequent meeting of the same body or a new body to which it allegedly reports? Should they be put to the people in a referendum? Or, should they be recommendations for consideration by first ministers and possible action through the legislative model itself?

These are all important questions but fundamentally I believe they stem from one basic challenge. Can we in this House of Commons make this Constitution of ours the expression of our profound attachment to Canada and our will to ensure that it becomes more harmonious and more dynamic? That is the challenge.

Can we do better for Canada? Can we make sure that Canada works effectively and well? That is the challenge, and I think the answer to that is yes.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

• (1130)

**Mr. Mulroney:** Mr. Speaker, when I announced the creation of the citizens' forum on November 1, I said that it is time to consider making reforms to our system that are "bold, far-reaching and unprecedented if need be". This government is committed to modernizing Canada's Constitution.

The citizens' forum is a new way of going about this process that will help identify what kind of country Canadians want. Typically, like anything new in this country, it attracts a certain amount of criticism. But my guess is that when Commissioner Spicer and his colleagues report, having spoken to the people who were left out in the past, after they talk to ordinary Canadians across the country, I think the results they will bring forward are going to be infinitely more beneficial than opinions of constitutional scholars and lawyers. We have heard enough from them in this country and not enough from ordinary citizens.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Mulroney:** The citizens' forum will give western Canadians an opportunity to articulate their genuine frustrations with a system of government that seems remote and unresponsive to their needs. That applies in many cases doubly to citizens of the north.

It will ask Canadians in far-flung regions how best they believe they can influence the decision-making process to ensure that it functions in a more equitable manner. It will allow all Canadians to discuss the relationship between Quebec and the rest of the country, and the accommodations required in today's Canada for the needs of both linguistic minorities and majorities to be respected.

The impact of regionalism and of multiculturalism on Canadian unity and economic development will also be examined. There was a time and not so long ago, perhaps

a decade ago, where the articulation of programs of multiculturalism was hailed as tremendous answer to many of our problems. Yet, now members of those very communities are suggesting to Parliament that there is probably a better way to do it and this must be examined. It is no longer a shibboleth or a slogan that there are real problems that emerge from policies devised in Ottawa that do not always meet the needs of large multicultural communities.

Clearly this government and governments before us and many members of Parliament have been talking too much and not listening enough. We must correct this fundamental deficiency and this government, and I know all members of Parliament will do precisely that.

**Some hon. members:** hear, hear.

**Mr. Mulroney:** The forum will facilitate a dialogue between aboriginal and non-aboriginal Canadians to discuss how the aspirations of Canada's first peoples can be met within the Canadian Constitution. Canadians are also being invited to consider what is best done by governments and what is best done by individual Canadians themselves. The citizens' forum will very probably stimulate discussion on the questions that underlie all of these issues: how to ensure that this country's institutions, particularly Parliament, designed in the 19th century, will be more responsive to the needs of Canadians in the 21st, at the same time whether the division of responsibilities among the federal and provincial governments needs to be changed.

Some answers will begin to emerge as genuine dialogue is initiated across Canada, as reports come in from the parliamentary committees established in New Brunswick, Alberta and Quebec, and of course by hearings initiated by private groups as well as by this committee that will be set up by the House of Commons today.

In light of recent experience, we must also consider how we can go about developing the kind of Constitution Canadians want. Some argue that the best way to achieve meaningful reform is to start from scratch by dismantling our entire system of federalism as we know it today. As I said in Montreal 10 days ago, it seems to me rather obvious that nothing at all can be gained from the attempt to destroy a political system that is reasonably efficient and respectful of identities, and that has, over 123 years, produced some rather remarkable results.

Rather, I think we have everything to gain by working together, members of all parties, business and labour, provinces and municipalities, recognizing that we have before us an enormous challenge to our national well-being. We have everything to gain by working together to improve and modernize our present arrangements.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, many Quebecers, in particular, find it difficult to understand how the Constitution, patriated 10 years ago,—the document that should have embodied their desire to flourish within Canada—instead enshrines their exclusion from the constitutional fold.

Because of the unfortunate events that led to the death of Meech, some would have us believe the only way to escape the status quo is to go back to square one and start again from scratch.

For my part, I say the country does not have to be dismantled in order to be later rebuilt. Let's not lose sight of the substance by chasing shadows.

There is another way, a better way, Mr. Speaker, to accommodate the need for fundamental change: it involves building on our strengths and improving our present system to adapt it to today's economic, political and cultural realities.

[*English*]

As I said in this House on November 1, "I believe that if it takes major changes to hold this country together, Canadians want those changes made. I believe if it takes a new process to achieve those changes, Canadians want a new process designed" and that is precisely what we are in the process ourselves of beginning to do today.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Mulroney:** As the discussion paper explains, modifying the current procedure through consensus and agreed practices is not the only solution possible. Nothing in the mandate of the proposed special joint committee precludes an examination of alternatives to the current formulae, nor, indeed, alternative ways of bringing about changes to them.

[*Translation*]

Never again should our Constitution be seen as an obstacle to achieving our great destiny—not in Quebec or in any other region.

Our fundamental document must accurately express who we are and, above all, clearly affirm what we aspire to become. That is the challenge we face.

Let us not be afraid to change our Constitution, but let us have the highest respect for what it should affirm and protect—the land of our ancestors and country of our children.

Together with all those who have placed their trust in us, I propose today that we find ways to meet the demands of a world undergoing swift and deep change.

With respect for what others have sincerely wanted our Constitution to be, but with an awareness of its imperfections and a determination to make it an instrument of unity rather than a source of discord, let us give Canada the possibility of amending its Constitution, in a manner consistent with our history and the needs for our future.

How, Mr. Speaker? All around us we can see in what direction other countries are moving. Look at Europe—at England and France—the mother countries of many of us.

A new, politically integrated and economically united Europe as Chancellor Kohl said recently and I repeat, a Europe where political integration and economic union will be complete. Those were the words Chancellor Kohl used.

• (1140)

But this new Europe is already in the making: in 1992, 340 million Europeans will form a common market; in 1994, Europe will have one central bank; and by 1999, they plan to have a common currency.

Mr. Speaker, Europe is irreversibly headed towards a new form of federalism. We must ask ourselves why this is so. The driving force behind this extraordinary movement in Europe is the French Republic. President Mitterrand himself is one of the great architects of European union and economic and political integration. The President of the French Republic has become the great architect of this political and economic integration. Why? Because the French, the British, the Spaniards, the Italians, the Germans—Europeans in general—consider it the political system most capable of ensuring respect for linguistic and cultural diversity, economic development and social justice.

The road Europeans are about to take is one that Canadians have already travelled: we have had a common market since 1867; we have a common currency since 1870; and we have a central bank since 1934. Why would we swim against the tide of history by abandoning our federal system while Europeans are discovering what we already enjoy?

About 10 days ago on television, we saw a dramatic illustration of this yearning for closer links when French miners shook hands with English miners, 500 metres under the English Channel. England is now joined to France. That is not merely a symbol. It is the most concrete and conclusive proof that the future belongs to those who unite.

In this House, I represent an electoral district in Quebec. To justify their desire to undo the country, some people in Quebec propose an eventual association with Canada, without any guarantee at all. To them I say: We already have an association, and we will make it even more productive and flexible than it is now, for the benefit of all Quebecers and Canadians—for the benefit of this great country of ours.

[*English*]

Let us all build and not bulldoze. Let's renovate and not raze. It is obvious that our constitutional amending process has not worked to our advantage. Everybody knows that. But we all know something else, something that wells up from our history and that we share as citizens of this magnificent country.

Both the idea of Canada and the ideal of Canada are precious, are of enormous value, and continue to live in the minds and hearts of all Canadians.

The spirit of Canada was not developed as a result of the bringing about of some constitutional document. Canada was not secured by a series of documents pasted together in London or Paris, or anywhere else. Canada already lived in the hearts of aboriginal parents who conveyed to their children an appreciation of the beauty of their natural environment thousands of years ago.

Canada was a dream shimmering on the ocean's horizon when Cartier and Champlain brought the

French language and culture to North America. The English settlers, the Irish, and the Scots did not come here to make constitutional amendments. They came here to build a nation where their children could grow in freedom and prosperity and peace. They built better than anybody ever dreamed. The result of their sacrifice, their vision, and their courage was Canada. They did that and it is up to us to maintain it and improve upon it.

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

**Mr. Mulroney:** Generation upon generation of immigrants were drawn here by this dream from every single country on the face of the earth.

We in the House of Commons are the sons and daughters of those men and women who have given us one of the most beautiful and prosperous, and one of the most free countries in the world.

It is now up to us to live up to that dream and to build a country that they would have wanted us to build for our children.

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

**Mr. Mulroney:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to table, in both official languages, a discussion paper prepared by the Government of Canada entitled: *Amending the Constitution of Canada*.

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to provide my party's response this motion to appoint a special committee to inquire and report upon the process for amending the Constitution of Canada.

While the Liberal Party intends to be extremely supportive of this joint committee, we have rather serious concerns and misgivings that I want to point out. I shall be focusing upon the fact that we think this particular committee should have been set up some time ago. In fact, a number of people will wonder if it should not have been set up rather than the Spicer commission. But I will let Canadians judge that.

We are concerned as well about the focus on the amending formula which we believe may be too narrow. We think that the critical question is really the division of powers among the various levels of government.

[*Translation*]

The constitutional amendment formula is obviously a very important element, but as far as we are concerned the key, the most important question is the sharing of powers.

[*English*]

Let me share with my hon. colleagues some of the concerns and misgivings that we have as a party.

• (1150)

There is another committee that has been appointed. There is already much confusion out there in the country. We fear that this will add to that confused state. Why is that? Well, there is the Spicer commission that is looking at the direction that Canadians want Canada to take.

There is the Bélanger–Campeau commission that is looking at the direction that they feel Quebecers want Quebec to take. Alberta has a commission. New Brunswick has a commission. Manitoba has a commission.

We are informed that the Assembly of First Nations has a commission because it does not have confidence in the various commissions that have been set up to date. I am told today that two unions have each now set up a new commission, the Public Service Alliance of Canada and the National Union of Provincial Government Employees.

[*Translation*]

Although the Prime Minister gave a clear explanation about this new committee and raised a number of major issues, it could lead to confusion because I think there are so many similar endeavours now taking place in Canada. People will ask why a new commission, why a new committee? Where will that lead us? Just what will that accomplish?

[*English*]

Many of you will know that the Bélanger–Campeau commission is seen as a well-organized group of people who are actually listening. It is certainly highly visible and, whether or not one likes what it is doing, we have to recognize that it is working extremely well in getting the opinions of various people from the province with respect to the directions that they want to take.

Interestingly enough, to date, only Jean Chrétien, Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada—and the only leader of a national party to do so—will be making a presentation to the Bélanger-Campeau Commission.

[*Translation*]

I am extremely proud of this initiative on the part of the leader of my party and I commend him for that.

[*English*]

In looking at the Spicer commission, we recognize that it has received, to be kind, less than positive reviews. One journalist has called it useless. Another has described it as out of control and disorganized. There are many other descriptors that I could use. One newspaper headline reads: "Citizens Forum Becoming a Joke".

I want to quote what the Leader of the Opposition said with respect to this particular commission. He has identified the critical issue when he said about the Spicer commission that "if it does not get to work soon with a full complement of members, it is going to lose credibility and that would be too bad because—we felt it was a way of making up for a real gap in the previous Constitution discussion, that is, giving Canadians a chance to be heard."

I think that that is in fact the issue with respect to the Spicer commission. It has been set up, but certainly to date, it has been short of accomplishments.

[*Translation*]

I am glad that two persons have now been appointed to fill the forum's two vacant seats. Unfortunately the reports I have had seem to indicate that one of the commissioners has yet to take active participation in the work of this forum which might prove to be very important for Canada.

[*English*]

The question that we need to raise is why has the government decided to set up a special committee of the Senate and the House of Commons. First and foremost—and we have to be very honest about this—this committee is a response to criticism. There is no question about it. It is a response to the Bélanger-Campeau commission in Quebec which I have identified as working particularly well. I also noted that the Spicer commission was not working effectively yet. I hope it finally gets its act together.

It is also a response to the Prime Minister's failure with respect to the constitutional process and the Meech Lake Accord. If he had been successful we would not be having such a joint committee right now.

That begs another question. Why did the Prime Minister fail? Canadians were wondering what the objectives of his initiative really were. We all wanted to ensure that Quebec was brought into the constitutional fold and that it would be a signatory to that particular document. As Canadians, we wanted that. Most Canadians wanted that.

Because of the lack of credibility of the Prime Minister with respect to a number of promises that he has made, people were wondering whether or not there were other objectives. That started to affect the process in a very negative way.

It was also a flawed process. There have been comments from every part of Canada from virtually every group. We do not have to go through the "dark night and 12 men behind closed doors" routine again. It was not an adequate process. Canadians felt left out. Because they felt left out, they became extremely suspicious of what was happening.

There could have been meaningful, public consultations on the Meech Lake Accord, but the government contended that it was a seamless web that could not be undone. I recognize that there were some consultations, but the problem is that once you say that it is a seamless web and that it cannot be undone, you are in a sense contradicting yourself. People say: "What is the use? This is a charade. This is not a sincere attempt to try to find out what Canadians are thinking."

There should have been more meaningful consultations along the way whenever a new step had been reached. There should have been continuing consultation, and it did not happen.

I will give an example of what occurred after supposedly having had a seamless web and after supposedly being unable to change whatever was necessary. As time ran out and as the Prime Minister and his government became concerned, suddenly the government changed its tune. It said that it might, in fact, accept a companion accord. In fact, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that it set up the Charest committee. It came out with its report but, for the most part, its recommendations were ignored.

Then, and even later, as we were on the precipice and in spite of having said there was a three-year deadline that could not in fact be ignored, the Prime Minister and his government shifted again. They thought that they should have a referral to the Supreme Court of Canada to see whether or not the time line could be extended.

[*Translation*]

I believe I have just shown quite clearly that the Prime Minister and his government have known failure in the constitutional process. The committee is urging the House to appoint today is a reaction to that failure, a reaction to a lack of sensitiveness towards Canadians, a reaction designed to reset the sights, if that is possible. I sincerely hope it is not too late.

[*English*]

It was really the Prime Minister, through a lack of sensitivity and through an inappropriate process, who killed Meech Lake and what could have been salvaged from it. For example, many constitutional experts say that three out of five amendments could have been passed with the 7-50 formula, that is, seven provinces with 50 per cent of the population saying yes. Those were immigration, distinct society, and opting out of federal programs with full compensation which is something that can happen now. We all know that that 7-50 formula could have given us those particular requests that Quebec wanted. Only two of the amendment would have required unanimity. They were the provincial role in the appointments to the Supreme Court of Canada and a veto for Quebec on constitutional amendments.

By virtue of packaging the Accord in this particular way, the Prime Minister set up an objective that was virtually impossible to reach. He rolled the dice too late, and Canada lost.

[*Translation*]

He put the bar too high and missed, and that is unfortunate. It is unfortunate for Canada and for all Canadians.

[*English*]

I want to talk briefly about the amending formula. Many of you will know that there are presently two concurrent amending formulae for the Constitution of Canada. One requires, as I indicated just a moment ago, seven provinces with at least 50 per cent of the population to support certain proposals. In these cases there is a three-year deadline.

• (1200)

The division of powers to which I have referred, and which is to me the most significant challenge that we have before us right now, can in fact be changed by virtue of the 7-50 formula, that is, seven province agreeing and that they have 50 per cent of the population.

Yes, there are some matters that require unanimity and they have no time limit, such as the changing of the amending formula and clearly, we should be looking at that.

One of the reasons that Meech Lake failed is because this amending formula that the Prime Minister proposed had no real significant mechanism for public input. There were obviously some discussions. There was in fact some input, but the process of input was flawed. People along the way felt that the deal was made. It was a seamless web that could not be undone. They felt left out. They felt as if they were being had.

Let us stress that there is nothing in the 7-50 formula or in the formula proposed in the Meech Lake Accord that would not have permitted the Prime Minister and his government from having a significant, detailed, ongoing public input for all Canadians from throughout the whole nation.

I think it is important when we talk about the 7-50 formula to take just a moment to try to understand where it came from. Many members will recall that the former Prime Minister, Mr. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, felt that he could, as Prime Minister, patriate the Constitution. We will recall as well, that he was supported by premiers Davis of Ontario and Hatfield of New Brunswick. However, eight premiers of those other eight provinces opposed this patriation in this way and proposed this 7-50 formula which Mr. Trudeau accepted.

[*Translation*]

In my opinion, it is extremely important to understand that the 7/50 formula is not perfect. Very few are, but this one, nevertheless, contains some positive elements. It is obvious that this formula does not adequately meet the aspirations of Quebec men and women. I suggest it was not the formula *per se*, but the way it was used which caused the failure of the Meech Lake Accord. Consultations were inadequate. They should have been ongoing. There was also the government's uncompromising attitude towards changes suggested by the Liberal Party as

well as a great many organizations from all parts of Canada.

[*English*]

This Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons, which my colleagues and I hope will be extremely successful, is getting off to a shaky start. One newspaper columnist has called this committee "Mulroney's new illusion". He goes on to say: "It is entertaining a dangerous illusion to imagine that a committee created in desperation will succeed where for so long all of the specialists have failed", and all of the previous efforts over the last 30 or more years have failed.

As I have indicated, this committee has a narrow focus. It deals primarily with the amending formula. It could in fact lead us, unfortunately, into error because that is not the major question. It is an important question, but not the major one. To us, it is the division of powers, looking at what each level of government can do that we must in fact tackle. The focus of the committee should be on the sharing and the redistribution of powers. It must be because that is the challenge, the reform of federal institutions, such as the reform of Parliament, clearly the Senate, no doubt the House of Commons could come in for some reform, as well as possibly the Supreme Court of Canada.

[*Translation*]

As a party, we insisted on the sharing of powers, not only on the constitutional amending formula, because we felt it was truly the key element, the number one challenge today for our country.

[*English*]

Let me talk about shared powers. Members will know that there are clear powers for the federal government, and as well, clear powers for the provincial and municipal governments. In fact, these powers for the national government are clearly defined in the Constitution Act, 1867. Let me give just a few examples.

There is very little debate about defence, currency and postal services. These are all in the national government's mandate, if you wish, they are in the federal jurisdiction. Here are some examples of some which are in the provincial jurisdiction: the laws governing property rights, municipal institutions, local works, regulating the issuance of local licences, the creation of municipal infrastructures, etc. There are, however, many areas where the lines have become blurred and therein lies the challenge, therein lie the difficulties, and therein lies the need for debate, discussion, and study.

In the area of health, the federal government makes a large contribution to the health of Canadians through the provinces and imposes, and justifiably so, certain standards and criteria that need to be met and adhered to. There is a significant decrease in the contribution, I might say, by the federal government to health and education. In education, there is still a substantial contribution, as it should be, but because there is a contribution from the federal government and because education is a provincial constitutional responsibility, there is some blurring, some confusion, some difficulty. The area of culture is another such challenge.

Aboriginal rights, while primarily federal, still have some implications for the provincial and municipal infrastructures. Immigration, again this is a blurred area and one that needs to be sorted out. We have international trade, communications, and the list goes on.

[*Translation*]

Concerning shared powers, I believe that what is of prime importance for me and my colleagues is to understand that some powers belong exclusively to the national government. Other powers belong to the provinces while others of course belong to the municipalities. In some areas, it is perfectly clear. For instance, National Defence belongs unquestionably to the federal government. On the other hand, all legislation dealing with property rights mainly belong to the provinces. On the other hand, there are some areas where the lines have become blurred, such as health, education, culture, native rights, immigration, trade and communication which should be examined to determine exactly who must assume responsibility.

[*English*]

Again I repeat, and I want to accentuate, the real issue is not the amending formula. It is one issue, it is an important issue. The real issue is shared power. I have tried to capture that element, that message, with the following question: how can the various levels of government best reorganize so that they best respond to the needs of all Canadians, wherever they live in this great

country. That is the real issue. This commission ought to have such a mandate.

[*Translation*]

What level of government can better fulfill the needs of all Canadians whether they live in this or that province, or in either of the Territories? What jurisdiction can better meet the needs of our fellow citizens? We feel this is where the challenge lies. We are now faced with major difficulties everywhere in Canada.

[*English*]

In summary, let me offer the following: The Liberal Party is willing to support the government's motion to create a special joint Senate-Commons committee to consult with Canadians and inquire into and report upon the process for amending the Constitution of Canada. We are supportive of this motion, in principle. However, we do have certain concerns and misgivings. We support this resolution because we are actually trying to help in a non-partisan way the Prime Minister to get out of this difficulty, this mess that he has created, because we truly want to work co-operatively to help Canada and Canadians.

• (1210)

We in the Liberal Party are willing to put aside partisan politics to work for the future of Canada. We are indeed, my hon. colleague, and I would hope that other hon. colleagues representing other *formations politiques* would be willing to do the same.

Some of the shortfalls of the mandate of the proposed committee are, as I indicated—

[*Translation*]

—much too narrow a mandate. I suggest we should look into the amending formula and that this process should give rise to a number of other questions, but I feel nevertheless that shared powers is truly the key issue.

Why do we support this government's decision to create such a committee? It is very simple. We are trying to help in a co-operative and non-partisan way the Prime Minister to get out of this constitutional mess that he has created and we also do want to help the Canadian people. We are willing to work all together for the future of Canada. There is no other reason.

But let us not forget that if, in the end, the Canadian people, whether Natives, Francophones, Anglophones, new Canadians, do not feel they really belong in this great country, if they feel that they cannot participate fully in the decision-making process, in the economic, social, cultural and linguistic life our society, if each region does not feel fully integrated, we will have failed.

[*English*]

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are debating this motion today. I know that it was the government's intention to avoid having this motion debated and that the Liberal Party was willing as well to forego a debate on this issue. But with this proposed committee we are talking about the Constitution of Canada. Parliament must be involved. Canadians must be involved and Canadians must be kept informed. My party is committed to these principles and that is why we forced this debate today.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Mr. Speaker, we oppose the government's motion for several reasons. Let me say at the outset that opposition to this motion is not opposition to constitutional renewal. Quite the contrary. We are opposed to this motion because we want substantial, meaningful constitutional initiatives. The proposed committee offers a one-dimensional response to a profound national crisis. It is an incomplete answer to a large and complex issue. The issue, the question, is what kind of Canada do we want to create and how do we create it?

This committee is being formed to discuss how we can get there, but nothing about where we want to go. We should begin by identifying some of those basic principles for a nation with a vision, a nation that knows where it wants to go.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** My vision and my party's vision for this nation is based on the principles of a commitment to social justice, a recognition that we have a responsibility to care for each other.

Our principles are based on a recognition of the value of diversity, that the Canadian nation will not be built on homogeneity, but true respect and celebration of our many cultural communities, of Canada's first nations, on francophone and anglophone linguistic groups.

Therefore, there must be a recognition in our Constitution of collective rights and collective responsibilities. As well, we have individual rights under the charter. We have to look to what makes us collectively a nation. If there is to be equality for all Canadians, we must ensure that the rights of groups and communities are respected. That may require different constitutional arrangements with different groups, whether those groups be aboriginal people or Quebec. Real equality comes from acknowledging diversity within one nation, and through that we will find a common bond.

From these basic principles we can move to really building a constitution. Canadians are looking for real meaningful constitutional renewal. They are looking for a constitution that reflects the reality of Canada, the reality of Canada as it is as we move into the year 2000. Canadians are looking for a constitution that meets the needs of aboriginal people, of women, of minorities, of Quebec, of the north, and of the regions of this country from coast to coast to coast.

This proposed committee will address only some of these issues. It will look at a narrow aspect of the Constitution. Its deliberations can easily be ignored by the government and will be ignored, if we look at the past record of this government. We oppose this motion, not because we do not care about Canada's future but because we do care about Canada's future.

Canadians know where New Democrats stand. We stand for one Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, to the Arctic Ocean. We stand for one Canada that celebrates its diversity, that brings people together in a commitment to creating a caring and a just nation for everyone.

There is little evidence to justify any faith or trust in this government's commitment to building a constitution through an open and democratic process. Let us look at the record.

First, there was the agreement at Meech Lake in 1987: 10 premiers and the Prime Minister drawing out a map for the future of Canada without talking or listening to the people who would have to use that map, the people who would have to follow its directions.

How was this map presented to Canadians? The Prime Minister said that not a word could be changed, not a comma could be changed. Throughout the debate he polarized Canadians by saying that anyone who expressed concerns about the accord, anyone who raised options to what was in the accord, had to be anti-Quebec. It was a divisive strategy. It was a destructive strategy for this country. If I may say so, it is one of the most destructive things that this Prime Minister and this government have done in this country, and that is why we are now at the point that we are at in 1990.

[*Translation*]

And what about the process that followed these events? A committee on Meech Lake was established, a committee that sat for a month, never left Ottawa and had very few opportunities to listen to what Canadians had to say. The Senate held numerous hearings. The ensuing recommendations were ignored.

When it realized it should listen to Canadians, the government finally appointed the Charest Committee. Our party and many members of this House took the committee seriously. We worked very hard to try and find solutions and reach a compromise.

Although it had little time, the committee tried to listen to what the people had to say.

[*English*]

The Charest committee did find a compromise upon which all three parties of this House agreed. What did the government do with that report? It ignored it. It ignored it like it has ignored all the recommendations coming from public hearings, whether those public hearings be on trade, GST, green plan or the Constitution. This government has public hearings. It hears, but it does not listen to Canadians.

• (1220)

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** The Charest committee was ignored. Then, true to form, the Prime Minister called together the premiers for one more back-room, closed door session, and Canadians were forced to live with the consequences.

The Meech Lake process failed, and the price of that failure has been a high one, with growing alienation in Quebec, in the west, among the aboriginal people of Canada, and indeed among all Canadians.

What lessons has the government learned from the failure of this process? Has it learned that Canadians have to be involved in every step of the process? Has it learned that Parliament has to be involved?

Let us look at the government's two most recent initiatives.

[*Translation*]

First, we have the Citizen's Forum on the Future of Canada, the Spicer Commission. The words "future of Canada" sound wonderful, Mr. Speaker, and if given a broad mandate, the Citizen's forum could be a very worthwhile exercise.

However, we are not really sure what the forum's mandate is. There is a lot of confusion about this, Mr. Speaker, because once again, the Prime Minister made a decision without consulting Parliament, without consulting the leaders of the opposition parties and without consulting members of this House. In fact, as events unfold, it is becoming clear that even members of the commission do not know the forum's mandate.

The Spicer Commission could have had a clear and realistic mandate if there had been consultations and if there had been a commitment. It may be possible to accomplish something, Mr. Speaker, at least I hope so. The New Democratic Party will do everything it can to make this work, and we urge the government to do the same.

[*English*]

Today we have this proposed joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the amending formula to the Constitution. Once again no consultation: no consultation from the Prime Minister with the leaders of the opposition, no involvement of this House in looking at long-term efforts on the Constitution. A discussion paper tabled after the Prime Minister spoke, not shared with the parties before when this motion was being presented, is unacceptable. It is the same old process in the same old way. It must change if we are going to save this country.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Each time since June 23, that an initiative has been put forward by this government, we say to ourselves: "Has the Prime Minister learned anything from past mistakes?" Evidently not, Mr. Speaker, and this is sad. Not in a partisan way; it is sad for Canada. We have to learn from our history. That is what the constitutional debate is all about now. We have to learn from our mistakes. They are clear and before us. But why does it not happen? That is the question Canadians need an answer to.

To have a discussion paper upon which a committee is to be formed not even presented to members of the opposition before the debate is inexcusable. It is arrogant and, as I say, it continues the same old process in the same old way. It is unacceptable. That is exactly why we wanted a debate on this motion today. That is why we simply refuse to rubber stamp this committee.

We also have a strong belief that this committee is too narrowly defined. The issue of the amending formula is an important one. As the member for Yukon, I certainly do not have to be reminded about what a unanimity provision in the amending formula on the future creation of provinces means to my home territory. I understand the importance. My party understands the importance of the amending formula.

The fundamental question here is whether this committee addresses the real issue. We say it does not. What Canada needs to know is not just how we are going to get there but where we are going.

It is also a question of priorities. What about aboriginal issues? Members of the government have said that any progress on constitutional issues regarding aboriginal people will have to wait until the conclusion of the Spicer commission. Aboriginal people are saying—and we are saying it—why do aboriginal people have to wait while for some reason this committee can go ahead and travel across Canada?

Given the broken promises of the government to aboriginal people, given the events of the summer, given that, as we speak, thousands of aboriginal people throughout the country live in poor housing conditions and have no chance of employment, I would suggest that aboriginal Canadians cannot wait. Has the Prime Minister learned nothing from the summer of 1990? If any committee should be travelling across this country now, it should be one on aboriginal affairs trying to deal with

the very complex situations of first nations across this country.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** What I am saying here today is that the constitutional debate that takes place should be both more immediately relevant and broader in scope than that envisioned by this proposed joint committee.

[*Translation*]

My party, as you know, has made numerous concrete proposals in this regard. We proposed the establishment of a constituent assembly. We asked that a Standing Committee on the Constitution be set up by the House of Commons, and renew that request today. If we have standing committees on transport and on agriculture, we can also have a committee on the Constitution, i.e. on the country's future. Such a form would allow broader discussion of the constitution, in particular of an amending formula. In short, a standing committee would allow us to examine the Constitution as a whole, instead of doing so in piecemeal fashion, as the motion put forward today by the government seems to be intended to do.

[*English*]

In conclusion, what I am saying and my party is saying is that it is not enough to strike a committee and travel around the country to discuss the amending formula, no matter how important that amending formula is, because Canada is not just about an amending formula; it is about people living together. We have to get to the heart of the matter; we have to talk about Canada itself.

When we talk about Canada, let us talk about national institutions, something this government seems determined to destroy. Let us talk about universal social programs, something else this government is obviously determined to let go. Let us talk about an economy that serves Canadian families throughout this country. Let us talk about a vision for Canada. Rather than look to an individual or an elite for that vision, let us look to the Canadian people: aboriginal people and women, people from the regions across the country, from Quebec; farmers, environmentalists, and minority groups. The vision is there. It is a vision of diversity within this country, and of acknowledging diversity within one nation.

Leadership is about bringing those visions together, and that is what we in this party intend to do.

We must work together to renew Canada, to give to our nation a new sense of direction and a new sense of purpose. We have a nation like no other and an opportunity that few on this planet have to build a society of people living together, sharing with each other, caring for each other, and celebrating the richness of our common humanity.

• (1230)

The responsibility we are charged with as members of Parliament is to bring Canadians together, to find solutions to our conflicts and to build for the future.

I want to propose, today, an amendment to the government motion, recognizing that the Speaker will need to make a ruling on this. I propose this amendment because I feel that through this we could fulfil our responsibilities to the Canadian people, to really address all of the issues.

Therefore I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" and substituting the following therefor:

"a standing committee of the House of Commons be appointed to consult broadly with Canadians and inquire into and report upon all matters related to the Constitution, including the amending formula".

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The Chair has received the motion in amendment moved by the hon. member for Yukon and will take it under advisement.

Ten minutes for questions and comments. The hon. member for Shefford.

**Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, after listening to the last three speeches, I had the distinct impression there was a lot being recycled here. About ten years ago I heard a speech in which the Prime Minister at the time used exactly the same terms. Three years ago, when I heard the Prime Minister of Canada talk about Meech Lake, it was the same speech, the same terms, the same old song. And when I hear hon. members repeat those same platitudes, I have to say we are very, very skeptical.

We are convinced this committee is doomed to failure. Mr. Speaker, when your house is on fire, it's too late to worry about the plumbing! To think they can reestablish a consensus in this country through an amending formula, Mr. Speaker, is utopian. It's a diversion, and it's a waste of time. They would have Canadians believe that

what is basically wrong with this country is the amending formula mechanism. This paper isn't even up to the standards of Political Science 101. Any student could have written a better paper than this. The text simply dishes up old nostrums that have been around for ages: the referendum model and the constituent assembly model.

Mr. Speaker, for many years, political observers have longed for this kind of process. However, we all know it is not part of Canada's tradition and that the present amending formula, which requires unanimity, will never be amended to allow for these alternatives.

No wonder the Prime Minister is panicking. Every time he makes a speech at a fundraiser, he has to announce a new committee. Thank goodness there aren't too many fundraisers right now, Mr. Speaker!

I think this initiative is worthy of a minor "Impro" league. He started with his so-called Spicer Commission—which is a big farce, even English Canada doesn't take it seriously, while it is completely ignored in Quebec—and now, he has just created a committee on plumbing. If any questions are asked, he might be willing to create a third committee on the division of powers and upon further questioning, he would probably appoint a fourth, fifth and even sixth committee.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that all these committees will not prevent Quebec from going ahead. Those who look at the world through rose-coloured glasses and think it will be business as usual are wrong. I may remind the Prime Minister that in his speeches before the demise of Meech Lake, he himself referred to the last chance, the last opportunity. Today, in his attempt to resurrect old political science papers, the Prime Minister is deluding himself.

Mr. Speaker, I am willing to accept the motion by the New Democratic Party which is more honest, in my opinion, because it is more open, while the position of the leader of this party is also far more realistic.

Mr. Speaker, this committee will never be able to come to grips with reality. It will be useless.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The hon. member for Hamilton East on a point of order.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, we have ten minutes to ask questions to the leader of the New Democratic Party. She wants to take the opportunity to make a speech. Fine. I want to make one too, but this is a question period. So, she should give others a chance to ask questions too. After all, we are more directly concerned by this issue than she is.

[*English*]

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond briefly to the previous speaker's comments simply by saying that despite our differences I am sure that no one in the Conservative Party, in the Liberal Party, or in the New Democratic Party feels that debating Canada is a waste of time.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the leader of the New Democratic Party a question. I must say that I found that she missed a tremendous opportunity in her speech. I found it remarkable that she began with partisan shots, unable to put the country ahead of party. It is simply not true that the Liberals opposed this debate. The fact is there is all-party agreement to have a one-day debate and the leader might well have reflected that.

She stated very clearly that her party stands for one Canada. That is a truly remarkable statement to those of us who fought the 1988 election, when her party in Quebec came out with a vision that was clearly at odds with the rest of the country. It is certainly a remarkable statement for those of us who saw the by-election of Laurier—Sainte-Marie where her candidate, in order to garner votes in that election, turned her back on Canada and the leader of the New Democratic Party did not denounce her. It is certainly a surprise to those of us in Quebec who have heard countless times the member for Chambly take a position which is clearly at odds with the members of the rest of her party. My question to the leader is, she may stand for one Canada, why does she not tell that to the members of her party in the province of Quebec?

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Mr. Speaker, I am the leader of the New Democratic Party. I speak for the New Democratic

Party. I stand in support of the member for Chambly who speaks with conviction as a Quebecer for Quebec interests within this party and for a united Canada.

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, you will permit some skepticism on our side. I was watching television about a month ago when the leader of the New Democratic Party said the Constitution was not a problem, the Constitution was not an issue, that what we should be looking at is strictly the economy. I am happy to see she now understands that the Constitution is very critical to the future of this country.

If in fact she speaks as the leader of the New Democratic Party, why is she afraid to speak before the Bélanger–Campeau Commission and to tell the people of Quebec exactly what her party thinks on this issue?

[*Translation*]

Why is she not prepared to go before the Bélanger–Campeau Commission and state her position on the Constitution instead of sending the member for Chambly. He is for sovereignty–association, but she is not. Why does she refuse to make a presentation?

[*English*]

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Mr. Speaker, I am accountable to my party. I am accountable to the people of Canada. I am not accountable to the Liberal opposition.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** However, I will say that both in Quebec and outside of Quebec I have spoken about our party's constitutional policy. I will continue to do so.

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for the NDP says we touched a nerve. Indeed it does touch a nerve when the leader of her party claims that they are the people who are speaking for Canada. However, she does not have the courage to go into the province of Quebec to speak about the federalist position of her party before the Bélanger–Campeau commission, but she is prepared to send the member for Chambly who is clearly saying one thing in English and another thing in French. One of the criticisms we have had of the government over this debate has been that the Prime Minister and the government have said one thing to English Canadians and another thing to Canadians in the French language.

• (1240)

There is one party and one leader who are prepared to say the same thing in both languages. It is the Liberal Party and it is the Liberal leader who has the courage to go before the Bélanger–Campeau Commission and tell Quebecers and Canadians about his hopes and dreams for Canada.

[*Translation*]

I find incredible and insulting that the government leader and the leader of the New Democratic Party refuse to state their constitutional policy for Canada.

**Mr. Duhamel:** They do not have one. They are afraid!

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, we are considering today a motion to establish a Special Joint Committee of the House to inquire and report upon the process for amending the Constitution, including alternatives to the present formula and other ways of changing it.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the amending formula is one of the contributing factors that lead to the Constitutional deadlock, but it is not the only one. The process itself was brought to a standstill because the Prime Minister refused to work as hard outside of Quebec as he did to sell the Meech Lake Accord to the people of Quebec. What he did is do a good job selling Meech Lake to Quebecers, but he did not say a thing about it outside of Quebec.

I know because I represent an anglophone riding outside of Quebec. Brian Mulroney and his gang did not come to Hamilton to explain what Meech Lake was about. Instead, they stressed upon the people of Quebec that to reject the Accord was to reject Quebec. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I did not reject Meech Lake. Nor did I reject Quebec.

My constituents have no understanding of what the Meech Lake Accord was. Some of those who were against the Accord do not want the separation of Quebec. They want Quebec to remain within Canada. After the failure of Meech, I think that we will now come to realize, with the work of the Bélanger–Campeau Commission and the recognition of the people outside of Quebec, that the situation is serious. We have finally reached the point where Canada must welcome Quebec within the Canadian family.

**Mr. Lapierre:** Too late!

[*English*]

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, I know my friend, Jean Lapierre, knows how much I bled in the Liberal caucus over the issue of Meech Lake. I want to tell him, and through him to Quebecers, and through them to Canadians, that the people outside Quebec who rejected Meech Lake did not want to reject the people of Quebec. For the Conservative Party of Brian Mulroney, who for three years travelled into the province of Quebec telling Quebecers, "A vote against Meech is a vote against you", and for the members of the Bloc Quebecois, who want to facilitate the separation of Quebec from Canada by telling Quebecers, "The rest of Canada does not care", I say to them, you are wrong. The rest of Canada wants to make a home for Quebec within the Canadian family. If we do not, if we fail in this initiative, and I dare say with the proposal of the government we are heading for failure, it is not only the federal Parliament of Canada that will pay the price but it is the country of Canada.

To have a Canada without Quebec, to have a Canada without one of the founding people who have contributed economically, socially, culturally, linguistically to the very fabric of our nation, that is to have no Canada at all. Perhaps there are a lot of Canadians with blinders on. I believe some of those Canadians were in my own party and I said so. However, the time has come to take those blinders off and recognize that not only do we have a country that is worth saving, we have a very special part of that country, indeed, a unique and distinct part of that country, known as Quebec, which must be made to feel at home again in the Canadian family.

How many Quebecers looked at the rejection of Meech as Canada's last chance to say no to Quebec? We have had another chance. Unfortunately, with the federal process which is being launched, not only by this particular committee but by the Spicer Commission, we are frittering away precious time in which the future of our country hangs in the balance.

[*Translation*]

After refusing to testify before the Commission on the political and constitutional future of Quebec, the Prime Minister actually believes that his initiatives here in Parliament will help Canadians meet the constitutional challenge. After refusing to recognize the main constitutional problem we must deal with in the near future, the Prime Minister thinks he is proposing adequate solutions. He does not understand the problem, and he is proposing the wrong solutions. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how can solutions be effective if the problem is ill-defined?

On November 30, I asked the Deputy Prime Minister whether the Prime Minister was going to appear publicly before the Bélanger-Campeau Commission. We already know he made several statements behind closed doors and we also know that the closed door process no longer works. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the Deputy Prime Minister answered no, saying that he failed to see why the Prime Minister should appear before the various commissions involved in studies and inquiries on the future of Canada. For shame, Mr. Speaker! The Prime Minister himself will not appear before the Bélanger-Campeau Commission on the future of Quebec! With or without the Prime Minister of Canada, Quebec's self-determination will have a major impact on Canada's self-determination. If Quebec decides to go its own way at the end of March, Canadians will lose a great deal, Mr. Speaker. Canadians outside Quebec have the most to lose if the Prime Minister is not prepared to speak for a united Canada before the Bélanger-Campeau Commission.

I believe the Prime Minister should acknowledge that national unity is his responsibility. Let's not fool ourselves, Mr. Speaker. Whether we like it or not, by reflecting on its own political and constitutional future, Quebec is actually determining Canada's future. With all due respect for the other provinces, I think we must admit that Quebec and Quebecers are the best informed on constitutional matters. It is not the first time they are dealing with these questions. We could even say the Constitution is a national sport in Quebec, and as with hockey, there are a number of well-trained teams, expert coaches, commentators who are well-informed and a very partisan, well-informed and knowledgeable public. The French in the St. Lawrence valley are past masters in the constitutional arts, and they also have the most experience in this field.

The 1982 Constitution is the seventh political or constitutional regime the French in Canada have known. The French regime, which started with the founding of Quebec in 1608, was followed by the British occupation after the Conquest in 1759, and then the Treaty of Paris

in 1763, which ceded French Canada to England. In 1791, the Quebec Act granted the right to speak French, practise the Catholic religion and use the Civil Code. The 1840 Act of Union united Upper Canada and Lower Canada, and in 1867, the British North America Act created Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, the Meech Lake Accord, to Francophones, was their eighth constitutional event, and following its demise, may be sure there will be a new eighth constitution for the people of Quebec, with or without Canada. The various constitutional crises we have known so far, Mr. Speaker, arose from the French Canadians' need to have their language and culture recognized and protected.

• (1250)

It would not be going too far to say that the very nature of Canada is determined by the fact that a francophone community and an anglophone community live side by side.

French Canada has always viewed the 1867 confederative pact as a pact between two peoples. This fact must be understood, Mr. Speaker, because it is still an important aspect of the on-going constitutional debate. Canada is a federal country, at the expressed request of French Canadians under the leadership of Georges Étienne Cartier, precisely so that they and the institutions that meet their needs may prosper in this land of America. Georges Étienne Cartier was successful in promoting his vision over the will of John A. Macdonald who wanted Canada to be a unitary state. Had Quebec not insisted there would have been no enduring constitutional debates throughout this century.

Chances are there would have been no amendments in 1982 had it not been for the rise of the independence movement in the Province of Quebec during the 1960s and 1970s. There would have been no Meech Lake had nobody felt the need to bring Quebec back into the constitutional fold. But then, Mr. Speaker, nor would we be confronted with an impending and serious crisis had the Prime Minister and his colleagues done their best to give all Canadians an enlightened explanation on the nature of the Meech Lake Accord. No, he chose instead to remain silent, Mr. Speaker. From the moment the accord was signed in 1987 until the very last minute he buried his head in the sand and let people interpret the arrangement as they saw fit.

So when the situation really turned bad he resorted to blackmail and attempted to manipulate the various parties in the dying minutes. This explains why we are now in this serious predicament.

The Conservatives played the constitutional game like a bunch of amateurs without giving it every consideration it deserved, and now they are taking the same approach with the Spicer commission.

[*English*]

The reason for the failure of the Meech Lake Accord was that the Prime Minister and the government never went to the rest of Canada to explain the real meaning of the process. Frankly, it played the constitutional game in an amateurish way and it is in the process of doing the same thing again. The Prime Minister said: "I rolled the dice." The Prime Minister said in *The Globe and Mail* that he created the constitutional crisis so he could force the parties to the table.

I fear that with the Spicer commission and with the parliamentary committee the Prime Minister is about to play constitutional roulette once again with the people of Canada. He is doing that because, instead of having a thoughtful, planned process of open constitutional reform, for five months after the death of Meech he did nothing. Then, he launched the Spicer commission which has been roundly criticized on all sides and which does not even have a full complement of full-time working members.

The constitutional clock for this country is ticking and we have a Prime Minister who is using amateurish approaches to try to solve a very difficult problem. Contrast that with the approach taken by the Bélanger-Campeau Commission.

[*Translation*]

Whether we like it or not, the first challenge will come from Quebec. All political, social and economic actors are now seriously considering Quebec's political and constitutional future, an exercise which is not being done in this House, Mr. Speaker. The opposing teams stand face to face. Experts one after another express their views. Every day the newspapers are full of briefs and comments of every description. People are following the debate very closely. And what is heard is beyond the

imagination of any other Canadian who even bothers to listen.

[*English*]

It is important that I say this in English, Mr. Speaker. The rest of the country has yet to realize that we are on the verge of a constitutional crisis which could result in the end of Canada. I hope that in some small way this debate and even the debate of the Spicer commission and, certainly, the debate being undertaken by the Bélanger–Campeau Commission will send a signal to the rest of Canada that Quebec has waited too long and the rest of Canada must wake up if we are going to be able to save the country in time.

[*Translation*]

First of all, listen to what Quebec social groups and unions are saying: They already want to leave.

[*English*]

They are already speaking about what they will do after the beginning of a sovereign Quebec.

[*Translation*]

Moreover, it is not only unions and social groups who are saying that, Mr. Speaker, but also financial organizations such as the *Mouvement Desjardins*.

[*English*]

When a major financial institution of the nature of the *Mouvement Desjardins* calls for independence, we know that the time for Canada is quickly running out.

[*Translation*]

Moreover, the *Conseil du patronat* wants Quebec to be distictive not only through its language, but also through a whole series of other institutions including the Civil Code, the Revenue Department, networks of manpower centres and financial institutions. Others, such as the Quebec Chamber of Commerce, although they would prefer to keep a Canadian money system, are already talking about the possibility of a separate currency for Quebec. Poeple have to listen, Mr. Speaker!

[*English*]

Listen Canadians, the Quebec Chamber of Commerce, although it would prefer to keep a Canadian money system, is already talking about the possibility of a separate Quebec currency. Time is running out and the Prime Minister does not have the luxury of the years and years of the three-year process of Meech. What he has is time running out on him, with federal initiatives that show little leadership, little planning, and little understanding of how grave the situation is.

[*Translation*]

**An hon. member:** It is true!

**Ms. Copps:** The ideas submitted to the Bélanger–Campeau Commission are each more daring than the next. Many are asking for the Quebec people to decide the issue in a referendum held as soon as possible. This Commission is supposed to table its report at the end of March, which means that the Quebec government would then have definite recommendations available and could act quite expeditiously.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will forgive me for describing in detail the process taking place in Quebec, but I did so because I wanted to compare it with the process here at the federal level.

[*English*]

I wanted to speak in detail, Mr. Speaker, about the Quebec process because I think we have to contrast that with the absolute lack of leadership and planning to save Canada on the part of this Prime Minister and this government.

The Spicer commission was cobbled together at the last second. The resolution about which we are speaking today was brought about as a response to an immediate political problem of the Prime Minister. Where has he been since June 23, when he knew that the constitutional clock was ticking? Where has he been? Why does the government not expand the terms of reference of this committee to make sure that it deals, not only with the important issue of the amending formula, but also the other questions that Canadians want put on the table?

It is simplistic and naive to suggest that the death of Meech was only a result of the formula of unanimity. The death of Meech was the result of a federal Prime Minister who was unwilling to speak out in the rest of Canada as eloquently and as vociferously as he spoke out in the province of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, I can speak with credibility on this issue because I spoke in the same language, with the same words, in every part of the country and I can tell you that the death of Meech which started the clock ticking for Canada was a direct result of the mismanagement and the amateurish approach of the government. I fear that we are about to repeat the same process with this position.

I pray for Canada, Mr. Speaker. I pray for Canada and I do not care what political party one belongs to, but I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, Canadians should wake up because the clock is ticking. We need a new deal for Canada and we need a new deal for Quebec in Canada.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The hon. member for Laval–Ouest, very briefly.

**Mr. Guy Ricard (Laval–Ouest):** Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the hon. member for Hamilton East and I must congratulate her, for she did take a stand for the Meech Lake Accord and supported it. Now, her leader will go to Quebec to appear before the Bélanger–Campeau Commission and force down the throat of the Quebecers things they may not be interested to hear.

I would Like the hon. member for Hamilton East to tell me how she will react to Mr. Chrétien's testimony before the Bélanger–Campeau Commission.

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, I was among those who wanted Mr. Chrétien to go before the Bélanger–Campeau Commission so that he could explain directly to the people of Quebec what his aspirations were for the future of Quebec within Canada. It is a well known fact that he opposed the Meech Lake Accord, but we also know that, during the after–Meech—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please! It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock.

At 1.01 p.m., the House took recess.

---

## AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

# STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*English*]

## PUBLIC SERVICE 2000

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, the government's white paper on Public Service 2000 tabled yesterday confirms the concerns of the Liberal Party and Public Service employees that real consultation is not part of the agenda of the government.

The document was prepared without consultation with employee representatives and far from being a discussion paper, it is riddled with dictates like "the government will", "the government has decided", "the government will require". There is no strategy in place for a dialogue. In fact the President of the Treasury Board has sent out mixed messages about whether the paper will even be referred to a special committee as recommended by the public accounts committee.

This is the acid test on whether the government really wants to consult with Canadians or just with corporate Canada. PS 2000 is now under the microscope. The Liberal Party, the Public Service, and Canadians are watching.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## AWARD OF EXCELLENCE IN ARCHITECTURE

**Mr. Jacques Vien (Laurentides):** On Tuesday, December 11, Mr. Speaker, I attended a meeting at Mont–Rolland's cultural and community centre. The meeting had been organized to celebrate the fact that Boudrias, Boudreau, St–Jean and Associates, an architectural firm of my riding of Laurentides, has been given a mention for the Ordre des architectes du Quebec Award of Excellence. The firm Boudrias, Boudreau, St–Jean and Associates received this excellence award mention for the quality of their work in renovating and enlarging the cultural and community centre of Mont–Rolland. This very functional building is greatly appreciated by Mayor Gilles Legault, his councillors and the residents of Mont–Rolland.

I want to congratulate Boudrias, Boudreau St-Jean and Associates for their outstanding work, and I commend them for receiving the excellence award mention from the Ordre des architectes du Quebec.

* * *

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Phillip Edmonston (Chambly):** This weekend, Mr. Speaker, I will be joining more that 5,000 people in Rimouski where, together, we will express our total disagreement over the cut-backs imposed by this government to the CBC, more particularly the savage reductions affecting eastern Quebec television stations.

Mayor Roger Thériault of Baie-Comeau, a community well known to the Prime Minister, I should think, said that these cut-backs are "a low blow which torpedoes the nascent regional conscience".

It is not too late for the Prime Minister to listen to his own electors, Mr. Speaker. These people, and the electors of Rimouski this weekend, as well as those of eastern Quebec and all the other regions of Canada hard hit by these unacceptable and harmful cut-backs are asking that they be rescinded.

The government must rescind these cut-backs immediately, re-instate these essential regional voices, and stop strangling everything that does not originate from major centres.

* * *

## CANADA POST CORPORATION

**Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Manicouagan):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House today the problems eight villages of the Lower North Shore suffered because of Canada Post's poor delivery service.

For over two months, Mr. Speaker, the residents of the villages of Baie Johan-Beetz, Kégaska, La Romaine, Harrington Harbour, Mutton Bay, La Tabatière, Aylmer Sound and Tête-à-la-Baleine get their mail with delays of up to 10 days in some instances.

That unacceptable situation results from changes made by Canada Post regarding the air transportation of postal matter to the Lower North Shore.

The Lower North Shore had managed to set up a good postal service for itself over the past few years. Then, a decision by the Canada Post Corporation in the spring of 1990 brought radical changes to the transportation and delivery of postal matter, which caused the service deterioration now facing the region.

Mr. Speaker, this situation can no longer be tolerated. Steps must be taken to restore decent postal service for the people of the Lower North Shore.

* * *

[*English*]

## CITIZENS' FORUM ON CANADA'S FUTURE

**Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq):**

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

Mr. Speaker, once again the Prime Minister has excluded the north from the national forum on Canada's future. Once again the north has been shut out.

The forum's chairman is quoted today as saying he would have preferred to have a northern aboriginal representative appointed. Obviously, the Prime Minister did not agree. Obviously, the Prime Minister has forgotten his pre-election commitment to stop treating the territories like poor cousins.

For this Prime Minister and this government, Canada seems to stop at the 60th parallel. People who live south of 60 are given a voice in the national constitutional soul-searching, but the residents of the far north, those who occupy 40 per cent of Canada's land mass, who make their contribution to this country's sovereignty and prosperity without the services other Canadians take for granted, are continually denied the opportunity to participate in the strengthening of this nation. Northerners are Canadians too. We have something to contribute. The people of the north will not forget that this Prime Minister thinks we have nothing to offer.

* * *

## CANADA'S GREEN PLAN

**Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound—Muskoka):** Mr. Speaker, the media and opposition parties have been attacking the green plan for being vague and not going far enough.

As one who has been involved with environmental issues for over ten years, I believe the critics are wrong, wrong, wrong. The green plan is a comprehensive agenda for decisive action on the environment with

defined targets and schedules, supported by $3 billion in new funding.

Other countries have developed similar plans, including the United Kingdom, France, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands and Australia. Frankly, not one of these countries comes even close to Canada in terms of committed funding, targets and schedules, scope and the extent of public consultation and participation in the formulation process.

If the critics expended more of their energy in constructive pursuits such as becoming full partners in the green plan solution, the common goal of a healthier environment would be reached in less time than any of us have ever imagined.

* * *

## THALIDOMIDE VICTIMS

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, three victims of the drug thalidomide spoke before the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare this morning. The three, representing 72 others like them, asked for monthly assistance based on the severity of disability instead of equal lump sum payments irrespective of severity as chosen by this government.

After 30 years waiting for compensation, desperation has forced these people to bring their case to the United Nations Human Rights Committee. It shames me to say Canada is the only remaining country that has not yet come to the aid of its thalidomide victims despite their obvious need. Thirty per cent cannot find meaningful jobs, and another 30 per cent rely on their families for support. I and the member for London East ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare to grant the request of the 75 Canadian thalidomide victims who have waited so patiently for redress. Please meet with them soon for the sake of justice, or do they need to wait for the judgment of the United Nations?

* * *

[*Translation*]

## CHILD CARE

**Mr. Jacques Tétreault (Laval–Centre):** Mr. Speaker, on December 6, 1990, the minister Monique Landry presided at the official opening in my riding of Laval–Centre of the first day care center made available in an office complex in Laval.

The "Génies en herbe G.L." center is an initiative of the engineering firm Gendron Lefebvre, with the support of Édifice G.L., the City of Laval and the Quebec child care services bureau.

Each year, this organization gets generous financial assistance from the government of Canada. The center accomodates 60 children, including 8 newborn, and there is an outdoor playground designed especially for children.

The location and layout of the center allow parents to come and see their child during the day. The community of Laval is grateful to the Gendron Lefebvre firm for this praiseworthy initiative.

* * *

[*English*]

## RURAL DIGNITY

**Mr. Ray Funk (Prince Albert—Churchill River):** Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth anniversary of the founding of Rural Dignity, a grass roots organization based on the principle that there are three great federal institutions which hold this country and rural communities together: the post office, the CBC and VIA Rail.

There are now thousands of rural Canadians, ably led by organizers like Cynthia Patterson and Barb Bonneau, who are fighting the cuts which threaten their communities and their way of life, like the closure and privatization of 5,200 rural post offices.

At one time the Prime Minister said that Canada is a country of small towns and big dreams. The last six years of population loss, poverty, privatization and lost services have been more like one big nightmare for rural Canadians. Grass roots movements like Rural Dignity Canada prove that rural Canadians are not going to stand by and watch the government gut their communities and their way of life.

There is a warning in this for all government members from rural constituencies; they had better pay attention to what their rural constituents are saying or face the consequences in the next election.

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West):** Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a GST-related fact-finding tour of southern Alberta and Saskatchewan in my capacity as Official Opposition critic for revenue. I met with western Canadians in 17 communities ranging from cities the size of Calgary to towns like Turtleford, Saskatchewan.

• (1410)

I spoke with them on radio talk shows, on the streets, in town halls and in malls. I met with mayors and other local politicians.

I wish to advise the House of three basic facts which I confirmed on my visit. First, western Canadians are overwhelmingly opposed to the GST.

Second, western Canadians are overwhelmingly opposed to the imposition of the tax on January 1, in the face of the clear need to rectify many obvious flaws in the proposed legislation.

Third, western Canadians are overwhelmingly in support of the Liberal senators' fight to defeat or delay the imposition of a tax they view as being forced on them by what many describe as the Mulroney dictatorship.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, in Quebec we often talk about regional development, and since September 1984, in conjunction with our economic partners in Abitibi, we have managed to get six Community Futures Committees from the Conservative Government.

I have always said to my constituents that these committees provide the perfect vehicle for consultation. The PQ member for Rouyn-Noranda, Mr. Rémy Trudel, who ran as an NDP candidate in Témiscamingue in the last federal election in 1988, agreed not long ago that federal CFC was "the ideal formula for consultation" and "a genuine socio-economic summit".

*S. O. 31*

Mr. Speaker, every community in Abitibi will draw on its strengths to start developing new industries and diversify its economy.

* * *

## LEADER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY

**Mrs. Gabrielle Bertrand (Brome—Missisquoi):** Mr. Speaker, in the December 12 edition of *La Presse*, journalist Mario Fontaine reported, and I quote: "When Jean Chrétien appears before the Bélanger-Campeau Commission, he will try to play down his federalist image". The journalist went on to say that the atmosphere at Liberal Party headquarters was very tense.

Along the same lines, backroom adviser Senator Rizzuto said that Mr. Chrétien would be very flexible and indicate that he was receptive to Quebec's aspirations.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether to laugh or to cry. What kind of credibility can Quebecers expect from a man who obeyed his mentor, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, and condemned the Meech Lake Accord, a man who stated that "Canada is not negotiable", a man whose wonderful promises made in 1980 were soon forgotten in 1982, a man who convinced western Canadians he would put Quebec in its place?

I am sure there are many people who, like me, are waiting for December 21 to hear the Chrétien creed, new style, adapted to its audience and to the circumstances.

* * *

[*English*]

## CORPORATE TAXATION

**Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, this week's nominees for the corporate welfare bum of the week award are: Prairie Oil Royalties Company, which had a profit of $5.1 million in 1989, a bonus of $1.6 million in tax credits, and no taxes paid.

**Some hon. members:** Shame.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Ranger Oil, with $32.6 million U.S. in profits in 1989, $3 million U.S. in government hand-outs and no taxes paid.

**Some hon. members:** Shame.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Ranger Oil, with $32.6 million U.S. in profits in 1989, $3 million U.S. in government hand-outs and no taxes paid.

**Some hon. members:** Shame.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Our last nominee, Northgate Exploration, with $5.3 million profits in 1989, with $1.4 million in government handouts and no taxes paid.

**Some hon. members:** Shame.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** With the gulf crisis driving the prices of oil on a roller coaster ride with Santa Saddam at the wheel, our nominees, along with other oil companies are in for some treats with the consumer, being the Xmas turkey.

For the winner: *l'enveloppe, s'il vous plaît, monsieur.* The winner is Ranger Oil, our corporate welfare bum of this week. Congratulations to our winner, Ranger Oil. You can be sure that they are not a "Lone Ranger" when it comes to profitable oil pricing.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## CANONIZATION OF MARGUERITE D'YOUVILLE

**Mr. Charles DeBlois (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans):** Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, Pope John Paul II canonized the first Canadian saint, Marguerite d'Youville, founder of the congregation of the Sisters of Charity.

Today, as they did 250 years ago, the Sisters of Charity help street people, offer assistance to battered wives, provide hospital care, provide shelter for children from troubled families, help teenage mothers, visit the sick, help our schools, and so forth.

My own family can bear witness to the dedication of the Grey Nuns, and the people of my riding are very proud to have the mother house of the Sisters of Charity of Quebec, headed by Sister Yolande Bonner, in their community.

Congratulations to all the members of this order who today continue to uphold the ideals of their founder, Saint Marguerite d'Youville, which are fraternity and justice.

[*English*]

## SOCIALIST AWARDS

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt):** Mr. Speaker, we have the weekly socialist awards of excellence.

The nominees this week are: one of the Quebec members of the NDP who preaches sovereignty for Quebec while remaining a party member who supposedly favours federalism. Louise O'Neil, NDP candidate in the recent by-election in Laurier—Sainte Marie who, after losing to the Bloc Québécois, decided to end her political charade, leave the NDP and join the separatists.

The envelope, please: And the winner is the New Democratic Party, the party that preaches unity to English Canada while telling its Quebec candidates that preaching separatism is all right as long as one of them gets elected. Hypocrisy runs rampant once again in the NDP.

It is obvious to any thinking person that the only hope for a united Canada is the Liberals under Jean Chrétien.

I call upon every member of the NDP who really cares about Canada to come and join us over here.

---

# ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

## THE SENATE

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister, I have a question for the Deputy Prime Minister.

It is about something that pertains directly to the executive authority of the Prime Minister. Under section 34 of the Constitution, the Prime Minister in effect appoints the Speaker of the Senate.

Yesterday, in what has been called "the worst example of parliamentary dictatorship", the Speaker of the Senate broke the rules of that place in an attempt to force through the GST.

I ask the Deputy Prime Minister: Why has the Prime Minister allowed the Speaker of the Senate, his appoin-

tee, to carry out these improper actions? Inasmuch as the Prime Minister in the House this morning said that he did not intend to bulldoze Canadians on the Constitution, is it not time he and the government stopped trying to bulldoze Canadians when it comes to the GST?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think I ever observed such a disgusting spectacle as the attack the Liberal Senators have made upon the Speaker of the Senate. It is unprecedented, absolutely unprecedented.

I am sorry to note that the Leader of the Opposition associated himself with that, because the Speaker of a House has the authority and responsibility to maintain law and order in a Chamber. It is about time that he has put his foot down. I think he should be applauded and will be applauded by all Canadians.

**Mr. Speaker:** Of course I am not sure where the next question is going to. I listened very carefully to the Leader of the Opposition. I listened also to his argument in the preamble that, because it was tied to the appointment by the Prime Minister, the question was appropriate.

I have serious doubts as to whether or not questions ought to be asked in this place that go directly to the heart of proceedings in the other place. I think for the moment that has to be my ruling.

**Mr. Gray (Windsor West):** Mr. Speaker, I will abide by the ruling because the Deputy Prime Minister has in effect admitted that the Speaker of the Senate is acting under the instructions of the government and the Prime Minister.

* * *

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a document from the Department of Finance in which the government admits that the GST is flawed and that it intends to change it in a number of ways.

I ask the Deputy Prime Minister: If the government is admitting that the GST is flawed, why, instead of trying to bulldoze it through, doesn't the government withdraw the GST, axe the tax, and give all Canadians a break?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has misinterpreted the response to the earlier question that he posed.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

• (1420)

**Mr. Mazankowski:** What I am saying and what is clearly obvious was that the Speaker's ruling in the other place was upheld by a majority of the members. That is consistent with the traditions of the House over there.

It is rather strange that when a challenge was made about a Speaker's ruling and the Liberals would challenge a Speaker's ruling and defeat it, all was well because majority ruled.

What is at issue here is that the majority has changed. It now is a Conservative majority, and that is what the hon. Leader of the Opposition is failing to accept.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister speaks of a majority of senators, but Canadians will not forget that this majority was created when the Prime Minister packed the Senate with a bunch of GST-loving Tories who are ignoring the views of a majority of Canadians who say they do not want the GST.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the amendments suggested in the document of the Department of Finance confirm that the GST includes a number of errors, particularly as it applies to tourists and cab fares. So I ask the minister, since the government finally admits that the GST contains errors, at least in these areas, why does it not mention books as well? Why does it still insist on taxing books? Again, why is the government so intent on taxing books? Why?

[*English*]

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, in response to the first part of the question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition wherein he takes issue with the actions of the Prime Minister in

invoking section 26 of the Constitution, I might just remind him that that action was perfectly legal and it has been upheld by at least three court cases.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Deputy Prime Minister. It concerns the leaky GST amendments, a copy of which I have in hand.

These amendments propose a series of changes to take effect at the same time as the present GST before the Senate is to take effect, on January 1. Is this not proof that the bill is badly flawed? Is this not proof that the Prime Minister and this government should have told the truth to Canadians, that the bill is wrong and should be withdrawn?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. member has been all these months. Both the Minister of Finance and myself, in this House and outside, have indicated that we were listening to Canadians.

We have already made, as the members knows very well, a number of improvements in the operation of the GST. We have done it. We will, as necessary, continue further improvement to the GST when the bill receives Royal Assent.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, this is the same government that told us there was only one budget leak. That is how honest this government is.

I would like to ask the following question of the minister who has just replied.

[*Translation*]

Why did the minister choose not to advise the House when he realized there were major flaws in his legislation? Why did he hide that information from the House? Why does he want to introduce a bill through the back door on Parliament's last sitting day before the Christmas recess? Why did he hide the truth from Canadians.

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, never did the government hide the truth. Quite the contrary, and I am amazed that a member who has been in this House for so long, at least for me because I am a relatively new member— Every time a budget is tabled we introduce a number of bills related to the budget, and in turn these are followed by others to make improvements and close loopholes. In the case of this major reform we consulted with Canadians. That is what we have been doing since August 1989, and we will seek every means available to ensure that the tax is as fair, as equitable and as effective as possible.

[*English*]

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. Clearly the government is intent on ramming through the GST. It is unfortunate that the Liberal senators did not vote against the GST on first reading or on second reading, or we would not be at this point now.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Mr. Speaker, both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance have said at various times that there are flaws in the GST. The Department of Finance has now released a document saying that the GST does have flaws. Surely it is the government's responsibility to get it right the first time. It obviously could not with this tax. It obviously could not bring in a fair tax system.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister do the right thing now and withdraw the GST?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the hon. Leader of the NDP that we shall do no such thing because this reform is very good reform for the economy of Canada. It will inject in the economy $9 billion, and this is what we are waiting for.

As for technical improvements, she knows as I know that as we go along, as we consult, as we are informed of possible improvements, we bring them on side. What is wrong with that? We are an understanding and attentive government.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It is also a government that says to Canadians: "Just trust us".

During the free trade debate there were a lot of promises made about lowered prices and a level playing field. We do not have any of that. The economy is in shambles. There are not more jobs, there are fewer jobs, and now the government says: "Just trust us. We will fix up the GST. Don't worry about it". We are worried about it.

This is the worst tax at the worst time. This government knows it. Experts know it. Canadians know it. Will the Deputy Prime Minister now bring in a fair tax system and withdraw the GST today?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I am amazed: 48 countries, among which are the most modern countries in the world, have such a tax.

I know that the opposition parties have had a fixation. They know that taxes are unpopular. They have been attacking this tax with great vigour, but they have been carried away by their own speeches. I am not.

This is a modern reform. It has been called for for 50 years. Committee after committee has recommended it. We are doing it. It is a tough thing. In so doing we are also listening to people and, when we can bring in improvements, we are doing it.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** This government keeps saying, Mr. Speaker, that it is doing a tough thing. What Canadians wish is that it would do the right thing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the battle opposing the Liberals and the Conservatives in the Senate goes on. This government will just not give up. While the battle goes on, the victims are forgotten. And who are those victims? They are, Mr. Speaker, the million and some unemployed men and women in Canada as well as the small businesses that can no longer manage to survive.

It is time this government recognized it made a mistake. It is time for them to swallow their pride. I ask the Deputy Prime Minister: Will the Prime Minister finally swallow his pride and withdraw the GST as common sense would dictate?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat to the hon. Leader of the New Democratic Party that we will do no such thing because, she can say what she pleases, the GST is an excellent tax and a fair tax. Of all comparable systems, it is the fairest because of the tax credits.

That being said, the hon. member requested that we change our policy. To that I say, as we say in English, the proof is in the pudding. If you look at the interest rates today, you will notice that they are down 15 basis points. They have been going down for several months now. That is our goal and it is achieved through a serious policy designed to control inflationary pressures. These pressures are decreasing. Like all Canadians, we are delighted. The big winner is not the government but the Canadian people.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South):** Mr. Speaker, I have always heard that the proof of the pudding was in the eating. Perhaps that is why the government is trying to jam the GST down the throats of Canadians. The draft press release, leaked yesterday, confirms to Canadians that the government has not thought through the GST. On top of the flurry of draft regulations coming from the Department of Finance that have just been sent to tax experts, we now know that the tax needs to be amended even before the bill has been passed through the Senate. This confirms that the government is rushing to get this tax through, in the desperate hope that Canadians will forget before the next election.

• (1430)

Why will the government not admit that it is simply not capable of implementing the GST three and a half weeks from now? Why does it not step back, withdraw the tax, start over, and give Canadians genuine tax reform?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I will tell the hon. member that we will be in a position to implement it. We have, in the past, brought forward improvements.

I will repeat, this is a very important reform that covers a lot of ground in the taxation area. There are areas, not necessarily of very great significance, that can be improved. We are working on them. It is a fact that we have been improving it since August and that we will continue, as we do with all tax bills.

**Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South):** Mr. Speaker, that is cold comfort to the Canadians who still do not really know what it is they are going to have to comply with in three and a half weeks' time.

[*Translation*]

More specifically, the draft press release proves that the government intends to introduce changes. At his meeting with students from Vancouver, the Prime Minister said that he felt it was too bad the tax was applied to books. Does the government intend to show students that the Prime Minister really believed what he said? Is

the government prepared to promise that its bill to amend the GST will also abolish the GST on books?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** The hon. member said that Canadians will not know what taxes they will have to pay. I think they know perfectly well. In fact, they said as much in the polls. When we are talking about certain categories of people or businesses, that is another thing altogether. We have to upgrade the system we have, and that is what we are going to do. As for the tax on books, I may remind the hon. member that at the present time we have a federal sales tax imposed across the board, more or less. We are going to remove it, and we will also grant tax credits, so that people who might be penalized by this tax, people on low incomes, will have more money in their pockets than they did before.

Furthermore, by injecting $9 billion into the economy, more people will work, they will have better salaries and they will be able to buy more books.

* * *

[*English*]

## THE CONSTITUTION

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. The issue being decided today is really based on trust. Canadians are asking themselves why should anybody in this country believe the Prime Minister's declaration this morning that he wants to establish a committee of the House of Commons and Senate to repair and to modernize the institutions of Canada when this afternoon his appointee in the Senate, the Speaker of the Senate, is going to cut off debate and ram through the GST?

Doesn't the Prime Minister understand that he who destroys and corrupts our institutions cannot heal those institutions?

**Mr. Speaker:** I think the hon. member would want to put his question with less use of provocative language.

**Mr. Tobin:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I shall put my question to the Deputy Prime Minister in another way, out of respect for this Speaker in this Chamber.

My question to the Deputy Prime Minister is the following. How can Canadians take seriously government initiatives to repair, modernize and make relevant our institutions, when this same government has been in the process of destroying institutions in this country?

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised that the hon. member, who has had a distinguished parliamentary career, would engage in the kind of abusive and unparliamentary reflection that he has just cast on the Speaker in the other place.

I think that he may very well want to rethink that because quite frankly, Mr. Speaker—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Mazankowski:** Mr. Speaker, surely what is at issue is that after eight months of consideration in the other place, it is time to make a decision. It is time to call the vote and it is the responsibility of the Speaker to maintain law and order and ensure that—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** I think we will move on. The hon. member for Winnipeg Transcona.

* * *

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to hear the Liberals so full of sound and fury signifying nothing.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would ask the hon. member to put his question.

**Mr. Blaikie:** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals fought the GST the way David Peterson fought the free trade agreement, by going to Japan. That is the way the Liberal Senators, who had opportunities to defeat the GST time and time again but did not take those opportunities.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would remind the hon. member that I asked him to put his question. I am going to have to move on if he does not.

**Mr. Blaikie:** My question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Deputy Prime Minister. If the government has admitted, as it has, through what we have come to know from this draft press release and ways and means motion, that the GST bill was flawed, would they not finally do the right thing with respect to the GST, admit there are many other things in it that have to be corrected, withdraw the bill and bring it back to the House so we can have another crack at it.

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** No, Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that question.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, if the government is willing to correct the things that the minister has indicated he wants to correct, why is it not willing to bring the tax back to the House of Commons so we can look at the inadequacy of the indexing, so we can look at the way it affects families, so that we can look at all the other injustices that this bill institutes, and do something about them?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, our documents pertaining to this tax and the bill itself were in front of this House since 1987 I think. If there were any constructive proposals to come from the other side of the House we would have found out by now.

* * *

## HARBOURFRONT CORPORATION

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence):** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-73 authorizes the Minister of Public Works to separate the development and program functions of Toronto's Harbourfront Corporation by dissolving the corporation and selling off its assets.

Will the minister tell us what economic factors prompted him to agree to a sales deal that will give three developers, Konvey, Rampart, and Huang and Danczky a $36.4 million benefit, a sweetheart deal, thanks to public funds?

**Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works):** Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleague opposite to give me the source for those very unimaginative and I would say completely inaccurate figures. As he knows Darcy McKeough, a fine administrator, went over much of the plan of Duncan Allan, an outstanding Ontario civil servant, and we found that the Darcy McKeough proposal was very well accepted in Toronto.

• (1440)

The Toronto mayor, Mr. Eggleton was pleased with it. In fact, many of the media people there congratulated us in getting this unanimous agreement between so many levels of government for such a constructive project.

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence):** Mr. Speaker, clearly the minister is not up to par because a government-financed appraisal reveals the stench that surrounds the deal.

For example, Konvey gives up properties worth $1.2 million in exchange for $6.2 million in benefits. Rampart walks away from a $10.6 million in return for $23.1 million prize. Huang and Danczkey gives up properties worth $6.1 million in return for a $25 million reward.

**Some hon. members:** Shame.

**Mr. Volpe:** Will the minister move to end this deal, or is he going to be content to let the stench of corruption taint the atmosphere of this deal?

**Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works):** If the hon. member has any serious concerns or problems with this particular proposal, I think he and his colleagues should sit down with some of the people in the Ontario administration, check with the mayor of Toronto, drop in and see Darcy McKeough and reflect upon the values of real estate in Toronto these days and maybe he will revise his estimates.

**Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the same minister. He claims that the Darcy McKeough proposals have been endorsed by the city of Toronto. In fact, on Monday they were rejected by a vote of 16 to one as being totally inadequate. Only the mayor voted in favour of them.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. MacKay:** I never said that.

**Mr. Tobin:** Tory developers.

**Mr. Kaplan:** Since when has the Government of Canada departed from the principle of paying fair market value for land that it takes from property owners?

**An hon. member:** Since Elmer took over.

**Mr. Kaplan:** The minister for privatization has said in the Toronto media that they did not pay fair market value. He says, "I am not arguing the figure. We paid a premium to get these three buildings off the south side." Why would the government pay a premium instead of fair market value when it has an obvious and full power of expropriation to take the land and not be bullied by developers into giving them premiums like this.

**An hon. member:** Tory developers.

**Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works):** I want to thank my colleague opposite for his usual penetrating look at the obvious. I never said that the city council endorsed it. I said that Mayor Eggleton was in favour of it.

In terms of abandoning the principles of fair market value, we have not abandoned those principles.

**Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre):** How can the minister say that they followed fair market value principles when his colleague says they paid a premium? Real estate appraisers who were paid for by the federal taxpayers and hired by the Government of Canada found those figures, to which my colleague referred, that show that instead of paying fair market value, the government has paid $36.4 million more than fair market value.

**Some hon. members:** Shame.

**Mr. Kaplan:** This is the government's own hired appraiser.

**An hon. member:** Resign.

**Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works):** I think my colleague's appraisals and his estimates for fair market value have the same relation to reality as Mr. MacEachen's projections for budgets. I think they are very inaccurate.

If the member would look at the present market value for real estate in Toronto, and if he would do a little research for a change, he would find that his figures and the figures of his colleague are in accordance with general Liberal economic and fiscal projections, terribly inflated and not very substantive.

* * *

## PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS

**Mr. Lyle Kristiansen (Kootenay West—Revelstoke):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Public Works. It relates to the two year old, three volume commissioned survey on West Block asbestos leaked yesterday, which has been hidden in the bowels of his department since December 1988.

The minister and the government is doing a lot of bragging lately about their green plan for the Canadian environment. The principles of the green plan, with all its talk about public information and consultation, ought also to apply to Parliament, MPs and our staff.

To have kept this report secret from the Speaker, from the Board of Internal Economy, from West Block MPs and from parliamentary employees for two years while spokespersons denied any danger was scandalous and unacceptable.

When was the minister made aware of the report and what did he do about it? In view of the fact—

**Some hon. members:** Order.

**Mr. Kristiansen:** —that yesterday the minister said he would check and report—

**Mr. Speaker:** There is a question. I am sure the minister would like to deal with it.

**Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works):** Mr. Speaker, I know that you share my concern at the complete lack of factual information that has just been delivered to the House.

As you and I have discussed today, the administrators of the House of Commons were made aware of this particular report.

**Mr. Kristiansen:** When? When?

**Mr. MacKay:** Shortly after it was completed, I say to my colleague from British Columbia.

If my colleague opposite is so concerned about it, as I indicated to my colleague from Cape Breton—East Richmond yesterday, I am quite prepared with the consent of the Board of Internal Economy to let him see the report or table it in the House. There is no mystery about it.

**Mr. Lyle Kristiansen (Kootenay West—Revelstoke):** Mr. Speaker, the information that we have is that answer is simply not true and not correct.

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** Order.

**Mr. Speaker:** I take it that the hon. member is saying that the answer is not inaccurate. Perhaps the hon. member could clarify his position and put the question.

**Mr. Kristiansen:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of the information that we have, that answer is not accurate.

My supplementary question, in this case is directed to the Minister of Labour. If the Minister of Labour had done his job and proclaimed Parts II and III of the Parliamentary Employment and Staff Relations Act, which was passed by this House four and one-half years ago, then our employees would have the right to know and to act, and we would not have this problem.

When will the Minister of Labour do his job as Parliament directed and give our employees the same basic health and safety rights as all other workers in Canada have? Will he have Part III of that act proclaimed now?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Labour and Minister of State (Transport)):** Mr. Speaker, one would believe that the hon. member would know that the proclamation of the act is not the responsibility of the Minister of Labour.

* * *

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Ms. Ethel Blondin (Western Arctic):** Mr. Speaker, the goods and services tax will be disproportionately brutal on the north. Northerners pay more than those in the south, 40 per cent more, generally.

Now the GST is threatening the economic viability of northern publishing companies which have developed a successful industry by using northern authors and settings. It is clear these concerned northern citizens are in the hands and at the mercy of the government.

Will the acting Minister of Finance recommend that books be exempted from the GST to alleviate the unbearable pressure on publishers and consumers from the north and across Canada?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, to begin with, I would not share the analysis made by my hon. colleague.

**Ms. Blondin:** You don't live there.

**Mr. Loiselle:** It is not a fact that such will be the effect of the GST. Obviously, she has been listening to her colleagues. She should listen to us.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Loiselle:** As my colleague, the Minister of Finance, has indicated many times, one of the heavy costs of living in the north is transport. The hon. member knows very well that people who bring things to the north have to pay a very heavy federal sales tax, which will be removed after implementation of the GST, hopefully very soon.

Credits will be available to members of certain communities. Notably, Indian communities in the north will have credits while not having to pay as much tax as other Canadians. I think on the whole they will be better off after reform.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. Ethel Blondin (Western Arctic):** Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear. I have just returned from the Northwest Territories where one of my constituents said to me that northerners this winter will pay $150 to $200 more to have their fuel tanks filled this winter. Try that on for size.

The cost of transportation is not going down. The cost of fur is going down. Unemployment is going up. The cost of living in the north is 40 per cent more than it is in the south.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you, the government fully intends to make changes to the goods and services act. We also know the government intends to tax all goods and services in the north, including transportation services.

Why will the government not exempt northern goods and services that are so vital to northern residents? Why does the minister opposite not take the opportunity to be merciful and listen to northerners who speak the truth?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

• (1450)

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, it seems we cannot win. When we listen and propose changes, we are accused of making changes.

I fully sympathize with the fact that we are now living in a very difficult environment. We know that. We forecast that in our last budget. We must come out of it as soon as possible. Part of the solution is through the force of our economy and the exporting companies. Many of the companies operating in northern parts of Canada will benefit greatly from this tax, bringing prosperity and more jobs.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Dennis Mills (Broadview—Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State for Finance. In the face of this economy, the real victims are the consumers and small business. Tax experts have said that the launch of this bill is going to be a disaster. There are close to 300,000 to 400,000 small businesses that have not even registered.

In the face of all of the difficulties that are facing consumers and small business, how, in good conscience, can the government proceed when it is overwhelmingly obvious that the negative effects are going to outweigh any positive effects?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to respond to that question. I would like to take this advantage to let the hon. member know that in fact there are over 900,000 businesses that have registered.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Jelinek:** Registration applications are coming in at over 100,000 a week. We are capable of processing up to 175,000 per week. Added to that, a recent Deloitte & Touche poll concluded that in the retail sector alone—and this is over a month old now—over 80 per cent of retailers were prepared for a January 1 launch.

I can tell the hon. member and this House that we are ready to go January 1. The business community is getting there. It will be there with the services that are being provided by Revenue Canada. We will have a launch on January 1 for the benefit of all Canadians coast to coast.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Dennis Mills (Broadview—Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, the minister talks about the number of businesses that have registered, but the real winners so far are the bigger businesses and also the government.

Studies according to the Canadian Federation of Independent Businesses show that consumers and small business are losing confidence and are not advancing with this bill. Why does the minister not address those who are suffering the most?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, the reason for this tax change is to assist those who are suffering the most.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Jelinek:** That is why we are moving in this phase of tax reform, for the benefit of those that suffer, in order to make them more competitive and more productive which will, in return, create more jobs and more productivity and a better economy in the country.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Jelinek:** Will you socialists keep it down so that we can at least have an exchange here?

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the hon. minister could conclude his answer.

**Mr. Jelinek:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member points out the Canadian Federation of Independent Businesses' study which is some months old. In fact, I think it is nearly one year old.

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Jelinek:** The study that I referred to is a Deloitte & Touche study done for the retail sector which is comprised primarily of very small businesses.

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Jelinek:** That study concluded that 60 per cent—Howard, will you shut your trap, please?

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Beaver River.

## GOVERNMENT REVENUES

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister in the absence of the Minister of Finance.

The government certainly knows that there is widespread public opposition to increased taxation. People do not mind paying taxes, but they are concerned about tax dollars disappearing into the spending machine of the government.

In light of these concerns, has the government considered establishing a deficit and debt retirement fund to which any excess revenues would be applied?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, since 1984, the government has followed a very clear policy of deficit reduction and expenditure control. We have been very successful transforming a $16 billion operating deficit into a $10 billion surplus. What a performance.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Loiselle:** We are looking at all the possible options, including that one. When the minister, my colleague, is here and comes forward with his budget, the hon. member will see what our decisions are.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River):** Mr. Speaker, my question is again directed to this minister.

Is the government prepared to introduce changes to the Income Tax Act, similar to section 110.1, to allow gifts to the Crown which can be applied directly to the deficit or the debt? Or else, second, is it prepared to introduce changes to the Financial Administration Act which will help ensure revenues go to reducing the deficit and not for further spending?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I think that we would, of course, want to apply any additional income from our taxation system to deficit reduction. The particular suggestion made by the hon. member will be looked at and I thank her for her suggestion.

[*Translation*]

## FOREST RESOURCES

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Forestry. Quebec Forestry Minister Albert Côté has inferred several times that the federal Forestry minister was trying to interfere with Quebec's provincial jurisdiction over forest resources.

My question is this: Could the minister give the House the assurance that the agreement proposed by the federal government to Quebec on August 24 respects the areas of jurisdiction of each government in this country?

**Mr. Michel Champagne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State (Forestry)):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to give my colleague the assurance that the federal government's proposal is aimed first and foremost at co-operation and partnership with all members of the industry, starting with the Government of Quebec.

We have always recognized Quebec's responsibility for proposing and maintaining regular forestry programs. With our next series of agreements, Mr. Speaker, we want, above all, to establish an effective partnership in order to accelerate the process of forest development in Quebec, especially in private woodlands.

* * *

[*English*]

## PUBLIC SERVICE

**Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the President of the Treasury Board.

Yesterday, he tabled the Public Service 2000 white paper. In his press conference, the minister demurred when asked which committee of the House he will be referring the white paper to. He declined to give any further details.

Will the minister now advise the House which committee he will be referring PS 2000 to, and when we can expect this to happen?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, I will do

precisely what I told the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts I would do when he wrote to me to ask this.

As I was about to enter the House yesterday, I was informed that the NDP did not like the idea of a special committee and that it would prefer a standing committee. I heard other remarks from the Liberal opposition that there are too many committees already.

I have asked the House leader on this side of the House to contact his colleagues to inform me of the desire of the opposition. Then, we will make a decision.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the President of the Treasury Board also stated that he now intends, after going through a task force and a white paper, finally to get into meaningful discussion with the unions involved. Is that a commitment, and what are this minister's plans for communication with the union?

• (1500)

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, they are very serious plans indeed. I would like to invite the unions now to be in touch with us. We have made public our intentions. I have told them that we will be prepared to negotiate and discuss with them.

I would also indicate to the hon. member that early in the new year I will put forward a full consultation process which will include, of course, any member who will want to come and state his or her mind on these very important matters. We are talking here of a major change made for Canadians. We have a fantastic civil service in Canada. We need to modernize it and remove the weight of Ottawa from it's back so that it can go on and serve the citizens.

I am determined to do that and I will welcome the contribution of anyone in this House to do that.

* * *

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Revenue has demonstrated the meaning of the Conservative dictatorship, "My way or no way". The minister is politically blackmailing business across Canada in order to sign up for the government's GST. Sign up—

**Some hon. members:** Order.

**Mr. Speaker:** Just a moment. I know that the hon. member would want to withdraw the word "blackmail". If he indicates that he is doing so, I will let him finish the question.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** I withdraw, Mr. Speaker. Numerous businesses will suffer across this country. The minister clearly does not understand the meaning of the word democracy.

My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. Does he not finally realize that this tax is flawed? He should withdraw it, go back to the drawing board and start all over again.

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is referring to my comments in a speech in Toronto earlier this week where I pointed out quite clearly and categorically to the business community, to those in the minority that have not yet prepared or registered for the GST, that if they do not register for the GST they will not be eligible for an input tax credit. They would not be eligible for the federal sales tax rebate on inventory. They would not be able to receive the up to $1,000 grant for start-up costs for small businesses.

What I am saying and repeating here today is for those businesses that have not yet registered, I think it is good business to do so in anticipation of a January 1 start.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to advise the House that I have several rulings to make. I think it would be of convenience to all members if we went ahead first with the usual Thursday question. The hon. member for Cape Breton—East Richmond.

* * *

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

### WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I have the usual question for the government House leader. Can he indicate to the House what the business will be for tomorrow, Monday, Tuesday and the remainder of next week?

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we will continue with the motion to

establish the special committee on the amending formula of the Constitution.

Tomorrow, I will be calling for report stage and possibly third reading of a number of bills which are important, though non-controversial, and hopefully they will be dealt with expeditiously: Bill C-63 on race relations, Bill C-68 on Yukon mining, Bill C-72 on the polar commission and Bill C-82 dealing with Quebec harbours.

On Monday, I hope to call for report stage under time allocation Bill C-84, the Petro-Canada bill, and on Tuesday, third and final reading of Bill C-84.

I will be in discussion with House leaders of the other parties with respect to further business for the rest of next week.

* * *

## POINT OF ORDER

QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order, if I may. Members on this side of the House would like from you, particularly in view of what happened to my colleague from Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte when he raised a question and then was asked by the Chair to rephrase the question, in which he obliged the Chair and then stood in his place for his customary second question and was thereafter informed by the Chair that he was out of order.

This may have been an inadvertence on the Chair's part, but members on this side, and particularly the hon. member, would like to have a full explanation if not today, perhaps tomorrow, as to what transpired, denying him the opportunity to phrase a second question which we believe on this side was very germane to the discussion which was taking place today.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps I can settle it now. I do not want to in any way offend the hon. member who is an experienced member of this House but as I heard the question, he was clearly linking the Prime Minister with comments including the word "corruption". I felt that that was out of order. I may not have made it clear that I felt that he should go to his second question and get on with it.

*Speaker's Ruling*

If I have erred by moving too rapidly I, of course, apologize but that is the explanation I give. I thank the hon. member for asking the question.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## PRIVILEGE

BLOC QUÉBÉCOIS—REQUEST FOR RESEARCH FUNDS—SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Speaker:** On Tuesday, November 27, 1990, the hon. member for Shefford raised a question of privilege related to a request he had submitted to the Board of Internal Economy to fund research for his group and to fund the office of the leader of the group. As Chairman of the Board of Internal Economy, I wrote to the hon. member to inform him of the Board's decision.

The hon. member had read the letter into the record and went on to challenge the fairness of the Board's decision, arguing with some vigour that "all hon. members should be treated the same" and that he and his colleagues must have the same rights and privileges as any other member in this House. The hon. member concluded with these words "— I beseech you to reverse your decision and if you refuse, you should at least have the decency to explain why."

These are strong words indeed. It appears to me that in presenting his impassioned case for additional funding for his group, the hon. member for Shefford has implied that the Chair has dealt in a high-handed and unfair manner towards certain members of this House. Furthermore, his words leave the entirely erroneous impression that the independent members in his group are being discriminated against.

As your Speaker, I cannot allow these erroneous impressions to stand unchallenged for they cast doubt on the impartiality of the Chair and risk tarnishing the whole House with the brush of unfairness.

[*English*]

First, let me state clearly that board decisions are made by the Board of Internal Economy, not by your Speaker. As Speaker, I am the chairman of that board and I preside over the deliberations of members, from all sides of the House, who sit as voting members of the board. These include the Deputy Speaker, the hon. government House leader, the hon. President of the Treasury Board, the House leader of the Official Opposition, the House leader of the New Democratic Party, the

chief government Whip, the Whip of the Official Opposition, and the hon. member for Lachine—Lac-Saint-Louise.

[*Translation*]

The Board considered the request made by the hon. member for Shefford that additional funds be made available to his group for research and for the office of the leader of the group. The Board decided not to make an exception in this case and not to make additional funds available at this time. The Board could have decided differently. For the moment, the decision stands and I can only reaffirm it.

[*English*]

That being said, however, it is important to note that the decision does not mean that the members in this group are impeded from full participation in the work of the House or that they are being deprived of support necessary to represent their constituencies adequately. The hon. member for Shefford argues that the nine independent members for whom he speaks require additional resources. Each member of this House receives a global budget which covers basic staff salaries, normal operating expenses of a constituency office, and related travel expenses. It is important to note that each of these members, like every other member of the House, enjoys the full flexibility to assign these financial resources as he sees fit. For example, under their global allocation, most members of the House will employ up to five staff persons to whom they assign research or administrative duties either in Ottawa or in the constituency, as they judge appropriate. The global budgets of these nine members taken together total close to $1.5 million.

• (1510)

In addition to the global budget, the House provides each member with a fully funded Ottawa office and coverage of important ancillary costs like telephone, postage, printing and travel. Such then is the level of support that the House of Commons offers to each and every individual duly elected to serve as a member of Parliament. It is in this context that the case of the hon. member for Shefford should be viewed.

[*Translation*]

One can well understand the reasons the hon. member for Shefford may have for pressing the Board of Internal Economy to recognize himself and his colleagues as an entity and to grant them additional funds accordingly. To date, these efforts have proven unsuccessful, but it is a long and dangerous leap to conclude from there that the basic rights and privileges of those members are somehow being abrogated.

A search of the *Debates* will show, on the contrary, that the hon. member for Shefford and his colleagues have been extended every courtesy by this House and that the Chair has safeguarded their participation in ways that are fully in keeping with our procedure and practices.

In Question Period the group was recognized for questions immediately on the return of the House in Septembe and have since been recognized most days when they sought to question the government or to make statements pursuant to S.O.31.

[*English*]

These brief remarks have sought to explain to all hon. members and to the public who are watching the House of Commons funding of an infrastructure supporting the hon. member for Shefford and his colleagues. I trust that they will dispel any incorrect perceptions about the situation, and clarify that the support and funding available to every private member of whatever political persuasion is fully available to members who have identified themselves as the Bloc Quebecois.

[*Translation*]

There are profound differences of opinion as to the best solution to the political and constitutional dilemmas we now face. The depth of the conviction with which these opinions are held and the very complexity of the issues before us make for a highly volatile situation. The Chair pledges to do its utmost to continue to serve this House in as even-handed and impartial a manner as possible. Meanwhile I ask for the continued co-operation of all hon. members so that, however vigorous and hard-fought our political battles, the work of this place will reflect the seriousness and the civility our constituents have a right to expect.

[*English*]

I have another ruling.

The hon. member on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Plamondon:** Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to ask you this: If I require some clarification on this point of order, should I request it now or wait until you have given your ruling on the other point of order?

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** If I finish the other point of order, it may perhaps resolve some other problems, or at least be a step toward resolving some other problems. I would ask the hon. member to wait.

ANNAPOLIS VALLEY—HANTS—SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Annapolis Valley—Hants rose on November 21, 1990 to declare that he was and wanted to be known as and registered in our records as an independent Conservative.

The hon. member for Calgary West intervened to make the point that in the Appendix to Wednesday's *Debates* members are listed by affiliation to parties recognized under the Canada Elections Act or as Independents, with no other possibilities in terms of that listing.

The Chair then indicated that the matter was the subject of discussion outside the Chamber and expressed the hope that it could be satisfactorily resolved.

Our further discussions on this matter were neither conclusive nor determinant of the issue. Before the Chair could so report back to the House, the hon. member for Annapolis Valley—Hants again rose on December 10, 1990 to press for recognition as an independent Conservative.

In his passionate appeal to the House, the hon. member referred us to numerous precedents where members having been elected under one label declared themselves under another affiliation and were so recognized.

He maintained that the political system in this country is based on the election of individuals whose party affiliation is incidental. The hon. member for Calgary West continued to insist that to invent a political affiliation which did not exist under the Canada Elections Act and to request the Parliament of Canada to approve the designation of that political affiliation in its written records when it does not exist as a label one can use in running for election in this country would be a serious mistake.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands submitted that the hon. member for Calgary West was seeking to alter the rules under which we have operated here by reference to changes in the Elections Act made in the 1970s. He concluded that based on precedents it would be entirely proper for the hon. member for Annapolis Valley—Hants to choose his designation and insist that it be inserted in the Wednesday listing as an Appendix to *Debates*.

The Chair concluded the exchange by asking if any member could advise the Chair if there was any legal impediment against the hon. member calling himself an independent Conservative of the House. None was identified.

The Chair promised to return to the House with a reasoned response and is prepared to do so now.

[*Translation*]

It is, perhaps, paradoxical that the political affiliation of an hon. member, which is so fundamental to his or her self-definition is, in our official records, given only marginal expression. As far as this House is concerned, a member is designated by political affiliation only in the weekly appendix to *Debates*, and only in appendices to *Journals* and the bound volumes of *Debates*. There are, of course, other applications of these designations as, for example, in the electronic Hansard or in miscellaneous listings of members of the House. However, these applications might be described as derivative in that they depend upon or are drawn from the listing which appears in the weekly appendix to *Debates*. Therefore, the designation of political affiliation in *Debates* must be the primary focus.

[*English*]

With very great respect to those who maintain an opposite view, the Chair must advise that it can find no prescription limiting the designations inserted under political affiliation in the Appendix to *Debates* to those parties officially recognized as such pursuant to the Canada Elections Act.

The absence of such a limiting prescription must be weighed against the combined weight of our past practice in this regard and our long-standing tradition of respecting the word and legitimate demands to self-definition of individual members.

Having tried to perform this balancing act in the present instance with very great attention and care, the Chair is persuaded to yield to the request of the hon. member for Annapolis Valley—Hants and accordingly hereby direct that he be listed as an Independent Conservative in the weekly Appendix to *Debates*, in the Appendices to the bound volumes of *Debates* and *Journals*, and in any documents or circumstances consequential to those Appendices.

I recognize that this was not necessarily a particularly easy decision to make, but I hope that it meets, after the long discussion that took place, with the approval of the members of the House.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Plamondon:** Mr. Speaker, may I say I am extremely disappointed by the answer you gave to the very clear question put by the member for Shefford. In his question he had asked you to justify—

• (1520)

**Mr. Speaker:** There is a long-standing tradition in this House. As the hon. member seems to be doing, it is not in order to comment on a ruling made by the Chair. If the hon. member has a question I will certainly try to answer him here or even in my chambers. After this caveat, he may continue.

**Mr. Plamondon:** I will ask my question, Mr. Speaker. I simply wanted to refer to the beginning of the questions of the hon. member for Shefford when he said "—please, at least have the decency to justify—". In the response you gave there was no justification for the fact that, for example, a group of Social Credit—

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** I regret very much having to interrupt the hon. member. It is true that the hon. member for Shefford used very strong language. I took that at the time because, as I said in my judgment,

[*Translation*]

—my colleague the hon. member for Shefford made an impassioned speech.

[*English*]

If the hon. member will read carefully what I have just said, it is abundantly clear that the board made a decision. The board made that decision. All I can say on that is that it made that decision today. It might make another decision on another day, but it is not for the Chair to give the reasons that the board may or may not be prepared to give. That is the situation. The application went to the board. The board has made the decision and for now, as I said,

[*Translation*]

—that is the situation of all members of the group.

**Mr. Plamondon:** Mr. Speaker, if you would allow me 30 seconds it would be enough to complete my remarks. I am not going to make a 15-minute speech. I am simply saying that on page 5 of your text it says "the rights and privileges of members are being abrogated". Well this answer breaches my rights as member of a group, if I compare it with answers given to the Social Credit Party which had only six members in 1979.

**Mr. Speaker:** Please, I fully appreciate the point of the hon. member, but we are having an argument. At the conclusion of the argument my responsibility is to make a ruling. The House now has that ruling. Should the hon. member wish to pursue the matter he has every opportunity to rise in the House during the oral question period and direct a question to the representative of the Board of Internal Economy.

**Mr. Lapierre:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Shefford on a point of order.

**Mr. Lapierre:** Just a point I would like to clear up, Mr. Speaker. Since you say in your ruling that there cannot be an exception this time, I would like to know an exception to what?

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** When I said that, what I meant and what I think is clear if one reads the text is that the board has made no ruling that would give any funding to one particular bloc outside the traditional parties. Clearly, if one looks carefully at my ruling, the board might do something else at another time.

If the hon. members wish to pursue with members of the board or through a question in the House to the representative of the board who is charged under our rules to answer for the board, then of course that is their privilege.

I think the Chair has exercised considerable patience in this matter. I would certainly ask the hon. members to read carefully the judgment, because I think they will find that the answers are there. When hon. members read it they should remember that the Chair by itself

cannot intrude into the workings of the board, nor would it be proper for me to comment thereon.

What I have explained to the hon. members is that if the board does not wish to give additional funds to a group within the Chamber, that is the board's decision. If the House wishes to overrule the board, that is enough.

Out of respect for objections which are about to be raised in the House—and I know they are coming—I think hon. members will have to accept the judgment. If they wish to raise it again at another time or in another way, please use enough inventiveness to not be challenging the judgment in its particular form.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Lapierre:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, not in connection with your first ruling, but with your second. Since you have recognized that our hon. friend has the right to be designated as he wishes, could you tell us if we should formally advise the House of our intention to be designated as members of the *Bloc québécois*? Could you tell us exactly what is the procedure in this respect?

[*English*]

**Mr. Speaker:** With respect to the application of the hon. member for Annapolis Valley—Hants, it would be immediate. I am sure that hon. members might wish to *avoir une discussion avec la Table.*

Sometimes the Chair has to ask for the co-operation of hon. members. I really think on this issue hon. members are abusing the patience of the whole House. I will move on to Orders of the Day.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

### THE CONSTITUTION

ESTABLISHMENT OF A SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

The House resumed consideration of Mr. Andre's motion to appoint a Special Joint Committee to inquire and report upon the process for amending the Constitution of Canada.



SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The Chair has now had an opportunity to consider whether the amendment moved this morning by the Hon. Member for Yukon was in order. The purpose of the main motion is to create a Special Joint Committee of the House of Commons and the Senate with the limited mandate of mainly looking into the Canadian Constitution Amending Formula.

The purpose of the amendment introduced by the Hon. Member for Yukon is to widen the mandate to include all matters affecting the Constitution, and, if adopted, the Standing Orders of the House would as a result be changed because the amendment also seeks to create a new Standing Committee.

In my humble opinion, the amendment introduced by the Hon. Member for Yukon extends beyond the scope of the main motion and by widening the committee's mandate, becomes a substantive motion which requires advanced notice and calls for a debate of its own as a main motion.

I refer my hon. colleagues to Speaker Lamoureux's ruling of September 26, 1967, and February 23, 1968. Citation 437(2) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, will further explain this ruling. I appreciate the graciousness of the House in allowing me a few moments to ponder this question of procedure.

Resuming debate. The hon. Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada has the floor.

[*English*]

ESTABLISHMENT OF A SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today in support of the motion before us to establish a joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate on the constitutional amending process.

If there is one item upon which I believe we can agree in this House, it is that a better way must be found to amend the Constitution. This became particularly clear during the Meech Lake process.

As the Prime Minister said in his address to the nation on June 23, 1990, after the failure of the accord:

It is essential that we find a better way to amend the Constitution "to reconcile the need for public participation and open democratic process with the legal requirements now in the Constitution".

[*Translation*]

Discussions surrounding the Meech Lake Accord made us realize that people see the main aspects of constitutional reform in many different ways. That is why the Prime Minister established the Citizens' Forum on Canada's Future on November 1, so that we could have a consensus on the fundamental values and aspirations of the Canadian people which we must take into consideration during our constitutional reform.

• (1530)

The Special Joint Committee and the Citizens' Forum on Canada's Future complement each other, Mr. Speaker. Both will give Canadians the opportunity to take part in Canada's constitutional changes.

[*English*]

Canada's search for an appropriate amending formula began long ago and has a rich and varied history.

The British North America Act of 1867 did not provide a formal amending procedure and when Canada achieved *de facto* independence from the United Kingdom in 1926 with the publication of the Balfour report, there was no agreement in Canada on a formula to amend the Constitution.

The power to amend our Constitution was left, therefore, with the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and in the intervening years up to 1982, a number of amendments to our Constitution were achieved by this route—the transfer of provincial jurisdiction over unemployment insurance to Parliament in 1940 and the sharing of provincial jurisdiction respecting old age pensions in 1951, to name only a few.

However, it was never satisfactory to Canadians that we had to go out of the country to amend our Constitution and during the 1920s and 1930s, the search for a domestic amending formula was on in earnest.

[*Translation*]

Following the release of the Balfour report, an attempt was made for the first time in 1927 to solve that problem at a meeting attended by representatives of the central government and the provinces.

The participants studied a proposal put forward by the then Minister of Justice, M. Ernest Lapointe, recommending that the Constitution be patriated and that a special amending procedure be added.

However, as with many previous attempts, negotiations on a new amending formula failed.

[*English*]

One constant question that permeated all discussions on this matter throughout history was how to combine the elements of stability and flexibility in an amending formula that would permit patriation of the Constitution from Britain.

In the numerous attempts to secure agreement on an amending formula, on only two occasions were the Prime Minister and premiers able to reach unanimous agreement in principle in an amending formula as part of a patriation proposal. They were the Fulton–Favreau formula in 1964 and the Victoria amending formula of 1971.

For that reason, it is interesting to examine these two formulae in a little more detail.

The Fulton–Favreau formula was drafted in the form of an act in 1964 and, like many previous proposals put forward at federal–provincial conferences, it was highly complex.

[*Translation*]

Any constitutional amendment would have been made by legislation of the Parliament of Canada and the approval of provincial legislatures would have been required in many areas.

Unanimous consent was required on certain matters, particularly the division of powers. Otherwise, there were different degrees of flexibility depending on the subject of the amendment.

Contrary to the Fulton–Favreau process, the 1971 amending formula suggested in Victoria was relatively simple. It was quite different from all other amending formulas in that no constitutional amendment would have required unanimous consent by all provincial legislatures.

[*English*]

Amendments to key areas of the Constitution, including the distribution of powers and matters excepted from the exclusive power of Parliament, would have been made with the consent of Parliament and the consent of the legislatures of two Atlantic provinces, of Quebec, of Ontario and of two western provinces representing at least 50 per cent of the population of the western provinces.

Amendments applying to one or more, but not all, of the provinces could be made with the consent of Parliament and the legislatures involved.

Amendments to the Constitution would have taken the form of a proclamation of the Governor General rather than an act of Parliament.

Finally, provision was made for Parliament and the legislatures each to exercise certain exclusive powers of amendment.

The Victoria formula abandoned the full rigidity of the specially-protected elements of the Fulton-Favreau formula and introduced the notion of regional protection.

In the end, of course,—

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Plamondon:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The hon. member for Richelieu on a point of order.

**Mr. Plamondon:** If this government thinks that the appointment of this committee is so important, how come we do not have a quorum, Mr. Speaker?

*And the count having been taken*:

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I see a quorum. I might add that the Chair and not the hon. member should check and decide whether we have a quorum. Debate. The hon. Minister of Justice has the floor.

**Mr. Plamondon:** Mr. Speaker, I am very surprised to hear you say that only the Chair can call a quorum. As far as I know, any member can do it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** You stated earlier that there was no quorum. However, what you just said is closer to what is considered proper in our Standing Orders. The hon. minister of Justice has the floor.

[*English*]

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** Mr. Speaker, the Victoria formula abandoned the full rigidity of the specially protected elements of the Fulton-Favreau formula and introduced the notion of regional protection.

In the end, of course, neither formula was adopted and it was not until 1982 that a made-in-Canada amending formula was finally placed in the Constitution as part of the 1982 Constitution Act.

[*Translation*]

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the 1982 Act was imperfect because Quebec was excluded from the agreement. The consequences of this exclusion are now history. We are still trying to find an appropriate amending procedure, that is a procedure with a reasonable degree of stability and flexibility.

This procedure should allow the people to participate and particularly allow Canadians to reach their constitutional goals.

[*English*]

As the Prime Minister said in his November 3 speech in Mont Ste-Anne:

> If it takes major changes to hold this country together, Canada wants these changes made—(and) if it takes a new process to achieve these changes, Canadians want a new process designed.

Canadians want to be able to achieve their constitutional aspirations. They do not want to have their dreams for this country blocked by an inadequate and inflexible procedure.

Hon. members, parliamentarians, play an important role in the constitutional process. If the process is not working, it is important that we consult with Canadians to find better ways of attaining our constitutional objectives.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I call on all members to support this motion in order to give Canada the Constitution its needs now that we are getting close to the twenty-first century.

[*English*]

I would just conclude by saying that in the current amending formula, the Parliament of Canada has a crucial role to play in implementing constitutional

change. Therefore, it seems to me highly appropriate that an examination of that process, in light of its failure recently, should be made—

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Rocheleau:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I regret having to interrupt the minister, but the hon. member for Hull–Aylmer is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Rocheleau:** We have been called to maintain a quorum in the House, Mr. Speaker. I notice that the government members are not present. Is that committee important or not? Could you please check if we have a quorum?

*And the count having been taken:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I see that we have a quorum. The hon. Minister of Justice still has the floor.

[*English*]

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to conclude by saying that given the role of Parliament in constitutional amendment according to the current provisions of the Constitution, that it is highly appropriate that the Parliament of Canada take the leadership in trying to determine a process that would respond to the concerns that have been raised by the people of Canada. Parliament must try to develop proposals that hopefully can gain the broader support of the other participants in constitutional amendment in this country and therefore, make the change of the Constitution in Canada and the development of the constitutional process something in which all Canadians can take pride and feel their involvement in.

I would, Mr. Speaker, on that note, urge the support of all members of this House of the motion before them and their support for the initiation of what I think is going to be one of the most important processes that any member of this Parliament could engage in in the course of a political career, a process that is absolutely essential to the preservation of Canada's future as a united and prosperous country.

• (1540)

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice. I was one of the members last spring who spent a lot of time on the special committee of the House looking at the Meech Lake Accord. Our caucus and other caucuses as well spent a lot of time looking at the recommendations we made under the very able chairmanship of the hon. member for Sherbrooke. Unfortunately, the day after those recommendations were made, they were put aside by the powers that be in the government.

What I want to know from the Minister of Justice is, what guarantee can she give us at this time, once this committee is struck, that the government will pay attention to recommendations that that committee may make? We had a unanimous report of the House of Commons by members of all three parties, and I think we had a consensus of what Canadians wanted in terms of the Meech Lake Accord, yet, that report was ignored by the government. What assurance do we have from the Minister of Justice that come next summer, if once again we have a committee report that is unanimous and reflects what people in this country are saying, that report is not going to be ignored?

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is correct to say that the work done by that committee was ignored by the government.

**Mr. Lapierre:** It was worthless.

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** I do not think it was worthless at all. In fact, I think it was an extraordinarily important exercise and I can congratulate everyone who was involved in it.

The problem at that time was that we were engaged in the process of constitutional change under the rules that came to us with patriation in 1982, which was at the denouement of a time frame that was determinative of the ability of the will of the First Ministers who had originally signed on to bring the agreement into force. That was hardly the ideal kind of circumstance into which to examine and evaluate the broader question of constitutional reform and how it might be brought into place. It was also, of course, not the case that the subject matter which the committee dealt with was the broad process. It was an attempt to try to see if in the context of

the Meech Lake Accord some agreements or some provisions could be recommended that might possibly salvage the accord.

As the hon. member will recall, on June 9, 1990, an agreement was reached by First Ministers. Much of the work of the Charest commission in which the hon. member participated was part of the environment in which that agreement was reached and, as they say, the rest is history. I do not see anything to be valued or anything to be gained by rehashing that.

I think it is precisely because we have lived through that time—and that parliamentary committee's activity was part of a process of trying to bring about constitutional change—that we can see the problems in the process. I think there is no group of people who are more profoundly aware of the difficulties we faced in that process than members of Parliament and, because the Parliament of Canada is one of the chief actors in the current amending formula, I think leadership must come from the Parliament of Canada, which is both Houses of the federal government.

The hon. member's experience and that of many other people in that House would be enormously valuable. There is no guarantee that recommendations made by a joint committee will ultimately find their way into the Constitution. We do not have in the Parliament of Canada the unilateral right to change the Constitution. But before we can even begin to address that question, the question of process has to be addressed. So the recommendation of the committee is obviously going to be terribly important. What will happen to it after that is not solely within the hands of the House, but I can give the hon. member my assurance that I personally am deeply committed to seeing this process succeed, and I am very confident that the results of that committee's deliberation will be of inestimable value. I cannot think of a better process, whether it is with private consultations, or whatever. Notwithstanding that the people in justice like to arrogate the law unto themselves, I cannot think of a better forum in which to come up with recommendations that are both legally sound and sensitive to the human and political realities of Canada. I think the hon. member has an enormous amount to contribute, and I can give him my commitment that I will be most interested, and I believe the government will be very interested and will make as much use of the results of the committee as it is possible to do.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu):** Mr. Speaker, after having heard the minister's speech, I wonder if she sincerely believes that Quebeckers will fall for such a diversion. We had the Charest Committee which watered down the Meech Lake Accord. The five requests were minimal, and yet they were rejected by English Canada. The Charest Committee was set up, and its report was shelved. The Spicer Commission was set up, and now another committee is being set up.

Are we taken for fools or what? Only fools would believe that striking a committe will do little more than buy time. Will the Quebecers in this government lend themselves to that musical chairs game for the sake of visibility, to be seen once in a while on television and defend the interests of Quebecers in committees that will end up concluding just the opposite of what the Bélanger–Campeau Commission concluded? How can a central government be expected to decide by way of referendum whether a province is to remain or not a part of Canada? Come now! If Newfoundland decided to leave, do you think that holding a referendum in the rest of Canada would prevent Newfoundland from leaving? Would a referendum held across Canada cancel out one held in Quebec? Be serious!

There are two founding nations in this country, one of which is pondering over its membership in this great big Canadian family. This kind of committee will travel across Canada, lull people, buy time and create a diversion. Would it not be wiser to allow the province of Quebec and its people to calmly think about its future without all these committees? Such committees are only good to buy time, in the hope of seeing the Quebecers, the francophone people of Quebec, be put to sleep again so that they will behave like the sheep they once were and swallow false promises like the ones made to them about the repatriation of the Constitution by all provincial premiers of Canada and Prime Minister Trudeau at the time of the referendum.

We had been promised that the Constitution would be repatriated. In the end, with such a committee, the Constitution was repatriated omitting one of the founding nations, that is to say Quebec. And we are to believe that the new committee will provide the answer to the

problem, as we did after the 1980 referendum, and be put to sleep again. We have come this far and the failure of Meech provided the motivation the people of Quebec needed to decide to take their destiny in their own hands, without the help of any committee. Such committees are nothing but a masquerade in democracy, when, in fact, the answer is very simple: two sovereign nations with a monetary union.

[*English*]

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is, of course, entitled to his own view which he expresses in the House with considerable force. I am not sure that he speaks for all Quebecers when he makes that statement.

The important point is to have a process that allows people, not simply to express their views, but to begin to develop and formulate their views. That is why, as part of the process for establishing this joint committee of the House and Senate, the government has tabled a discussion document which sets out the history of constitutional amendment in the country and poses some of the possible options that members may wish to consider as a starting point, as opposed to an answer.

The joint House-Senate committee to examine the amending process of the Constitution is complementary to what has become known as the Spicer committee, the Citizen's Forum. The Citizen's Forum is designed to ask Canadians to have a dialogue with one another about what kind of country they want and the role of the official members of the commission is to gather those insights, to stimulate the discussion, and then to bring to the Government of Canada, and also to this House, a report on the state of the nation.

It is a unique and very valuable process that involves all Canadians and not simply the traditional elites who have, for most of our history, monopolized the discussion of constitutional change. I think the process is important.

I would take exception with the implications that the hon. member stated because I come from a province that did support the Meech Lake Accord. I strongly supported the Meech Lake Accord and I supported it when I was a member of the provincial legislature in British Columbia, before I had any conception whatsoever that I would be foolish enough to subject myself to the amount of travel required to come to Ottawa.

I have a passionate commitment to the survival of the country and to the respect for the rights of Quebecers and their ability to find their place in the sun. I am deeply hopeful that it will be possible in this country to find a process of constitutional change and a process of accommodation that will enable us to protect that existence.

• (1550)

Frankly, I believe that the wonders and beauties of my province, British Columbia, are part of the patrimony of every young Quebecer and I would say that anyone who wished to deny young Quebecers that patrimony is going to have to answer them very strongly.

Therefore I believe that this process will contribute to the efforts of many Canadians to preserve what we believe is something quite extraordinary in the context of the countries of the world and to preserve it in a way that all Canadians will be able to fulfil themselves and be true to themselves. This is a very important step in that direction.

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce):** Mr. Speaker, this government motion to set up a special joint committee to examine the formula for amendment to the Constitution is, I am afraid to say, just another desperate, cynical move by the Prime Minister to correct somehow all the damage done by the failure of the Meech Accord. That failure, I might say, resulted from the stubborn inflexibility of the federal government and the government of Quebec.

The core provisions of the Meech Accord could have been saved if the Prime Minister had acted sooner in dealing with the proposed amendments, especially the proposals of the Charest committee report.

But, no, the Prime Minister and the government ignored all attempts to amend the Meech Accord. They kept rolling the dice and waited until the eleventh hour until that date when the Premier of New Brunswick, Premier McKenna, made proposals for a companion resolution in an attempt to break the deadlock that had developed with respect to the Meech Accord. It was an attempt by the Premier of New Brunswick to have the best part of the Meech Accord, the core provisions, go through.

Time and again, attempts were made in the House to amend the Meech Accord so that it would be acceptable on a broader basis in the county. This party, the Liberal Party, put forward nine amendments on two occasions when that proposal was before the House, but they were turned down systematically by the government. I believe other opposition parties did the same thing.

As I say, finally, at the eleventh hour, the Prime Minister decided to set up the Charest committee to examine possible methods of breaking that log-jam, based on the proposals made by Premier McKenna. The Charest committee did its very best and put out a report, but it was too late in the day due to the three-year deadline for accepting amendments to the Constitution which is in the present amendment formula. I will deal with that in a minute.

The present amendment formula, which was adopted in the Constitution of 1982, requires that an amendment be agreed to by seven out of the 10 provinces, representing 50 per cent of the population of Canada, plus the House of Commons and Senate of this Parliament. It also requires that when an amendment is initiated, either in a province or at the federal level in Parliament, that the required number of provinces must adhere within a three-year deadline from the date of the first proposal of an amendment in one of the houses of a province or of the federal government.

Because a lot of people did not know, I want to point out that most of the Meech Lake Accord—a good three-quarters of it—could have been accepted under the seven out of 10 amendment formula. Only three provisions in the Meech Accord required unanimous consent. The general amendment formula of 1982 was seven out of 10 provinces representing 50 per cent of the Canadian population, but there were certain measures that required unanimous consent—

**Mr. Corbeil:** Name them.

**Mr. Allmand:** Name them? One was the amendment formula itself, one was the amendments to the Supreme Court, and I forget the third one.

**Mr. Corbeil:** What was the main one?

**Mr. Allmand:** Well, I don't know. What was the main one?

**Mr. Corbeil:** Quebec integration into the Constitution.

**Mr. Allmand:** No, no. The hon. member does not know the Meech Accord, himself. The Meech Accord dealt with the distinct society. The distinct society provision did not require that, if that is what he is talking about. The distinct society provision only required seven out of 10 provinces to agree to that particular proposal. It did not require unanimous agreement.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, eight out of 10 provinces agreed to all of the Meech Accord. Two did not. Two, at the last minute, were left opposing but, even then, I think Manitoba would have come on-side, if we had not run out of time and if the Prime Minister had not waited until the last minute, rolling the dice, as he said he had done.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Allmand:** If the Prime Minister had taken the measures that he took late in the day, if he had taken those in January or February and set up the Charest committee at that time, then—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Allmand:** Mr. Speaker, there are some members in this House who do not have much respect for democracy. They are shouting from their seats because they do not like to hear what is being said. Even the members in this party over here, who participated in this ridiculous charade that took place at the time, only moved afterwards.

The point is that at the last minute the Prime Minister set up the Charest committee and then ignored its advice. If he had done that at an earlier date, the five core provisions proposed by the government of Quebec would have been accepted.

What was the amendment formula before 1982? I have just described the amendment formula of 1982. Well, before 1982, of course, there was no specific amendment formula. The Constitution of 1867, which was a statute of the British Parliament, did not provide for an amendment formula. Amendments were made by an address of the Parliament of Canada to the British Parliament requesting an amendment. But a constitutional convention had grown up whereby the federal government did not make such an address unless there was unanimous consent of all the provinces. That was a very inflexible amendment formula and it was very difficult to obtain amendments to the Canadian Constitution which was basically the British North America Act of 1867.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Lapierre:** I rise a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The hon. member for Shefford on a point of order.

**Mr. Lapierre:** I would like to help my colleague. There was never unanimous consent for the rapatriation of our Constitution. Consequently, the British formula was not that demanding. A large consensus because—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I regret to interrupt the hon. member for Shefford, but that is not a point of order. It is debate. The hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce.

[*English*]

**Mr. Allmand:** Mr. Speaker, if the hon member would listen, I pointed out that there had been a constitutional convention, not a constitutional law, prior to 1982 that the federal government would not make an address for an amendment to the British Parliament unless there was unanimity. That was not written into law, but in fact it was the constitutional Convention of the day and, up until 1982, that was the practice that was followed.

It was extremely inflexible and that was why there had been many attempts to obtain a more flexible and more reasonable amendment formula. It was attempted with the Fulton-Favreau formula. It was attempted at Victoria. It was attempted in the late 1970s. Finally, in 1982, an amendment formula was approved.

What is interesting is that the hon. member for Shefford said it was approved against the agreement of Quebec. I must remind the House that the formula that was agreed to—the formula that is now in the Constitution—was agreed to by the Premier of Quebec with seven other provinces. Those were the eight provinces that agreed to that amending formula, contrary to the proposal that had been put forward by Prime Minister Trudeau and supported by Premier Davis of Ontario and Premier Hatfield of New Brunswick.

• (1600)

The Prime Minister of Canada, with New Brunswick and Ontario, had provided a formula with a veto power for Quebec. The eight other provinces got together and came up with what is now the amendment formula and proposed this. Finally, the Prime Minister of Canada agreed to it. I think that has to be clear on the record. In any case, we finally did get an amendment formula in 1982.

As I answered to the Minister of Labour, the amendment formula itself could only be amended by unanimous agreement of all the provinces and the federal government. It cannot be amended by the seven out of ten formula.

In discussing how we can change the amendment formula, we must keep in mind that we will require the agreement of every province in Canada, the House of Commons and the Senate.

For a moment, I want to refer to the formula that was tentatively agreed to at Victoria in 1971, known as the Victoria formula. This was the preferred formula of Prime Minister Trudeau and the Liberal Party.

According to this formula, Quebec would have had a veto, Ontario would have had a veto, two Atlantic provinces out of four had to agree to the amendment. If there were not two, that would be a veto from Atlantic Canada. Two western provinces had to agree to the amendment, representing 50 per cent of the population of the western provinces.

Under that formula known as the Victoria formula, Quebec would have had a veto power, but no, that was rejected. Mr. Bourassa first accepted that, went back to Quebec and faced with a lot of controversy in his province, turned down the Victoria formula plus other measures that were included in the Victoria proposals for constitutional change.

**Mr. Corbeil:** He never accepted that. That's wrong.

**Mr. Allmand:** The Fulton-Favreau formula of 1964 was somewhat similar to the formula that we have today, but it left to unanimous agreement a large number of constitutional items, including the division of powers. Under the Fulton-Favreau formula for constitutional

change, you needed unanimous agreement to change anything to do with the distribution of powers. Other things could have been changed by a two-thirds of provinces with 50 per cent of population. In any case, the Fulton-Favreau formula was never accepted.

With respect to the establishment of this committee, yes, this party is willing to support the establishment of a committee to examine how we can better amend the Constitution, but we think that that cannot be the only matter to be considered by that special joint committee.

It is impossible to sit down and discuss how to change our Constitution without at the same time considering other important constitutional matters, including the division of powers and the Senate. I would say as well the place of aboriginal peoples in this country. It is a shame. It is a bit of a scandal that that has gone on so long and not being able to agree to the true place of our aboriginal peoples in this country.

In the Constitution agreement of 1982, it was provided that there would be three First Ministers' Conferences on aboriginal self government. Those three conferences were held. Not much headway was made. A fourth such conference was held after the Conservatives came to power in 1984.

Another matter that I would suggest has to be dealt with at one time or another is our basic language rights. While the Constitution agreement of 1982 has some good provisions with respect to language rights in it, there is a need for more change to provide greater equality, greater equity for English and French speaking minorities across this country.

In particular, I would hope that some day section 59 of the Constitution agreement of 1982 would be abrogated because section 59 puts certain restrictions on the use of English in the Province of Quebec, restrictions which are not imposed on French language minorities in other parts of the country. I must say, Mr. Speaker, I voted against that provision in 1982.

In considering proposals for constitutional change before this committee, I do not think the committee should be too uptight or too reticent to consider measures that are sometimes referred to as distinct for Quebec or special for Quebec.

I voted for the Meech Lake Accord. I had accepted it, even though I would have preferred that it be amended. It did not bother me that we had a provision in our Constitution that Quebec was distinct, because it has been in effect distinct for a long time. It is the only province with the civil law.

Arrangements have been made over the years for it to have its own pension plan different than the Canada Pension Plan. There were special arrangements for immigration, student loans, tax collection and so on. These have not hurt the Confederation. This could not be done on a wide scale basis, but to take into account very special needs of Quebec language and culture and other matters that are close to Quebec's heart, I think that we have to consider these and put them in the Constitution in one way or another so that it is fair for all provinces.

As I say, it will not be something new. It was done since 1867. If you want to be serious about this, it was done from the time of the Quebec Act in 1774.

There are, of course, other studies going on at the present time with respect to constitutional change, and that is why at the very beginning of my remarks I accused the Prime Minister of a bit of *ad hockery*, of desperation in setting up yet again another forum for constitutional change.

A few weeks ago he set up the Spicer commission, or the people's forum to listen to Canadians with respect to the future of this country on constitutional change. Already two members of that special commission have resigned, and two new ones have been appointed.

All this demonstrates that the Prime Minister did not give much attention to this in the first place. These things were set up quickly. The terms of reference were set up quickly. Not enough instruction was given to the chairman, and not enough information was given to members of the commission before they accepted to sit with this very special commission.

This commission is already under way. We have the Bélanger-Campeau commission which is sitting in Quebec. The provinces of Alberta, New Brunswick and Manitoba have also set up commissions with respect to constitutional change, and so has the Assembly of First Nations.

Next Monday, the leader of this Party, Mr. Chrétien, will appear before the Bélanger-Campeau commission to put before them a comprehensive approach to constitutional reform for Canadian unity and for federalism.

I must remind this House and members of the public that the Liberal Party of Canada was the first party, as a matter of fact, to accept the five basic proposals put forward by Mr. Bourassa in 1985 for constitutional change for adherence to the Constitution.

Later, those five proposals were put into a format known as the Meech and then the Langevin Accord. At that time, there was an addition of other measures which were not present when Mr. Bourassa made his original five proposals.

I have stated—it is well known—that Mr. Chrétien, the leader of the Liberal Party will appear before the Bélanger–Campeau commission on Monday and will be the only leader of any political party to appear before that commission to stand up for Canada, the federal system and Canadian unity. He will be the only leader to speak for Canada before that very important commission.

In conclusion, let me say that from 1970 to 1972 I sat as a member of the last Special Joint Committee of the House of Commons and the Senate with respect to the Constitution. I have the report here, *The Constitution of Canada: Final Report, 1972* which was a very comprehensive study.

We spent two years going to towns and cities, large and small, in this country listening to Canadians with respect to the Constitution. We at that time supported and backed the Victoria formula as the best formula for constitutional amendment. I think what is important is that leadership has to be shown if we are to truly unite this country once again and turn back the tide of separatism on all sides.

Quebec was not rejected at the time of the Meech Lake Accord. Eight provinces were in favour of Quebec's proposals. The perception was an unfortunate one coming out of the fact that the Meech Lake Accord failed. Certain resolutions at Sault Ste. Marie and other municipalities gave the impression that Quebec was not wanted. I want to say that Quebec is dearly wanted. There is a great appreciation in this country for Quebec's language and culture. thousands of children all over this country are doing immersion in French. Both parts of Canada would be great losers if this country were to divide.

• (1610)

What we need is leadership. What we need is hope. I hope that this committee, although it has certain limitations, will be able to provide us with some of that hope and some of that unity.

**Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq):**

[*Editor's note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask some questions of the hon. member with regard to the north. We have been feeling rather left out as northerners and as aboriginal people. I do not think that is a surprising statement because, as we heard earlier, yesterday the north and aboriginal people were ignored once again in terms of the Spicer commission, the Citizens' Forum on the Future of Canada.

I just wonder what hope do we have because right now under the amending formula, although in the past there has always been bilateral negotiations between the Government of Canada and any territory wanting to become a province, under the amending formula that is a change. With all of those roadblocks in the way, how can we be assured that our desires, our aspirations will be recognized in any form, allowing for this present government's attitude in ignoring the wishes of the aboriginal people as well as northerners?

**Mr. Allmand:** Mr. Speaker, historically new territories were admitted to the Confederation by a simple vote of the territorial assembly and the federal Parliament. This was the case with respect to Newfoundland in the late forties. It was also the case with respect to the other provinces at a much earlier period. One was to presume that if one day the Yukon and the Northwest Territories were to become full provinces, they would do that through a decision taken in their own legislative assemblies and in this Parliament.

However, since the Constitution of 1982 it became a case where they required seven out of ten provinces with 50 per cent of the population to accept a new province. Then with the Meech Accord it was recommended to be even more stringent.

Finally, we in the Liberal Party presented an amendment to the Meech Accord to permit the admission of the northern territories on a basis that was somewhat similar to what had taken place historically, on a one–to–one basis.

That was one issue which was difficult to understand because it was never part of the five proposals put forward by Mr. Bourassa for adhesion to the Canadian Constitution. In the five proposals that he made, he never mentioned at all what would be required for the acceptance of new provinces, especially provinces from the north. However, once the Meech Accord was published, the Langevin accord was published, we saw that that was in there. When we tried to amend it, we could not understand why the federal government and Quebec would have been so intransigent in not agreeing to something more reasonable when it had not been the basis of their proposal in the first place.

I would hope that there would not only be a fair amendment formula for the Northwest Territories and the Yukon in any new constitutional amendment formula, but that also there would be greater recognition in the Constitution for aboriginal rights and for aboriginal self-government.

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to say just a few words on the resolution before the House today. It calls upon Parliament to create a special joint committee to study the amending formula, which in reality is the whole process of amending our Constitution. They take us into the area of a constituent assembly, constitutional conventions, the wisdom or lack thereof of a referendum to determine the Constitution of this country, as well as technical things like how many provinces or what majority in the House of Commons it may take to amend the Constitution of Canada.

I want to be very direct with the few concerns that I have about the internal process of constitutional change among the parties in this House. I have been through the process now about three times: in the joint committee back in 1980-1981 for patriation of the Charter of Rights, in the joint committee on the Meech Lake Accord in July and August 1987 and, more recently, last spring on what we call the Charest committee of the House of Commons looking at the modification of the Meech Lake Accord.

One of the concerns I have is that the Prime Minister has to be more forthright and more direct with the other parties in the House when it comes to forming a committee, sharing information, and trying to achieve what we all want in this House with a few exceptions, which is a strong, united Canada recognizing all of our diversities and differences.

When this committee was to be struck there was no phone call to the Leader of the New Democratic Party or, to the best of my knowledge, to the Leader of the Liberal Party, or to my friends in the Bloc Quebecois or anybody. There was no call. There was no consultation with the critics on the opposition side. It was the same when the Spicer citizens' forum was struck. There was no consultation.

[*Translation*]

In Quebec, Mr. Speaker, when Premier Bourassa decided to appoint the Bélanger-Campeau Commission, he had many consultations with Opposition Leader Jacques Parizeau. They met several times and there were consultations between the Liberal Party and the Parti québécois concerning the two co-chairmen of the commission. Consultations went on over several days. It was the same thing in the other two or three provinces where they established commissions or committees on the Constitution, Mr. Speaker.

But here in this House there was not even a phone call from the Prime Minister to the Leader of the Opposition or to the hon. member for the Yukon concerning the appointment of the chairman of this commission. Perhaps Mr. Spicer was the appropriate choice, perhaps not. But since we are dealing with the Constitution of Canada, now is not the time to show partisanship, because in principle this issue ought to unite the political parties and the Canadian population. But there was no consultation between the Prime Minister and the other members of the House.

[*English*]

I would have thought after the problems around the process of the Meech Lake Accord that the Prime Minister would have done that. We had today, for example, the tabling of a discussion paper about what is going to be referred to this special joint committee. Once again, that was not shared with the opposition before the decision was made to strike this particular committee.

I say to the Prime Minister that if we want to make this work, and we had better make this work, it is easier to happen if the Prime Minister and the minister responsible were to treat this in a more non-partisan way, in a more apolitical way. It would be better for this House

and better in terms of the spirit of constitution making in this country.

It is very important that we get on with this work. In our party we would like to see this committee look at more than just the process. The process is extremely important, and it has to be looked at before we can implement the content. I know that we know that, but it seems to me to be more important and more relevant if this committee had a mandate that looked not only at the process but also the content of what people want in terms of constitutional change. We can deal with both.

Once we report, especially if we have the unanimous report of the three major parties in this House, it is important that the Prime Minister of this country make a commitment that he will use it as the basis of any consultation that he undertakes on behalf of the Government of Canada on constitutional change. That did not happen last June after the special study on the Meech Lake Accord, chaired by the member for Sherbrooke. Those are important things in terms of the internal process of how we operate here in this House.

• (1620)

It is very important that we ask who speaks for Canada in this debate. Quebec is doing what Quebec is doing with the Bélanger–Campeau Commission. Manitoba is striking a special committee. There is one in Alberta. There is one in Nova Scotia. There may be others like it in Ontario, very shortly.

In terms of Canada it is important that this Parliament has a position that stands up for and defends this country. It is very important that be done. When we draft a constitution it is important that that constitution be the constitution of the people that represents the people of this country. It is not a constitution that represents only politicians and governments of this country or premiers or prime ministers.

That was the fundamental problem with the process around the Meech Lake Accord. I do not blame the Prime Minister of Canada entirely for that. The amending formula was inherited from 1981, through the then negotiations led by then Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau. This time, in what I consider the Canada round, we must come up with a more democratic way to amend our Constitution. We must look very seriously at the option of constituent assemblies or perhaps constitutional conventions across this country where people are gathered to write their own constitution.

If we look back at the original union of this country, we see that it was more than the politicians who were involved back in the 1800s. In Philadelphia, in the United States, it had a constituent assembly, although not a very broadly based one, where the states all sent a number of delegates to negotiate on their behalf. Once it came up with what it thought was the Constitution of the United States, it went back to the various states and had vigorous debates in the various assemblies. One by one, they approved the Constitution of what became the United States of America. We must broaden that process.

We will have failed this country if we do not make a recommendation from that committee that broadens it into one form or other of a constituent assembly or constitutional conventions at some part of the process.

We must also have mandatory public hearings. We have done this fairly well in this House, but it is often after the fact. We did not have public hearings before the drafting of the accord that we call the Meech Lake Accord. We had public hearings after the drafting of the accord, and those public hearings did not travel with a committee across the country. We stayed here in Ottawa and had people come to us, rather than us go to the people, which is the wrong way around.

I hope we have learned that the Constitution belongs to the people of this country. We start with the people of this country in various parts of Canada. We build a constitution for them, with them, every single step of the way.

In that Canada of the future we have to recognize that we are a diverse country. We must build a country that is built on co-operative federalism if it is to survive. We have to recognize the uniqueness and the differences of the province of Quebec and enshrine those differences in a constitution.

Most Canadians are in agreement that Quebec is unique and different in terms of culture, language, education, communication, and immigration. It should be looked at differently in the province of Quebec. That must be accommodated, as we must accommodate the differences and the uniqueness of our first nations, the aboriginal peoples of this country, in their evolution toward self-government and in the recognition of their

distinct languages and distinct cultures as well. Those are two things which make this country unique and different.

[*Translation*]

The belle province of Quebec is different, what with its distinct society and the reality of the French language. Laws are different in the Province of Quebec. Culture, the Catholic religion, a lot of things are different.

[*English*]

As well as the differences with our aboriginal people. In addition, we have linguistic duality in terms of making sure we protect the linguistic minorities and help them to grow.

I see the minister across the way from Montreal who is responsible for the Official Languages Act and is a spokesperson in many ways within government for the English minority in the province of Quebec. It is also important that we have roughly one million francophones outside Quebec who need some more constitutional guarantees if this country is to stay together.

In addition, we have to make sure that we have some flexibility in this country for the other provinces as well. I do not share Clyde Wells' point of view that every province must be treated with absolute equality. I do not share that point of view, for there are legitimate differences not only in Quebec but in the other provinces as well. I see the member for Beaver River here. Her province of Alberta has some different arrangements with the federal government from what we have in Saskatchewan. I will give two examples of what I mean.

The family allowance legislation applies universally in this country for eight provinces. The two exceptions are the province of Alberta and the province of Quebec, with different arrangements with Ottawa in terms of how family allowances are delivered in those two provinces. And so be it. There are some slightly different arrangements. That is Canada. That is part of our flexibility.

Another example is the collection of taxes in this country. One province, the province of Quebec, collects its own personal income tax. Three provinces collect their own corporate income tax. Quebec and Ontario have done so for a long time. In 1981 the province of Alberta decided to do the same thing so it collects its own corporate income tax. That is what we have, a co-jurisdiction between the federal and provincial governments in many areas of Canada. If we can have that kind of accommodation, that is good for this country in terms of recognizing our diversity and differences and, instead of letting those differences divide us, having those differences unite us and flower in this country and make it all to better Canada. I think that is within the realm of reality.

I remember very well when I was a university student listening, with admiration, to the talk in this country about co-operative federalism by then Prime Minister Lester Pearson and opposition leaders like Tommy Douglas and Robert Stanfield. They talked about co-operative federalism, recognizing our differences and building on those differences and building on that diversity, and using that to unite this country into a country which has many cultures, two great languages, and the first nations, aboriginal people.

That is what we must do. We must come up with a way of making those accommodations and building that national consensus because, if we do not do that, it is bye-bye to this country.

[*Translation*]

And the hon. member is right, this is good-bye Canada.

[*English*]

It is really tragic in this debate that we have had some rigidity from people like Clyde Wells on one side and the Prime Minister on the other side. I think a great number of Canadians were looking for an accommodation and looking for a compromise.

I am very concerned about this country, about the future of Canada. I think the government is destroying Canada. It is destroying this country, not only in terms of constitutional change but also in terms of the national institutions of Canada such as the CBC, the post office, VIA Rail and the trade deal with the United States. Instead of trying to strengthen and build the links from east to west and north in this country, it is building more and more links between the north and the south, into the United States, and importing into Canada more values from the United States of America.

Those things are hurting this country. Those things are Balkanizing Canada. The government had better wake up and smell the coffee in terms of that reality. We have never had a federal government and a federal Prime Minister who have been so unpopular as they are today. They are unpopular because of the way they have handled the Constitution, because of the GST and the divisiveness of that tax, because of the trade deal, and because of what they are doing to our national institutions.

It is about time that someone started to speak for Canada in this country. It should be the Parliament of Canada, this institution, that speaks for Canada.

When we look at the prospects today, they have probably never been as dim for this country, so it is about time we get our act together as federal parliamentarians and start standing up for what is good about Canada and pulling ourselves together rather than tearing us apart. It is easy to take cheap shots at so and so and such and such a party. There are differences in every federal political party in this country. I have my Liberal friend from Newfoundland saying look at so and so in the NDP. Look at all the people in the Liberal Party. There are all kinds of Liberals that have diverse views. There are many Liberals in Mr. Bourassa's government who have all kinds of diverse views.

• (1630)

[*Translation*]

A lot of people in the Liberal Party of Mr. Bourassa are in favour of Quebec sovereignty or of Quebec independence yet they stay in the Liberal Party.

[*English*]

If we are going to start playing those kinds of games and having the federalists in this country divide off one against the other and fight off one against the other and making a partisan issue out of the future of Canada, then there is not much future for this country. I say that to my friend of the Liberal Party from Newfoundland.

In conclusion, we have to stand up for this country. For me Canada is not on the table, is not negotiable, is not for sale. This country must stand together. The way to unite and keep it one country is to recognize our diversity, our uniqueness and to build on that diversity and that uniqueness and make this an even greater country in the years that lie ahead.

**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 Western Arctic—Land Claims; the hon. member for Surrey North—Medicare; the hon. member for Malpeque—Financial Institutions.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River):** Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank the hon. member for his comments and ask him a question or two.

I notice in my travels across the country that there is enormous confusion. Last spring when we were going through the pain of the Meech Lake Accord, the Charest commission was set up and people wondered what that was going to accomplish. It came and it peaked and since then it has disappeared completely.

At the beginning of November the Spicer commission was set up, and I think people are wondering what it is going to accomplish. Now, just a matter of weeks later, we see the Prime Minister announcing that there is going to be a joint Senate and Commons committee to try to determine the amending formula.

I think people right across the country are asking, what is to be accomplished by all these things? The hon. member has clearly brought that to the forefront, that people are definitely concerned and there is an enormous amount of confusion across the country.

People are feeling adrift about our constitutional situation. I believe that not only are people right across the country concerned, but I am wondering perhaps if the government itself is adrift in its own idea of constitutional matters, not knowing exactly which way to turn, and of course fearing that it will maybe widen the divisions within its own caucus.

I was wondering about this discussion paper, was it shared even with the Tory members? The hon. member mentioned that it was not shared with the opposition. I wonder if this was a surprise announcement perhaps at a fund raising dinner recently by the Prime Minister. Was his own caucus aware of it? Did they have a chance to discuss it fully and know what was in it, or was the Prime Minister acting unilaterally in coming forward with this?

I would be interested in hearing the hon. member's comments on that.

Finally, I would like to ask the hon. member his feeling about Section 41 of the Constitution of Canada where it says that:

> An amendment to the Constitution of Canada in relation to the following matters may be made by proclamation issued by the Governor General under the Great Seal of Canada only where authorized by resolutions of the Senate and House of Commons and of the legislative assembly of each province:

In other words, for any amendment we would need unanimous consent. I will just direct my hon. friend to that section in the Constitution.

I was wondering and would really appreciate his comments in light of the First Ministers' conference in Ottawa in June which we witnessed. I would be interested to ask his comments about the need for unanimous consent by all the provinces in Canada. We saw it was disastrous and we are still going through the pain of the death throes of Meech Lake that we saw in June. I would like to understand his viewpoints on how the Prime Minister and the government of this country think that we would come up with unanimous consent again in light of Section 41 of the charter?

**Mr. Nystrom:** The first issue is a discussion paper, Mr. Speaker. I cannot speak for government members of the House. I assume they did not see the discussion paper either. It would be quite an insult to members of the opposition if it were shown to the government members and not the opposition members. I assume they did not see it, but how do I know?

In terms of Section 41 of the Constitution, there are three ways to amend our Constitution. That is one of the ways. That comes from the patriation of 1981. Section 41 says that in order to amend our Constitution for things like the office of the Queen, the Governor General, federal institutions, the use of the French and English languages, we need the unanimous consent of all the provinces and the federal Parliament which is the House of Commons and the Senate. This is one thing we should take a look at. We could have more flexibility in amending the Constitution.

I do not have any pat answers for that. It was spelled out back in 1981. I was a member of that committee. These were the important national institutions. It was important that Alberta, Saskatchewan or Quebec would approve before we could change an important institution like the Supreme Court of Canada, or the monarchy, or the Governor General or the Senate. There is a real problem with that, but there are also some good arguments for it. Hopefully, we can look at some ways—whoever is on that committee—to make that a bit more flexible. I see that as one of the purposes of this committee being struck today.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilles Rocheleau (Hull—Aylmer):** Mr. Speaker, I think that Quebec's political sovereignty is in the best interests of Quebec and of Canada. The purpose of this committee, again, is to create a diversion, it is an expedient.

I believe that Quebec's political sovereignty seems, unless of course Quebec would give up taking on its full distinct character and specificity—which would be unthinkable—the ultimate choice determined by history and strengthened by two irreconcilable visions of Canada. Quebec's political sovereignty has become the logical choice, in the best interests of Quebec and the rest of Canada, Mr. Speaker, because of the cleavage concerning Quebec's status within the Canadian Confederation. There is a lack of understanding about the very philosophy of the main constitutional changes to be considered. There is the systematic refusal from the English-speaking majority of Canada to recognize Quebec with special status and to give this province the necessary powers to promote and protect its specificity. There is, Mr. Speaker, the gradual weakening of Canada's provinces.

**An hon. member:** Come to the point!

**Mr. Rocheleau:** I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that some of my colleagues would like to object. I will simply refer to the Charest committee which was created last spring by this same government. I will remind you, Mr. Speaker of the Citizens' Forum which was established lately, again by the same government, by the Prime Minister, Mr. Mulroney. There is also, Mr. Speaker, the committee we want to create today. This is simply a device, Mr. Speaker, intended to create a diversion. It is an expedient on the part of the government and I think we cannot go on being part of Canada It is just a matter of time, Mr. Speaker. We have to wait for the Bélanger-Campeau Commission to table its report at the end of March and we will see that Quebec wants to be the master of its own future, that it wants its sovereignty.

We have nothing against English Canada, and I think that if Quebec attains full sovereignty, we will then be able to talk—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The hon. member for York South—Weston is rising on a point of order.

[*English*]

**Mr. Nunziata:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. You will have noticed that there are several other members who wish to ask questions of the previous speaker. The present member speaking is not being fair in allowing sufficient time for others to ask questions. I am sure he wants to act as fairly as we act with them.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** So I would ask the hon. member for Hull—Aylmer to briefly conclude his remarks since other members want to speak on this issue.

• (1640)

**Mr. Rocheleau:** In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my good friend from Saskatchewan a question, because they are also distinct from Quebec over there, also distinct from Alberta.

I would like the last hon. member to tell me if the people from his province want to be deceived again by the federal government, by the Prime Minister, with the establisment of this new committee rather than wait for the results of the Bélanger-Campeau Commission?

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton—Melville):** Mr. Speaker, I am not at all for the independence of Quebec. I do not favour at all an independent Saskatchewan or Newfoundland or any other Canadian province for that matter. I am for an independent and sovereign Canada. However, I can understand the hon. member, Mr. Speaker. But I am not a Quebecer. I am Canadian and I want our country to stay together. We need Quebec to have a great Canada, a different Canada.

**An hon. member:** Yes, to pay taxes!

**Mr. Nystrom:** Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against this proposal from the Mulroney governement. We have moved an amendment to discuss the process of amending the Canadian Constitution and the amending formula itself. I sat on the committee that was chaired by the hon. member for Sherbrooke and we made many propositions but they were ignored by the Prime Minister of Canada.

I asked the Minister of Justice a question because now that those new propositions were made to us we want to know if those propositions—

[*English*]

Will these recommendations be taken by the Government of Canada and used as its position when it bargains on the Constitution? I am being very brief because I want one or two Liberal questions if possible.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The period for questions and comments has now ended. I am sorry, but the period is over. The member for Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte on a point of order.

[*English*]

**Mr. Tobin:** Mr. Speaker, I think all members know that my colleague has been waiting to ask the member about the policy differences between the leader of the New Democratic Party and Mr. Edmonston. I think if we ask for unanimous consent, the House might grant it so we can ask that question.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** There is no consent. Debate resumes. The member for Nunatsiaq.

[*English*]

On a point of order the hon. member for York South—Weston.

**Mr. Nunziata:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I just wish to indicate, and let the record show, that it was the Bloc Quebecois that denied the opportunity to this House to continue asking questions on this important issue.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Plamondon:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The member for Richelieu on a point of order.

**Mr. Plamondon:** Mr. Speaker, I hardly accept my colleague's comment, as it was he who interrupted my colleague from Hull—Aylmer as he was just starting to speak. Had he not interrupted him, he would have had enough time to ask his question.

**An hon. member:** Of course.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I request the cooperation of members on both sides of the House. Messages have been exchanged from one side to the other. I recognize the hon. member for Nunatsiaq.

[*English*]

**Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

Mr. Speaker, the amending formula is a very important one for northerners. I want to use my time today to express the concerns of northerners with the current amending formula and recent and ongoing attempts to change it. I also want to touch on the issue of territorial attendance and participation at federal-provincial constitutional conferences and similar federal-provincial meetings.

I would hope that governments in this country have learned from the events of the past three years that constitutional changes cannot be made in this country without the full participation and involvement of all the people. I used the word "participation" deliberately. Asking people for their views with no intention of listening to them is a recipe for failure.

We have been left out, excluded and forgotten once too often. We will not allow it to happen again and we can take some comfort from the support ordinary Canadians have given to us during the last constitutional round.

We span four time zones, Mr. Speaker, and sit, if you look at a map, on top of six provinces: British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, and Quebec. The area of the territories is basically what was left after the other provinces were carved out.

The physical distances are enormous. The distance between Baffin Island, the most eastern part of my riding, and Yellowknife, the capital of the Northwest Territories, on a map is similar to the distance between Quebec City and Edmonton.

Greater than the physical distances within the territories are the psychological and political distances between the territories and the federal and provincial governments of the country. The Yukon and the Northwest Territories have a constitutional status which is unique in the country. Most of the time, because we are not provinces yet, the north is simply forgotten in major, national decision making.

We are very much part of the national psyche. Yes, everyone acknowledges that Canada is a northern country, but we are not allowed to participate in the constitutional development of the country.

There are 52,000 people in the Northwest Territories and 25,000 people in the Yukon. That is a small population, less than the population of the city of Ottawa, but in a democracy, size is not a determinant of political voice.

The fundamental principle of democracy is one person, one vote. But in constitutional negotiations, the most essential and primary discussions, the northern territories do not have a voice. We elect representatives to our territorial legislatures, just as provincial voters elect their representatives to their legislative assemblies. At the constitutional table, provincial voters are represented by their premiers who have a vote at that table. The voters of the territories do not have a voice at that constitutional table. Our elected leaders are not allowed to vote. We are told that the federal government is our voice and that the federal government will look after our concerns.

I want to make something clear to the House. The federal government does not and cannot speak for northerners at the constitutional table. We have seen the evidence of that in the last round of constitutional talks. During the last minute negotiations at Meech Lake, our territorial government leaders were allowed to speak for 10 minutes to the federal and provincial premiers and were then politely asked to leave. "Thank you for your time, but we do not have time for you." That is basically what they were told.

There is no accountability in such a situation. Another basic principle of democracy is the accountability of the elected representation of the people to the people who elected them. The federal government is simply not

accountable to the people of the territories and, hence, cannot represent us.

Like other Canadians, we deserve to have our own accountable representative at the constitutional table. No other part of the country is denied a voice at the constitutional table like we are. As I said earlier, the recent practice has been to invite the leaders of the territories to some meetings, not all. The invitation is at the discretion of the Prime Minister who is supposed to be representing us because they will not allow our territorial leaders.

If the northern government leaders are invited, they are shown into the meeting room, permitted to make a statement, and ushered out again. This situation is unacceptable. It is demeaning, and it is insulting.

Under the Constitution Act, 1982, the Governments of the Northwest Territories and the Yukon were assured of participation at constitutional conferences when an agenda item directly affected the territories. The 1983 constitutional amendment also assured them of participation in constitutional conferences dealing with aboriginal issues.

In 1983, 1985, and 1987, the territories were invited to the constitutional table. At constitutional officials' meetings held between 1983 and 1987, representatives of the territories were full participants.

The territorial governments also attended some annual premiers' meetings but were excluded from the crucial August, 1986 Edmonton Premiers' Conference on the Economy. That conference dealt with Quebec's constitutional demands and it was at that conference that the premiers agreed to make Quebec's demands the constitutional priority.

• (1650 )

The territories were told at the time, however, that the discussions did not affect them and they were not allowed to participate in—

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Plamondon:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The hon. member for Richelieu on a point of order.

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu):** I remind the governement that if this bill is so important, why is it that again we do not have a quorum in the House? This is the third time!

*And the count having been taken:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I see that we do have a quorum. The hon. member for Nunatsiaq may continue his presentation.

[*English*]

**Mr. Anawak:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if the hon. member considers it a very important—

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Corbeil:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The Hon. Minister of Labour on a point of order.

**Mr. Corbeil:** I just want to ask you if it is in the code of ethics of this House for an hon. member to disappear behind the curtain immediately after having requested that the quorum be checked. If he is interested in having a quorum, he should remain in his place to make sure that it is the case instead of wasting the time of the House.

**Mr. Lapierre:** On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. You are perfectly aware that it is the responsibility of the government to maintain a quorum in this House. Obviously, there has been much negligence on the part of the government and the Minister of Labour has reason to be annoyed because his colleagues do not think that this debate is important. But if some hon. members ask to call quorum, it is out of respect for

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but once again, messages have been sent and received. Now I give the hon. member for Nunatsiaq the opportunity to address his colleagues.

[*English*]

**Mr. Anawak:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that the hon. member who raised that phoney objection was probably not very interested or he would not keep telling us about the lack of quorum.

The territories were subsequently shut out of the Meech Lake and Langevin Block meetings. In September, 1988, the current Prime Minister admitted that the territorial leaders had been treated like the poor cousins of Confederation. He pledged to change this situation, but that promise was made just before the last election

was called and, of course, like so many other of the Prime Minister's promises, it has not been kept.

The north is remembered, it seems, when we have something the rest of Canada wants—our resources, for example. We are not a storehouse to be plundered. But that is how we have been treated. We do not get any royalties from the development of our natural resources. How many Canadians and how many members of the House know that? All the royalties flow out of the territories.

And now, the environment. Protecting the environment has become an essential component of the government's agenda because of public opinion and pressure. The new focus on the Arctic environment, we feel, has not sprung from a deep concern within the government, but rather from the pressure of ordinary concerned Canadians.

Because of our small population and our limited tax base, we are financially dependent on the federal government and we do not fully control our destinies. Over the past couple of decades, through a process of devolution, we have been taking over more and more of the powers exercised for us by the federal government. Except for the control and management of our natural resources, the territorial governments function essentially in the same way as provincial governments, but we are not yet provinces.

Provincehood is not just around the corner. It will be several more years before either the Yukon or the Northwest Territories are prepared to become provinces, and the Yukon will probably achieve provincehood first. In the Northwest Territories, we are discussing the division of our territory into two territories. The eastern territory will be known as Nunavut.

Although all of this is some time away, this is to show that we have constitutional aspirations and objectives. We do not want to be cut off at the pass, and we do not want the door shut in our face. We do not want our options to be limited. We want to make our decisions out of a full range of choices, the same choices other regions of the country had before they became provinces.

We are not asking for anything more than anyone else had in the country. We are asking simply for the same treatment.

When the various regions of the country became provinces, they did so in a bilateral agreement with the federal government. Saskatchewan, for example, and Newfoundland negotiated on a bilateral basis with the federal government. No other province in the country had a role in that decision. The matter was negotiated and agreed to by only the region concerned and the federal government. That was the way new provinces were created in this country until 1982.

In 1982, the new amending formula changed that practice. Under the new amending formula, the creation of provinces suddenly was subject to the agreement of seven out of 10 provinces having 50 per cent of the Canadian population.

The seven plus 50 rule was a dramatic departure from the historical practice. The territories saw their constitutional aspirations being limited. Another concern was the fact that changes could be made to territorial boundaries with the consent of seven provinces representing 50 per cent of the population. No voice was given to the territories regarding future changes to their borders. Boundaries of existing provinces could be extended into the north without any consultation with the Northwest Territories.

The north protested. The entire legislative assembly of the Northwest Territories flew to Ottawa to express their concerns through the government.

A year later some progress was made. In the 1983 constitutional conference, the federal government, nine provincial premiers, the leaders of four national aboriginal organizations, and the leaders of the two territorial governments signed the constitutional accord. That 1983 constitutional accord contained an agenda of issues which all the participants had agreed to discuss at future constitutional meetings.

The amending formula issues identified by the territories—namely, the creation of new provinces and the extension of provincial boundaries into the territories—were on that agenda for future constitutional discussions. That agenda, Mr. Speaker, remains unfinished. Although there were two more aboriginal constitutional conferences after 1983, one in 1985 and one in 1987, these issues were not discussed. The federal government had changed and aboriginal self-government had become the primary focus of discussions.

The amending formula's impact on the territories was left outstanding, despite the first ministers' commitment to deal with it.

The amending formula contained in the Meech Lake Accord made the situation even worse for the two territories. Under Meech Lake, unanimity was required for the creation of new provinces and every province would have a veto over whether the territories would become provinces.

The Meech Lake amending formula allowed the extension northward of existing provincial boundaries upon the unanimous consent of the provinces and Parliament.

These decisions were made without consultation with the territories. These decisions were made behind closed doors at meetings to which the territorial leaders had not been invited. When the territorial leaders asked to participate, they were denied the opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the unanimity amending formula in the Meech Lake Accord set back the constitutional progress of the territories. Not only were we set back, we were held back. Meech Lake entrenched the colonial status of the northern territories. Meech Lake made the territories perpetual colonies.

What northerners objected to in Meech Lake was the additional powers every province in the country gained over our destiny, at our expense, while we were denied a voice.

I want also to point out to hon. members that, despite northern concerns about the two aspects of the 1982 amending formula, northerners also achieved something under that formula. The 1983 constitutional conference I referred to earlier achieved agreement on constitutional amendments affecting aboriginal peoples. That constitutional conference, chaired by the Right Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, resulted in constitutional amendments dealing with aboriginal rights.

Attached to the 1983 constitutional accord on aboriginal rights was a schedule, a motion for a resolution to authorize the Governor General to issue a proclamation amending the Constitution of Canada.

Under the amending formula of 7 plus 50, resolutions were introduced in the legislative assemblies of the provinces and the Parliament of Canada to amend the Constitution of Canada. These resolutions were passed by the provincial legislative assemblies and the House of Commons and were proclaimed by the Governor General in June 1984.

Northerners were pleased with those amendments. Northerners had fought hard for those amendments. Northerners had a large role in the achievement of those amendments.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have much to contribute. But we continue to be denied the opportunity to do so. Northerners were excluded from the Citizens' Forum on Canada's Future. There were no northerners appointed in the initial round of appointments. The Prime Minister could have corrected this by appointing someone from the north to fill at least one of the two recent vacancies created on that forum. The north once again has been made to feel like outsiders looking in. Mr. Speaker, you cannot build a nation if you let some people in and leave others out. You cannot have a whole and healthy nation if you have insiders and outsiders.

Let us do things right this time. Let all parts of this great country bring their wisdom and experience to the table, allow all peoples of this nation to participate—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please.

It being five o'clock p.m., pursuant to order made on Wednesday, December 12, 1990, the debate on the motion now before the House is deemed completed.

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 yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Order made Wednesday, December 12, 1990, the division is deferred until Monday, December 17, at 7 p.m.

It being five o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—MOTIONS

[*English*]

### THE ENVIRONMENT

TROPICAL RAIN FORESTS

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should develop a rainforest policy with specific guidelines ensuring that Canada will not finance, directly or indirectly, any development activities which may destroy or degrade tropical rainforests.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to speak to my motion with regard to our world's very fragile rain forests, their continued destruction, Canada's involvement in that process and some suggestions as to how the Government of Canada can prevent the continued destruction of our world's precious rain forests.

I have said many times when talking of environmental issues—and yesterday in this House in speaking to the government's green plan which it has brought in, which we all agree is a very vague paper presented to the Canadian public, that in many ways is toothless—that when it comes to discussing environmental issues, environment is one issue that knows no political borders.

If we pollute oceans, if we destroy rain forests, the effects of that degradation is felt, not just outside of the borders of Canada, but it is experienced and felt by Canadians as well. It influences our well-being as Canadians. Environmental destruction, wherever it occurs in the world, eventually affects the life and the lifestyle of others and Canadians.

When we talk about environmental destruction affecting our lifestyle, we have to realize that there can be negative effects to our lifestyle in terms of our own health degradation. But also, we have to recognize that it is our lifestyle here in Canada which contributes to so much of the environmental degradation that occurs in the world. Certainly, that is the fact when it comes to the destruction of our world's tropical rain forests.

It was felt just a few years ago that tropical rain forests were disappearing from the face of the earth at the rate of 11 million hectares a year. In fact, evidence today suggests that we are losing our tropical rain forests at almost twice that rate. At least 16 to 20 million hectares of tropical rain forest are lost every year.

One of the problems that contributes to this is the fact that Canada and other developed nations around the world are major importers of tropical hardwoods. Europe and Japan dominate the world's consumption of tropical hardwoods, but Canada imports tropical hardwoods to the extent of $120 million annually. Our primary imports of tropical hardwoods consist of plywoods and other wood-fabricated products, used in the construction industry and furniture-making industry. In Canada, our main source of imported tropical hardwoods is Indonesia. Indonesia and Malaysia alone account for more than half of hardwood log exports in the world. Throughout my comments I will give specific examples of the impact of the destruction of tropical rain forests.

The state of Sarawak in East Malaysia has the highest rate of logging in the world. Seven square kilometres of tropical rain forest are lost every day. At this rate, within seven to eight years, the rain forest of Sarawak will be logged out completely. Not only is this devastating to an enormously important ecological system, but also it brings about the result of destroying the homes of native persons who depend for their survival on eking out an existence in tropical rain forests.

Timber extraction methods currently used are 99 per cent unsustainable. Even selected and selective felling, in which only a few desirable species are extracted from tropical rain forests, happen to destroy up to 70 per cent of any forest. To date, the only people who are able to successfully harvest tropical hardwoods from rain forests are indigenous peoples, rubber tappers and, in Brazil, the nut gatherers who have demonstrated how to extract rain forest products without destroying the ecosystem at the same time.

It has been shown that tropical rain forests in their natural state are more valuable to this world than their destruction for the timber products which we purchase in the developed world.

One of the environmental non-government organizations in Canada which has been very sensitive to global environmental issues is Probe International. It was just a few weeks ago that I received from them one of their Probe Alert announcements that talked about Cameroon rain forests which are currently under siege. What is happening in the Cameroon at the present moment is that the World Bank and the African Development Bank are busy preparing forestry loans for the African Republic of Cameroon. The loans will open the flood gates, as the Alert bulletin says, "to commercial exploitation of the country's remaining primary rain forests." These ancient forests are among the richest in the world in terms of diversity of plant and animal species and are the home of pygmy peoples, hunters and gathers, whose survival and cultural identity are intertwined with their environment.

Cameroon, like much of Africa, has lost vast areas of savannah woodland to export crops such as coffee and cocoa. Another reason why rain forests have been so enormously destroyed world-wide is to cut down the timber, first for sale overseas, and also to produce export crops to bring income to poor countries.

• (1710)

Logging in Cameroon, which got under way on a commercial scale about 15 years ago, has already devoured nearly half the country's tropical forests, notably in the coastal and central regions.

Today, no primary rain forest remains in the central region. If the World Bank and the African Development Bank get their way, Cameroon's rain forests will disappear like its neighbours'.

The Cameroon government, with enormous international debt problems, is desperate for foreign exchange earnings. It is looking to its untapped southern rain forests for solutions. The label is used: "sustainable management"; but it has been shown that when logging is done on a commercial scale, the methods are not sustainable.

Logging leads to mass deforestation. It does not sustain the rain forest's ecosystem as the experts promised. Furthermore, logging roads inevitably open up the rain forest to colonization, agricultural settlement and cultivation which the land cannot support.

The very construction of roads to haul out logs from these areas creates enormous destruction to the ecosystems in the area.

Canada is a signee and a contributor to the UN International Tropical Timber Organization. This organization was set up in order to try to preserve tropical rain forests. But to date, few measures have been taken that have been effective. The organization is generally considered by environmental groups to be toothless. Canada has played, and continues to play a role in the destruction of tropical rain forests through our importation of tropical hardwoods.

Canada must look at all of its policies internationally to see how we can improve our record. A Brazilian by the name of Jose Lutzenberger, a leading environmentalist and the winner of the 1988 Right Livelihood Award, speaking in Toronto of November of 1987 said: "Rain forest destruction has been called the biggest biological holocaust in the history of life. The resulting loss of biodiversity will affect the entire ecological system on which humanity depends, leading to consequences depressingly similar to those expected from a nuclear winter."

We have many benefits that derive from tropical rain forests which are not well appreciated. Tropical rain forests provide important environmental services such as the prevention of soil erosion and the protecting of watersheds.

Rain forest plants provide valuable medicinal extracts in the fight against leukaemia, cancer and other diseases, not to mention the traditional yield of spices, canon, dyes, pesticides, fibres, nuts, fruit, vegetable oil, waxes, gums and rubber worth billions of dollars.

We have yet to really research and explore all of the benefits that rain forests provide to us as Canadians, and to everybody as citizens of the world. However, we are beginning to understand somewhat, but not completely, the destructive impact of cutting down tropical rain forests.

The clearing and burning of huge areas of Amazonian rain forest has contributed to the greenhouse effect and possibly to the thinning of ozone layers. Rain forest destruction once again threatens the livelihood and possibly the very survival of 200 million people world wide. In Brazil alone, the native population living in the Amazonian rain forest has fallen from 1 million in 1900

to under 200,000 today. The reckless destruction of people's homeland is not only environmentally irresponsible. It also violates the International Bill of Rights.

Rain forests are being destroyed for a variety of economic reasons, but often these economic reasons are supported by inappropriate government policies. Canada itself is a culprit of that. Many of the so-called development projects, for example, that have been located in tropical rain forests have been environmental disasters and social tragedies. For example, the Balbina Dam in Brazil flooded 2,400 square kilometres of pristine tropical rain forests and forced one-third of the Waimiri-Atroari Indians from their homeland. Yet not one kilowatt of electricity will be generated from this dam because surveying errors have made it impossible to fill the reservoir with sufficient water.

There are many ways that Canada can improve the record. We are a member of the World Bank and other multilateral development banks which finance so many of the development projects that destroy tropical rain forests. We must bear responsibility for the global problem as it exists. We could have policies that would prevent us from importing into this country tropical hardwoods, for example. Austria is one country in the world that has such policies in place. Australia is considering such a policy.

In other countries at other levels of government, municipalities for example, are putting in place by-laws prohibiting the use of lumber in government contracts. In West Germany, 30 local councils as well as the West German government have voted to stop using rain forest lumber. Forty per cent of Holland's municipalities has the same by-laws in place.

It is important when Canada contributes to development projects internationally that environmental assessments are done prior to funding being put out in support of projects. This should be a factor in all of our CIDA funded projects, but it should also be a factor in the development banks that are supported with funding from Canada.

There are many different areas and policies at which Canada can look. I think it is important that Canada call together a conference of environmental NGOs that would work with bureaucrats and politicians to work out government policies here in Canada which would lead to the preservation of tropical rain forests instead of their destruction.

As I said at the outset of my remarks, this is not simply for the survival of native peoples in Third World countries who must have a voice in the kinds of projects that are supported and take place in their countries. It is also for the benefit and welfare of Canadian citizens as well as other global citizens.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Charles-Eugène Marin (Gaspé):** Mr. Speaker, the question of tropical rainforests brought to our attention by the hon. member for Northumberland is a crucial one that has concerned the Government of Canada for some time. Of the numerous threats to our environment, the degradation and destruction of rainforests is the one that has received the most attention by the international community because of its global scope.

Mr. Speaker, forests cover almost one third of emerged land and they support life to a great extent on our planet. They provide humanity with building materials, food, fodder, numerous medicinal plants and, most importantly wood for cooking and heating.

Forests also play an essential role in the environment: they protect soil from wind and water erosion; they reduce flooding risks by absorbing excess water; they purify the air by producing oxygen; they absorb humidity; and they provide shelter for humans and animals.

• (1720)

The consequences of the increasing elimination of the forest cover are very serious. The ground erosion causes a decrease in soil productivity; the loss of firewood sources reduces energy supplies; the threat of extinction of about half of the vegetal and animal species, including several medicinal strains, leads to a reduction of the genetic make-up. The tree loss reduces the forest's capacity to temper the planet's climate by recycling moisture, thus producing a climatic change.

While it is a global phenomenon, Mr. Speaker, the situation is even worse in the tropics where economic and demographic pressures are compelling the people to develop and transform forest areas in order to use them for mainly farming, domestic and commercial purposes. These abusive practices are impeding sustainable devel-

opment of forests and contribute to depletion of forest capital.

According to experts, demand for wood products from a rapidly growing population, unbridled settling of forest areas, cutting of firewood and industrial development cause the loss of 17 million hectares of tropical rainforests each year. Some 32 hectares of rainforests are destroyed every minute. On a global level, the annual loss of tropical rainforests is equal to three times the area of Nova Scotia.

As regards public assistance for international development, Canada has taken various initiatives to assist in the preservation of these precious forest resources. Since its creation in 1968, the Canadian International Development Agency, which administers 75 per cent of the Official Development Assistance Program, has recognized the importance of forestry in development matters, by supporting numerous programs and projects related to forests.

Throughout the years, developing countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Caribbeans received CIDA assistance to make an inventory of their forest resources and set up forestry institutions.

Lately, forestry activities of CIDA took a broader dimension, thanks to a better understanding of the diversified function of forests as a source of food, lumber and firewood and for soil conservation and climate regulation. In most cases, the local people participate in those projects. CIDA spends about $100 million a year in the forestry area.

Because forestry has a global dimension, world cooperation is essential in order to take up the challenges developing tropical countries are facing. Canada takes an active part in this area.

In 1985, the forestry and conservation sector of CIDA cooperated closely with the World Resources Institute, UN organizations and the World Bank in order to develop and implement the tropical forest plan, which is the most important international cooperation initiative to this day in forestry.

That plan is a framework for action with an emphasis on a coordinated approach through which many donor countries can cooperate in order to solve the tropical forest crisis. Both that framework and the CIDA program concentrate on a better use of the land, promote the development of an environmentally sound forest industry, a more efficient use of firewood, the conservation of tropical forest ecosystems and help institutions set up sustainable forest development programs.

Because it involves an international effort, the program can mobilize more resources than any individual country acting on its own. Since the program began, the influx of financial resources to the forestry sector increased by 17 per cent.

From the beginning, Canada has closely participated to the activities undertaken under the program and has provided leadership to expert teams from Canada and from across the world in Peru, Guyana, Zaire and Rwanda, in order to study the needs of these countries in the forestry sector.

Mr. Speaker, the people's participation is essential to forest conservation and management. The local population will take part in tree planting, pruning and cutting activities and can also support forestry institutions and their staff either by teaching or studying in these institutions.

For example, community participation is ensuring the success of the broad-leaf forests development project that CIDA is implementing in Honduras. In the forest villages of the north coast of the country, local populations are replanting trees on small lots in order to create a supply of firewood and are learning new methods of soil conservation to increase their agricultural production. These methods contribute to higher living standards. The project is therefore a success since it addresses at the same time the problems of degradation of tropical forests, forest management and rural poverty.

In another Latin American country, Peru, CIDA has contributed to the implementation of a graduate program in forestry at *La Molina* University located in the capital, Lima. Part of that institutional reinforcement program included the training of seven Peruvian students in Canada. To protect the ecosystem that the rainforest represents, it is necessary, among other things, to create national and regional reserves by improving planning and management as well as genetic resources conservation.

In Brazil, in the tropical rain forests of the Amazon, CIDA plans to provide technical equipment and training as part of a conservation project. A region will be chosen where the forest is managed by the population and

where activities such as picking Brazil nuts are done without cutting down trees.

In Southeast Asia, where certain type of forests are also threatened, the Centre for the Development of Tree Seeds ASEAN–CANADA, whose administrative headquarters are located in Thailand, helps increase the tree seeds supply required for the implementation of the reforestation programs of the Association of South East Asian Nations and for the protection of the gene pool.

Mr. Speaker, we have to face facts: there are industries which depend on the forest. The marketing of forest products is also an essential activity for many developing countries. The industry can prosper only if forests are protected and preserved, and populations will protect and preserve forests inasmuch as their commercial and economic value is recognized.

In North-East China for instance, a CIDA project seeks, within the framework of a comprehensive plan to integrate different aspects of forest management, to increase and make better use of scarce forestry ressources. One of the goals is to improve tree planting and management methods, protect forests against insects and disease, and introduce better and more environment friendly harvesting techniques.

From an energy standpoint, statistics indicate that 80 per cent of all firewood collected in the Third World is used for cooking and heating, but this source of energy is becoming rapidly depleted.

In the hills of Nepal, where firewood is the sole source of energy for 94 per cent of the population, deforestation has led to serious shortages and massive erosion. CIDA is helping the Nepalese government increase supplies of firewood through the Karnali-Bheri integrated rural development project. Tree planting and soil conservation have helped to slow down deforestation and increase energy supplies in Nepalese mountain communities.

During that time, it was noted in Zaire that firewood shortages were due to the use of open fireplaces that let heat dissipate. Due to diminishing supplies of wood, a more efficient solution was required. That is why CIDA cooperates with the Centre for Energy and Wood Technologies to convince the population to consume 30 to 50 per cent less wood. So far, more than a hundred craftsmen have been trained to build ovens, on a commercial basis, and approximately 900 housewives have been trained to build their own improved oven.

• (1730)

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, you will find that the Government of Canada is sparing no effort to contribute to the protection of tropical rain forests through our Official Development Assistance programs.

The problem of degradation and gradual disappearance of tropical rain forests must be addressed at its source that is by the people controlling this precious resource. It is in that perspective that Canada supports the efforts to reinforce the institutions of developing countries that are working at the conservation and management of forest resources, through various public education programs and the implementation of sustainable forest management.

The Canadian government's concerns are thus as great on the international level as they are on the domestic level in relation to our planet's forest resources.

[*English*]

**Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by complimenting my colleague for Northumberland and state that I welcome the opportunity to speak to this motion.

The hon. member has crafted a very skilful motion. It does incorporate the merging between the environment and the economy, and the financing that is necessary to save the rain forests, the policy which she is urging Canada to adopt.

This motion also gives me an opportunity to focus on the very important principle that has to be established at the outset; that our global environmental security is not possible without economic justice for the people who are involved.

I also want to point out that the concern about the rain forest extends far beyond the concern for trees. It is a timely motion as well because we have in our news today the trial of the murder of one Chico Mendez in Brazil. Chico Mendez's death was the worst kind of human rights violation. He does not have a life any more. He was an environmentalist working to try to maintain the integrity of the Brazilian rain forest.

We have today in the news that one of the accused has confessed to the murder. It seems to be a way to cover up who really is responsible for the murder. There are allusions that it will be right up to the highest level in the Brazilian government.

What we are talking about in this motion gives us an ability to focus on the very pervasive concern there is: rain forest, money, human rights violations, and international debt.

I also had the opportunity earlier this fall of meeting Mutang Tuo who is a native of Sarawak in Borneo. He came to talk about the need to preserve the rain forest in his country. I was quite moved, having listened to him, because it is his home.

David Suzuki was before our caucus yesterday. He made it very clear that we in the northern countries do not seem to have a real depth of understanding that there are biological limits, that we are biological creatures, and that air, water and soil do not respect human boundaries. Mutang Tuo did.

When we talk about the destruction of the rain forests, it is not just trees we are talking about, it is indigenous peoples. Rain forest destruction is a major contributor to global warming. As a member of the parliamentary committee on the environment which has been examining the phenomenon of global warming and the threat to our global survival that that presents, this rain forest destruction is very real to me.

Rain forest destruction also reduces natural diversity, wiping out countless species before their potential uses in medicine, agriculture and industry are even discovered.

As Mutang Tuo very graphically demonstrated to me, it is also about the destruction of forest dwellers—human beings. This is not just in Sarawak. It is happening all around the world. It is happening in Malaysia, Indonesia, Cameroon, Zaire, Peru, Colombia and Brazil.

Canada contributes to this problem. This is why this motion is so cleverly crafted. Although we do not import a lot of tropical wood, we are a contributor in a kind of back-door approach through the international financial institutions. Canadians have to realize, and I hope that those who are watching this evening will take note, that Canada does contribute to the deforestation of the tropical rain forests. Probe International has done a lot of work in getting us to understand this.

In the Cameroons a loan from the World Bank will primarily be used to finance the infrastructure for commercial logging in 3.5 million hectares of rain forest. No environmental assessment is required because of the sort of back-door approach that the World Bank is taking on it.

Another actor in this problem in the Cameroons is the African Development Bank. Here is where the Canadian connection is quite clear. Canada is a member of the African Development Bank and last year gave $130 million to it. The African Development Bank is quietly preparing even bigger loans through the World Bank to help Cameroon devour its rain forest.

What we have to understand is that Cameroon does not have a lot of flexibility in how it addresses its financial problems. It is an underdeveloped country. Canada should be using its role in the international financial institutions, through the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund—our finance minister is a director of the International Monetary Fund—to ensure through that very direct mechanism that Canada does not contribute to the destruction of the tropical rain forests in Cameroon, Malaysia, Indonesia, Sarawak, Peru and Colombia because we are all going to pay if that rain forest is destroyed.

We are going to be paying, not just in the cost of human rights violations—that is, as human beings we feel for people who are hurt, we feel for the people who are moved off their land and out of their way of life—but also because the destruction of the tropical rain forest is a very real threat to our global environment. This is the issue that is going to be before us over the coming decades, if we have that long.

The Global Conference on Debt and Adjustment recommended that Canada's directors on the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank work to solve this problem. I think we have to be very conscious that Canada has an important role. We are one of the G-7 countries.

I want to alert people out there that they have a role to play in this as well. I am not optimistic that Canada is going to take the right approach. I am not optimistic for two major reasons, which are very real to me as a parliamentarian who has been here for just over two years. I participated on the international debt report for the external affairs and international trade committee. The government response to that report, called, "Secur-

ing our Global Future", was very disappointing. The government does not seem to have a grasp of the urgency of the international debt problem and the link to the rain forests.

The second reason I am not very optimistic is because recently, just this past Tuesday in fact, the government's green plan has come out and we see once again a sort of inability on the part of the government to understand the urgency of linking the global environment to our own security. I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by asking those people who are out there, those Canadians who care about the global environment, to get in touch with your member of Parliament and make sure that he or she is aware of Canada's role in the destruction of rain forests and tell them to stop.

• (1740)

**Mr. J. W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the debate this afternoon. I would like to express appreciation to my colleague, who lives in Ottawa, who has graciously permitted me to speak first so that I can depart this lovely community for an even lovelier part of Canada, Fredericton, New Brunswick.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the initiative of the hon. member for Northumberland in raising one of the most serious and urgent issues on the public agenda for consideration by this House. No subject is more Canadian than forests and no place is more appropriate for the discussion of forest issues than the Parliament of Canada.

The member's concern is well founded. We depend on forests, perhaps in more ways than we have yet learned to count, not just as a source of product and jobs, although these considerations are of vital importance to Canadians. Forests are, as we have rather belatedly come to see, a vital and vulnerable part of the life support system that allows us to exist on this planet. All around the world, trees meet human needs for lumber, paper, food, and medicine; they shelter our fields and homes; they yield fodder for our livestock; they will fuel the fires to cook half of the world's meals today; and, beyond this, awareness has finally dawned that forests are active players in the very process of life. They hold back deserts, they stabilize hillsides, they regulate run-off, clean the air, and shelter countless life forms.

So I share the member's concern because the global forest is under assault and it is in jeopardy. Once it covered most of the planet, now less than a third of the earth is forested. Recent statistics from the food and agricultural organization of the United Nations indicate that the problem is even worse than we thought. Figures announced by the food and agricultural organization in June suggest that the rate of tropical deforestation actually rose by about 70 per cent during the 1980s to the point where some 17 million hectares of tropical forests are being lost every year. Half of Africa's forests are already gone. Much of Central America grows more barren every day. In China and in India, one-third of the world's population puts immense pressure on just one-twentieth of the world's trees.

Can the process be stopped? The evidence up to now is discouraging. We have failed for centuries to replace the trees we use because of short-term thinking, lack of vision, and wrong-headed attitudes. Quite literally, we haven't been able to see the forest for the trees.

But the process has to be stopped or we will degrade our planet and impoverish our children's future. The answer, the solution to deforestation is complex and it is difficult. It has many facets and it will take a lot of effort on many fronts.

Key parts of the answer lie in other areas seemingly unconnected with forestry. Most fundamental, for example, we need to bring the population explosion under control because even a perfect forest program, worldwide, cannot cope with exponential population growth. Experience reveals to us that the only sure way to lower birth rates is to overcome poverty. So the first step in protecting the world's forests is through broad, generalized development programs in such fields as health, food, education, and job creation, with the bulk of the benefits going to the poorest people.

The environmental movement can make a big contribution by helping us to become responsible consumers. The forestry profession which is going through a revolution in its thinking needs to explore and develop whole new areas such as agriforestry and social forestry so that it can make an even more profound contribution. But the member for Northumberland is right in believing there is legislation or regulatory aspect to the solution which means a role that governments, parliamentarians,

and international organizations must play if they are to be part of the answer. However, I am afraid that I am not at all certain that the approach she advocates is necessary or even helpful.

The member asks that the government develop a rain forest policy with guidelines to prevent Canada from financing projects that might destroy or degrade tropical rain forests. The intent is beyond reproach, but the effect might be somewhat different.

In one sense, the member's proposal is an unnecessary duplication of what already exists. As many members know, for some years now—since 1986—projects being considered for funding by the Canadian International Development Agency have been systematically reviewed, as part of the normal approval process, for their impact on the environment which very notably includes their effect on tropical forests.

The essence of the member's proposal is, in fact, already an integral part of government policy and indeed of the strategy for Canada's official development assistance as tabled here in 1988 by the Minister of External Relations and International Development.

Not only are bilateral projects analyzed for their environmental impact, but Canada has also been a leader in the effort to review such impacts caused by the World Bank's lending practices, particularly in regard to tropical forests.

Major reforms have, in fact, been made to meet those concerns. During 1990, the World Bank released guidelines for the environmental assessment of all its major projects in January and, in September, it issued its first annual environmental report. Just last month, it produced a specific paper on forestry lending policy. Admittedly, it is late in the day, but the changes are coming.

I feel that M-398 essentially duplicates what has already been achieved. True enough, it goes a bit further, but that could in reality prove a weakness, rather than a strength. There are times when a situation is not simple, when, for instance, a project that would destroy 100 trees will in the end save thousands of trees by providing alternative sources of energy. There are times, particularly in multilateral affairs, when it is better to be involved in the action and in a position to influence decisions, rather than sitting on the sidelines with clean hands but no say.

Rigidly applied, M-398 could be a strait-jacket, a ban on Canadian participation in anything that involves cutting trees in tropical rain forests, and I do not think that that would be helpful at all.

In fact, I feel that we need to move a giant step ahead in the way we think about economics and the environment in this post Brundtland era. When it began to dawn on us, back in the 1960s and 1970s, that there seemed to be a conflict in economic growth and the health of our natural environment, this new awareness from the Brundtland days represented an important step forward in our development thinking.

It was only the first step, and it is time now to make another major advance in the quality and the sophistication of our concepts by absorbing the wisdom offered in the Brundtland report and making it an internal part of our attitudes and our thought processes.

That historic report, the most important document of the 1980s, told us how much damage we are doing and advocated the principle of sustainable development. It did not stop there. It took us another step along the road by arguing very persuasively that the conflict between ecology and economics is an illusion or, at most, a short term effect, and that in the final analysis, there is no conflict because good environmentalism is good economics and vice versa.

I make this point because I think the member's proposal misses the relevance to the tropical forest of this lesson from Brundtland.

Tropical rain forests are more likely to be preserved and looked after if their owners, the people of the developing countries, see them as a source of wealth and benefits, as a valuable asset that must be protected. That implies some degree of use and exploitation. Sustainable development, certainly, but development nonetheless.

A moment ago, I acknowledged that the member is basically right in feeling that some kind of regulatory approach is needed as part of the solution to the rain forest problem. But we cannot chop nature up, and put it

in little compartments. Everything affects everything else.

Tropical rain forest depletion is closely linked to such profound issues as global warming and the loss of biological diversity here on our planet. The best way to deal with this is not piecemeal and single-handedly through an isolated ban on Canadian aid funding. That would be a fragmentary and futile approach.

The best way to tackle this issue, and the only way that can really work, is by playing a vigorous role in working out an internal solution and an international solution, one that has the active support of all the players, one that rallies global resources and authorities to deal with a global problem, one that is fully worked out and carefully elaborated, so that it can take into account the endless complexities, and make the interconnections with other related moves that are under way. That is the approach which we advocate. That is the approach which must be taken.

• (1750)

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, the colleague who has just finished speaking is about to take off for New Brunswick. Having heard what he has to say about what great progress we are making and how wonderfully we are doing in environmental assessments of development projects, I think I should give him a pile of reading to take with him on that airplane. He might come back on Monday a little bit better informed, with a little more understanding of the depth and breadth of these issues.

Some projects do have a direct impact on tropical rain forests. The industrial development forestry project in Peru, mentioned by a previous speaker, extended a $17 million line of credit to Peruvian timber companies to buy Canadian lumber extraction and sawmilling equipment for logging in the jungles of the Amazon. The project also involved $9 million for forestry training and technical assistance. Nevertheless, virtually all commercial logging activities in the rain forest have been proven to cause permanent environmental damage.

We certainly have a long way to go in making our overseas development aid policies more consistent with the words we say about the environment but are far from practising or integrating into our decision making and policies in government programs.

I want to restate a fundamental principle that came out of the Brundtland Commission. It is that we have no economy, healthy or otherwise, without an abundance of environmental resources. Without energy, we do not feed and drive our industry. Without raw materials as resources, we have nothing from which to manufacture. If we deplete our forests, we have nothing to cut down and to sustain the benefit that healthy, thriving forests, properly harvested, can provide perpetually.

There was a third corner-stone of the Brundtland Commission that seldom gets mentioned. We talk about the economy and we talk about the environment and we talk as if we have to balance them and trade one off against the other. That misses the essential message which is that we have to integrate them because, without protecting one, we cannot protect the other.

The third corner-stone is equity. We will not solve the world's environmental problems, whether it be rain forests, global warming, ozone depletion, or anything else, until we address the fundamental problems of a world that is divided between a small proportion of its population who consumes the vast majority of its wealth and resources, and a very large population who lives on minuscule scraps from that very abundant table that we, in the developed countries, are fortunate to have.

We are not going to solve our environmental problems, as my colleague who introduced this motion said, until we deal with the problems of international debt. It is a shame and a disgrace that we in the northern countries receive more money from the poorest people on this earth than goes from our countries to theirs. That set-up is so debilitating that there is no way those countries can get out of the cycle of poverty and population explosion.

Some members may wonder why I am addressing the issue of poverty when we are talking about rain forests. The simple fact is that world-wide the single greatest cause of environmental degradation is poverty. It is a population explosion which is based on infant mortality which can be reversed dramatically simply by improving the literacy of women. Yet, we insist on huge megaprojects that support our industries when we go to try to help in the Third World.

That is why I am talking about poverty. We strip the resources from the poorest part of the world. We make our profits on them and we send virtually nothing of these profits back to the poorest parts of the world. We are engaged, and we, Canada—not the United States, not Britain, not Japan, not West Germany, but we, Canada—are engaged in an economic colonialism that is more devastating than the last century's colonialism when countries were occupied and run from within. We can sit back in our nice comfortable homes and never even have to see the populations, the cultures, and the ecosystems that we are destroying to enjoy our comfort.

Some of the members have spoken about CIDA, but it goes far beyond CIDA. The Export Development Corporation, the trade facilitation offices, and the whole network of agencies that I am only starting to find out about, which support and subsidize trade with billions of Canadian dollars every year, have no requirement to meet any kinds of environmental standards. We take millions of dollars from the taxpayers of Canada to support the export of coal-fired generating systems. When are we going to ask ourselves how we can use those billions of dollars every year to try to export technology and products that are helpful, that will allow the Third World countries to start sharing some of the wealth of this planet and some of the comfort it offers, without doing the destructive damage to the planet that we have done?

I am looking at the green plan. I read it in great detail and then I went back through it today particularly looking for things relevant to this debate. It does nothing to address the whole role of Canada in the international economy and how we are feeding our industries, our jobs, and our wealth off the poverty, the degradation, and the depletion of other people's rights to a decent and fair quality of life. This has nothing about the rain forests of the world. It has nothing about our own old growth forests. It has very wishy-washy policies with very few things in the way of specifics and timetables on how we are going to better manage our own forests.

After nearly two years and $6 million spent on consultation, is this the best we can do when it comes to an invaluable and irreplacable resource of the world?

Mr. Speaker, I see the time for debate is ending, and I urge all members. They know the rules perfectly well. If they want Canada to address the rain forests, all they have to do is not stand up and speak again after I sit down.

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have but a minute or two to address what is a very important issue and I would like to take that minute to say two things.

First, I would like to say to the member who moved the motion that we on the government side very much share her concerns with respect to the state of the rain forest. We are very conscious of the fact that there is a tremendous connection between economic conditions in the Third World and Fourth World and with the state of the rain forest.

I have had the opportunity to visit Ethiopia during the course of the last 12 months. Although the conditions are not those which most people would associate with that of the rain forest, I did see that there was a very real emphasis on the part of CIDA in ensuring that the type of development policies we had in place were as environmentally friendly as they could possibly be.

• (1800)

I think, Mr. Speaker, you are suggesting to me that my time has expired. Perhaps I could have the opportunity on another day to discuss the issue at a greater length, the sort of length which it deserves.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1), this order 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.

MEDICARE

**Mr. Jim Karpoff (Surrey North):** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure who is here to respond.

I want to go over some of the questions that I raised earlier in the House concerning the financing of medicare and the crisis that has arisen in the country. The crisis is twofold: One is very fast escalating health care costs and at the same time reduction of government payments, particularly federal transfer payments.

In the federal transfer payments it used to be 50–50 until the Liberal government in 1977 brought in the block funding. At that point it was to increase at the level of the GNP plus the rise in population.

Of course the Liberals then brought in the famous six and five which limited the growth. In 1986, the Conservatives brought in the first of a number of budget restraint measures that reduced it to GNP, minus 2 per cent.

Last year there was a further reduction in which they brought in a freeze for 1990–91 and 1991–92, and then it was to increase at the rate of GNP minus 3 per cent.

We now have a number of provinces, led by Mel Couvelier, the Minister of Finance in B.C. and by Mr. Remillard and Mr. Coté of the Quebec government, which are demanding that they be allowed to bring in user fees and extra billing.

Over the last week I have been very pleased with the stand taken by both the Minister of Finance and the Minister of National Health and Welfare who have risen repeatedly in this House and have said that they will uphold the Canada Health Act. They will uphold all of the five principles that are set out in the Canada Health Act. Also, they will not permit any province to institute user fees or extra billing. I was most pleased with that answer, as were most Canadians.

However, when we have asked the government what it is going to do when it is no longer transferring any cash to the provinces for medicare, so that its only leverage in which it can force the provinces to comply is gone, what then?

That is not some distant time. It has been calculated that the federal government will not be transferring any cash to Quebec by 1995; to Ontario by 1997 or 1998. In fact, I was advised in a meeting I had with the new minister of health for Ontario, their calculations indicate that it may be even sooner. Of course, it depends on the moneys raised from tax points. With the downturn in the economy, that is a little bit unpredictable.

I guess all Canadians are starting to say that the federal government is not going out of the health care and medicare field with an announcement, but with a whimper. It will simply be reducing its cash transfers to the province so that within the next 10 years it will not be giving any money to any province. The government will simply wimp out. It will have no leverage in which it can insist on national standards. Then the provinces will be able to introduce measures that will Americanize our health care system.

• (1805)

I have three questions that I would like addressed. There has been some debate as to when those cut–off dates are going to be. Can the government confirm the date that the three biggest provinces, Ontario, Quebec and B.C., will no longer receive cash transfers under medicare? It has been said and federal government documents claim it is 1995 for Quebec and Ontario is supposed to be 1997 or 1998. When is that point under the current budget restrictions that were introduced in 1986 and last year?

Second, once there are no more cash transfers, how is the government going to enforce the Canada Health Act? It has no leverage. What can it do?

Third, because of escalating costs, is the government now prepared to use what remaining spending power it has to try to assist provinces in innovative methods of delivery of health care so that all of the health care costs can be brought into the most efficient and effective health care system. Without that all of us know that ultimately down the road there is going to be a real crisis. We must manage our health care system efficiently, effectively and without it becoming such a high cost that the country cannot afford it.

**Mrs. Dorothy Dobbie (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend spouts a lot of nonsense and he knows it. The Minister of National Health and Welfare has stated time after time, after time that the national health system in Canada is supported by this

government and is in absolutely no danger. In fact, I would like to refer the hon. member to pages 16097 and 16098 of *Hansard* for December 3, 1990, where the minister addressed the hon. member's question about changes to the federal health legislation, as the hon. member no doubt remembers.

**Mr. Karpoff:** What's he going to do when he's not transferring the money?

**Mrs. Dobbie:** Year in and year out Canadians, when they are asked their opinion about the health care system, have expressed a high degree of satisfaction with health care and this is very significant in itself. Perhaps even more revealing of Canadians' commitment to their health care system are the results of a recently reported opinion survey that was carried out across 10 nations. Among the countries that had national health care systems, satisfaction with the system was the highest in Canada. Most Canadians surveyed regarded the system to be fundamentally sound and 95 per cent disagreed that there were such problems that complete rebuilding of the system was needed.

What is it about Canada's health care system that elicits such commitment and pride from Canadians? I believe that hon. members like my friend across the way will agree that it is the uniqueness of our system and its basic philosophy that our citizens' health and access to quality care should not depend upon their financial means. This has been the guiding principle of health care in Canada since the 1950s and it is just as true today.

Just over six years ago the House unanimously passed the Canada Health Act. This is the act which embodies principles which are admired by Canadians and praised by many other countries around the world. It is a publicly administered system which operates on a non-profit basis, with comprehensive coverage for medically-necessary hospital and physician services, universal coverage for all Canadian residents, coverage that is portable and reasonable access to care without financial barriers. Extra billing and user charges are contrary to the principles of reasonable access and such direct patient charges are discouraged.

In the Canada Health Act this government is opposed to such patient charges, both in principle and in practice. That should answer the hon. member's question.

Extra billing and other user charges have been shown to deter the least advantaged Canadians from seeking necessary health care. Three years ago, in April 1987 direct charges to patients were eliminated in Canada under this government's direction.

Suggestions by the hon. members opposite that our government is anything less than totally committed both to the letter and the spirit of the Canada Health Act are irresponsible, inaccurate and misleading. We are fully committed to the principles of the Canada Health Act.

• (1810 )

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

**Ms. Catherine Callbeck (Malpeque):** Mr. Speaker, during Question Period on November 1, I asked the Minister of State for Finance what specific action he was going to take regarding the criticisms of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions concerning that particular office.

These criticisms were made that week by the Auditor General in his 1990 report. The Auditor General said of the superintendent's office that it was not doing everything possible to ensure that it could sound the alarm in time to prevent a financial institution from going under. So I asked the Minister of State for Finance what he was going to do about it and he brushed off my question and actually said that I was drawing conclusions.

I was not drawing conclusions because that question was based on facts taken right out of the Auditor General's report. I invite the minister to read that report.

In my supplementary I asked the same question, that is, what was the minister going to do about the Auditor General's complaints. Again, I got a vague answer. So I am here again tonight to try to get a satisfactory answer to these concerns. This is a very important question because, as we are aware, it is absolutely essential that we ensure the soundness of our financial institutions. I know that many Canadians have heard the shocking details surrounding the American Savings and Loans scandal where over one-half trillion dollars in taxpayers' money was lost. I think the latest estimate is something like $600 billion.

Certainly Canada has not been without its bank and trust company failures. People may remember the Principal Group and Canadian Commercial Bank failures in the west, the Greymac-Seaway Trust failures in Ontario, or they may be aware of the difficulties facing Standard Trust today in Ontario. I am sure that the taxpayers do

not need to be reminded of these events. When the Canadian Commercial Bank experienced difficulties in 1985, for example, taxpayers spent approximately $125 million on a rescue package for the company, which went under anyway.

We as legislators have a duty to see that no more taxpayers' money is lost through the failure of one of our financial institutions. We have a responsibility to protect the people who place their money and their trust in these institutions and we have a responsibility to ensure the soundness and the stability of financial institutions and, indeed, of our financial system as a whole.

Really, the issue before us is the one that, tonight, is the same as I brought in on November 1, that in the 1990 report, the Auditor General said that the Superintendent's office had improvements to make in a number of areas. I want to list just three of these. They do not always write down their findings after inspecting a bank, a trust, or an insurance company and, in some cases, no files were kept; they are not fully using their new computer system which could greatly improve the effectiveness of the office; and, if they are inspecting a trust company, for example, which is owned by a commercial parent corporation, they do not have access to the books of that parent company, even though the parent's financial health could pose a threat to the trust subsidiary. While this last problem should be eliminated by proposed government legislation, this government's incredible slowness in bringing in the legislation may have put at least one trust company solvency at risk.

• (1815)

I know that my time is just about up, but I want to ask again what this government is doing about the problems cited by the Auditor General so that Canada will have the most secure financial system in the world.

**Mrs. Dorothy Dobbie (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here to answer the question about how we protect people who hold interest in our financial institutions.

The hon. member will be glad to know that the primary objective of the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions is to protect the interest of depositors and to protect the interest also of policyholders by ensuring the soundness of financial institutions and the stability of the Canadian financial system.

Through a comprehensive framework the office monitors and examines supervised institutions for compliance with applicable legislation, related regulations and guidelines, and it gathers information about the operations of institutions for use in developing sound regulatory policies and assessing strengths and weaknesses in the financial system.

In respect of life and property insurance companies there has been for some time an early warning system in place with respect to deposit taking institutions under federal jurisdiction. The Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions has developed a framework which identifies problems as they may exist in financial institutions.

Action is taken on such matters through discussion with senior management of the institution. The regulatory policy sector of that office identifies trends of problems that might be surfacing, and these matters are drawn to the attention of the examiners.

The Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions has studied the Auditor General's report, and it agrees generally with the recommendations that have been made. In Mr. MacKenzie's response he noted that work is well under way to complete implementation in most cases. In other areas he has incorporated the Auditor General's recommendations into his planning documents.

The Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation is also concerned about possible financial problems of member institutions. Therefore CDIC is working on standards aimed at promoting sound business and financial practices. If sound corporate governances, practices and standards are in place and followed by member institutions, the incidence of problems should be reduced for the benefit of all concerned.

The federal government has brought forward new legislation which was tabled on September 27. This legislation includes a new power for the superintendent to require controlling owners of financial institutions to furnish information. As well, comprehensive self-dealing rules and a new director's policy are also proposed. These measures supplement the actions which were taken in 1987 aimed at strengthening the supervisory system.

Finally, the House finance committee has already begun its study of Bill C–83, and we are bringing forward the rest of the legislative package as soon as possible.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 6.19 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Friday, December 14, 1990**

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### CANADIAN RACE RELATIONS FOUNDATION

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-63, an act to establish the Canadian Race Relations Foundation, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** There are three report stage motions in amendment to Bill C-63, an act to establish the Canadian Race Relations Foundation, standing on the Notice Paper in the name of the hon. member for Vancouver East.

[*Translation*]

Motions Nos. 1 and 3 are in order and will be debated and voted on separately.

[*English*]

Motion No. 2 is out of order. It seeks to introduce provisions requiring a widespread disclosure of information and even distributing criminal sanctions against defaulters. It is well beyond the scope of this bill and the Chair cannot permit the motion to come before the House. In this regard, I will refer hon. members to Citation 778 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition.

[*Translation*]

I will now put motion No. 1 to the House.

[*English*]

MEASURE TO ENACT

**Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East)** moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-63 be amended in Clause 4 by striking out lines 29 to 33 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"facilitate elimination of racism and all forms of racial discrimination throughout Canada by the development, sharing and application of knowledge and expertise in order to contribute to racial harmony in Canada by."

• (1010 )

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that at least two of the proposed amendments were accepted. I hope they will be acceptable to the government as well.

Motion No. 1 has to do with the very purpose of this Canadian Race Relations Foundation. It is something that we debated very extensively in committee. Indeed, there were many witnesses, including the Japanese Canadian Association and if I recall correctly, the Congress of Black Women were particularly adamant that in the purposes of this bill there must be specific reference to the main purpose of establishing this foundation, which is to eliminate racism in Canada and all forms of racial discrimination throughout Canada.

I know from discussion in committee and from the minister's response that this certainly was the intent, but in the present wording of the purposes and goals, it is far too wishy-washy, if I may use that expression, and refers just to the development, sharing and application of knowledge of expertise. We are very much afraid if this is not spelled out more specifically as the purpose being to eliminate racism that we will have a foundation that is largely a rather passive research institution, an academic kind of institution. That is not what people are asking for.

We have had an escalation of racism in Canada, I regret to say. We have really a very serious situation. This foundation is one of the most important steps of the government and it is a considerable investment hopefully to have a strong movement to make changes in Canada. Therefore, Motion No. 1 is an amendment to add the

phrase that the purpose of the institution is to "facilitate elimination of racism and all forms of racial discrimination throughout Canada—" I hope very much that the government will accept this amendment.

**Hon. Gerry Weiner (Secretary of State of Canada and Minister of State (Multiculturalism and Citizenship)):** Mr. Speaker, I would first like to take a moment and thank the members of the legislative committee for their very dedicated efforts. Certainly they have brought forward on behalf of the many witnesses who appeared some very constructive suggestions that I believe and know have strengthened the bill.

My own impression is that this particular motion really adds nothing further to what we already have. Indeed, trying to contribute to racial harmony in Canada already causes some new discussion and new dilemma. As far as I am concerned, I am thankful that we did hear all the witnesses, that we did work very closely together, members on all sides of this House, in strengthening the bill.

However, I do not feel that this adds anything and, therefore, cannot accept this suggestion. I heard the member say that she is very pleased with the Canadian Race Relations Foundation and would hope that that would indicate that we could see an early approval, so that we can get on and actually have the foundation in place in Toronto and begin to do the work it was intended to do.

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence):** Mr. Speaker, as a member on the committee, I thank the minister for his acknowledgement of some serious work done by committee members.

One of the elements of that serious work is reflected in this motion. Not only is it important for this Parliament to consider the principle of the bill itself but to provide the kinds of directions and purposes that give focus to the activity of the foundation.

Otherwise it will be a foundation in name only, in generic, philosophical principles that no one can dispute. However, in terms of its practicability and its ability to deliver something to Canadians, it will be absolutely worthless.

This motion addresses itself to the intention to provide some direction, to provide some purpose, and to give a sense of meaning to some of the work that must be done. We must keep in mind that none of that is going to be of enormous weight, inasmuch as the operations of the foundation will be generally funded by a fund of $24 million. If we also keep in mind that fund managers tell us that we can draw a maximum of 5 per cent from such fund in order to maintain the fund, quite frankly we are going to be providing very little toward the elimination of discrimination and racial discrimination, unless we put in the bill something specific that gives direction both to the board of directors and to the executive director.

Unfortunately the minister has to note, even in trying to promote racial harmony and racial co–operation in this country, that there seems to be a resistance. However, this Parliament owes it to all Canadians to be much stronger than that resistance, that reaction to initiatives that are positive and worth while for all Canadians.

We support this motion. It enhances the bill and gives it that purpose which it sorely lacks.

**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. 1, standing in the name of the hon. member for Vancouver East. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

Motion No. 1 (Ms. Mitchell) negatived.

**Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East)** moved:

Motion No. 3

That Bill C–63 be amended in clause 6 by striking out line 37 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"siders appropriate, subject to the approval of the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism and Citizenship of the House of Commons."

She said: Mr. Speaker, before I go into the details of this amendment, I would just like to qualify one of the comments that was made by the minister.

While I think it is extremely important, and so does my party, to have a race relations foundation, we want a race relations foundation that has real meaning and is not just something that is going to rubber stamp for the government and be a forum of political recognition or political appointments to the board and so on.

We are not supporting this race relations foundation as the government has proposed it. We have worked very hard, along with the other opposition party and along with witnesses, to try to get major changes. I am very disturbed that the minister refused Motion No. 1, which we have just been debating.

Motion No. 3 in my view is not nearly comprehensive enough to make the major change that is needed in the structure of this foundation. We tried in committee to persuade the minister, as did witnesses, that this new foundation must operate as a step detached from government. It must be a separate agency. It must be able at times to criticize government and certainly to press the government to make administrative and legislative changes that are necessary to help in the elimination of racism in Canada.

In committee we proposed that there be a more independent board, rather than a board appointed by the minister, in other words political appointees he would choose, with some consultation with groups, but groups of his choosing. We have seen that he has very strong likes and dislikes in groups that come to him about ethnocultural matters.

• (1020)

We have proposed that there should be an independent board and that nominees for that board should come from the whole community of ethnocultural groups and groups concerned with race relations and intercultural relations.

We asked that there be a procedure—and I think it would be an important model for other similar kinds of institutions—for these communities of organizations to put forward nominations for board members, and that the minister then take these nominations and present them to cabinet. In this way it would be far more democratic and we would ensure much greater credibility of the board of directors.

The minister refused this request in committee and he also refused to change the method of appointment of the executive director of the new foundation. It seems incredible that a board of directors of an agency, in this case the Race Relations Foundation, would not have the power to choose and hire its executive director, the senior staff person who would be carrying out its policy. That is exactly what has happened. The minister again refused to change the act. Under the present act, the executive director is appointed by cabinet. He or she will not be hired by the board of directors. Again it will be a political appointment recommended by the minister and appointed by cabinet.

This is a ridiculous way for what should be an independent organization to operate. It only says to us that the minister does not want this foundation to be independent, that he wants to keep it under his control. Certainly most of the witnesses who appeared at committee objected very strongly to that.

Indeed I was speaking just last week to representatives of the National Council of Japanese Canadians who were the instigators of this foundation. It was part of the redress settlement for Japanese Canadians who suffered many injustices during World War II. They felt very strongly also that this foundation should be independent of government and therefore should have a board that is not simply a board of political appointees.

As I say, the minister turned down this request in committee. We were very serious in trying to approach this in a non-partisan way, because we really want this foundation to work in an effective way. Since he turned it down and since we cannot reintroduce that motion in the House today, Motion No. 3 is somewhat of a compromise.

We appeal again to the minister to give more credibility to this board. He may not intend to make it a vehicle for political appointments, but that is the perception that will be out there. That is the danger in the present structure.

In order to have a monitoring effect, we are proposing in Motion No. 3 that Bill C-63 be amended to state that the minister's recommendations and the proposed appointments by cabinet should be subject to the approval of the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism and Citizenship of the House of Commons. Granted, it is dominated by government members, if it ever meets, which I regret to say it has not been doing. Certainly this would give cause for it to meet. It is dominated by government members, but it would give an all-party group the power, in co-operation perhaps with community groups, to take a look at who the minister is nominating. It would give far more credibility to the nominees who are being proposed.

I would strongly recommend that the minister accept this proposed motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. member of the other opposition party who can never remember my party's name. It happens to be the party that led most of the opposition to this bill. That party is the Liberal Party, and we have two questions about this motion.

[*English*]

The motion should address itself, in its intent, to the function of committee. In our legislative committee we tried to point out that there is a very important component of this foundation which should call into question the viability of parliamentary committees. If we are to establish a foundation with a board of directors solely responsible to the Governor General in Council and an executive director with only one source of responsibility and accountability, that is to the Governor General in Council again, it calls into question the credibility and legitimacy of all of the operations of such a foundation.

By suggesting that perhaps that accountability should also be transferred over to a standing committee of the House of Commons, we would then have access to a direct pipeline to the deliberations of this Parliament, both to sensitize Parliament and to return to the intentions with respect to that foundation.

One of the most important questions is: How do we finance some of the philosophies the minister says this foundation addresses? It might be instructive to point out to everyone here, even my colleague in the other opposition party—

**An hon. member:** The real opposition.

**Mr. Volpe:** That which is dormant, yes, I agree.

For example, while we are applying some moneys to this foundation to the tune of $24 million, $12 million of which is coming from the Japanese Redress Foundation, we are taking away some moneys from heritage language studies. Those are activities which enhance the co-ordination, integration and harmonization of peoples in our country.

What did they do? They attacked a very viable and very effective method of creating racial and social harmony in this country, for example, one that served in the city of Toronto alone 100,000 young boys and girls. It addressed a total of 1,000 teachers on those subjects. It leveraged other activities in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and other areas around the country. They took away $16 million to do what? They will finance something such as this, at a time when all heritage language-type programs together, in total, are exactly .015 per cent of government finances or government expenditures. That is one and a half hundredths of 1 per cent. Now they are going to establish a foundation, and its board of directors and executive director will have only one source of accountability, and that is to the Governor General in Council.

Canadians need to be empowered. They need to have an understanding that their voices are heard. They need to know that the moneys they put toward the financing of this country serve their needs and their interests. We cannot do it by separating the function of the board, the executive director, from the people itself.

This motion deserves some support. We are happy to give it, even though it comes from a dormant third party.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Gerry Weiner (Secretary of State of Canada and Minister of State (Multiculturalism and Citizenship)):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept the hon. member's suggestion with respect to this motion.

[*English*]

This motion calls for substantial change in established practice. Since 1985 all Governor in Council appointments are open to review by a standing committee of Parliament, which can call for review of any Governor in Council appointment.

**Ms. Mitchell:** What about the CRTC appointments?

**Mr. Weiner:** Listen, you might learn something; for once.

This motion contradicts the principle of ministerial accountability for Governor in Council appointments. These are serious machinery of government issues. This motion would change established practice by making the Commons Standing Committee on Multiculturalism and

Citizenship ultimately responsible for appointments to the foundation. We therefore reject the motion.

• (1030)

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**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.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Motion negatived, on division.

Motion negatived.

**Hon. Gerry Weiner** moved that the report stage of Bill C–63 be concurred in, as amended.

**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):** Do I have the consent of the House for the bill to be read the third time?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*English*]

**Mr. Weiner** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, today it is my privilege to begin third reading debate on Bill C–63, an act to establish the Canadian Race Relations Foundation.

This legislation articulates more than the technical workings of a government initiative. It expresses our national commitment to multiculturalism and to greater cross–cultural understanding among Canadians.

We are a people unlike any other. We inhabit an immense land, one–sixteenth of the earth's terrain. As vast and as limitless as our land is the diversity of the Canadian people. But it is not our diversity alone that makes us unique. It is our ability to recognize and even welcome our different cultures and backgrounds. It is our belief that in this vast territory of ours there is enough room for everyone.

We have declared Canada to be a multicultural nation and in so doing we have helped to define the Canadian identity itself. Multiculturalism is at the heart of who we are. It represents a confident vision of ourselves and of our future together. It is a progressive force in the ongoing process of building a strong, dynamic and unified country.

That is the essential message of multiculturalism today: unity within our diversity, political unity within our cultural diversity.

The true source of our unity resides in the thoughts and beliefs of the Canadian people, in the honourable and timeless ideals that have guided our development and shaped the lives of every Canadian, past and present. It is difficult to pin down and express the values that have inspired Canadians through the generations. But they are reflected in the kind of society we have created for ourselves; our democratic way of life that encourages a plurality of views and perceptions; our judicial system where equality and justice are a promise made to every Canadian man and woman; our social system that seeks to assist the disadvantaged in our society; our belief in the free enterprise system as a means of achieving national prosperity.

These are some of the values that set us apart. They are the foundation of our hope for Canada and for our future together. All of us want a better life for our children and for our children's children. We all want to build safer communities free from social problems like family violence and drug abuse. Each of us has a vested interest in ensuring that our health care, our educational system and our economy are prepared to meet today's challenges.

The finest hope that we can have for our country is that it will support and lead the human struggle for equality; that all our citizens will have the opportunity to lead productive lives, free from the destructive forces of racism and racial discrimination.

Will that day come? We know it will not come as the result of a single initiative or one sweeping act of Parliament. It is the sum total of our actions as Canadians that will allow us to move forward and to achieve our ideals.

Today in this House I believe that we are making progress towards that goal. The Canadian Race Relations Foundation is a foundation for and about people. It represents a significant development in Canada's evolution as a multicultural nation.

As the legislation outlines, the foundation will promote the development, sharing and application of knowledge and expertise that will contribute to eliminating racism and all forms of racial discrimination across Canada. That is a challenging mandate, but one for which Canadians recognize the need.

The legislative committee on Bill C–63, which listened to a broad range of groups, institutions and individuals, concluded that there is widespread support for the establishment of the foundation.

I want to take this opportunity to again thank members of the legislative committee, whose efforts have brought us to where we are today. I know there are other members in this House who have contributed in a positive way to this bill. To them, I express my thanks also.

We must continue to match goodwill with action. Within Canada today there is a growing need for reliable research and new race relations resources. The race relations foundation will meet that need. The best expertise in the country will be used and developed by the foundation, along with a comprehensive information bank, accessible to all Canadians.

The foundation will be of direct benefit to people working on the front lines. It will serve community groups, policy makers, business and labour organizations, researchers, private and public institutions, as well as interested Canadians.

By using the foundation's research and services, the initiative of educators, advocates, managers and decision–makers will be more focused and effective.

It will be a valuable resource for government also, by providing informed and objective information on race relations issues.

[*Translation*]

The foundation is not intended to replace special interest community groups and organizations or to impinge on their legitimate role in defending human rights.

Although the foundation will be based in Toronto, its mandate as the Canadian Race Relations Foundation will be national in scope. The legislation provides that the foundation and its services will be open to all Canadians.

[*English*]

The foundation will be a sound investment in our future. As such, it must start operating with a solid funding base.

The federal government is establishing an endowment fund of $24 million. Half of that amount will be contributed on behalf of the Japanese Canadian community, in commemoration of the injustices suffered by Japanese Canadians during and after the Second World War.

The foundation will also be incorporated federally as a charitable organization, in order to enhance its fund–raising potential.

The over–all responsibility of the foundation is one shared by all Canadians, to overcome racism and racial discrimination in our midst. The foundation will provide a national focus for this effort. By gathering expertise and knowledge from across the country, we will be able to share and use all existing Canadian expertise. In this way, we will be able to find creative solutions to the problem of racism.

The race relations foundation is an expression of the hope and determination of Canadians to realize a multicultural vision for this country. It is a symbol of our unity of purpose and of our shared citizenship values.

Yesterday's decision by the Supreme Court that upholds the constitutionality of the Criminal Code's anti–hate law can only serve to underline further both the importance of that vision and the work this foundation will undertake.

We know this foundation will not create magical solutions. It will not solve the problem of racism and racial discrimination in Canada, but it will contribute to our efforts to find new answers. It will be good for Canada.

Hon. members, I ask for your continued support in the passage of Bill C–63. If our work in establishing this foundation unlocks even one door, if it improves the life of even one Canadian who would have otherwise known

only discrimination, then it will surely have been worth all the effort.

• (1040)

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to the minister with great interest. I rise on behalf of the Liberal Party to say a few words on Bill C-63.

It is very important that a foundation such as this be set up. We on this side are in agreement with the principle of this bill. We do, however, have certain concerns about the implementation and the ability of the foundation to function given the constraints of the bill.

Canada is a rapidly growing country. We are opening our doors to more immigration. The Minister of Employment and Immigration announced that we are almost doubling the number of immigrants we admitted in the past. We are attracting immigrants from a different source than in the past. In the 1960s and 1970s, immigrants from Europe were attracted to Canada. We are now attracting immigrants from Third World countries such as Sri Lanka, India, Pakistan and South America.

The new visible minorities coming here are more prone to abuse from mainstream every-day Canadians. It is not unusual when walking down the main streets of Canada to hear slogans and slurs aimed at these minorities, often by community members. It is very important that we reach out and teach Canadians that as we progress to the year 2000 we need to be tolerant of each other.

As we grow more tolerant of each other, we will learn to live with each other. It is very important that this foundation function, but as it will not have a free hand and will be very closely tied to the government, I have doubts about its ability to function. Yes, it is there on paper and, yes, it will function, but will it support the new immigrants? Will it enhance their everyday life? I feel the constraints imposed on this foundation might not allow it to fulfil its objective.

The problems we have are many. First, I have a problem believing that the same government which decimates the heritage language program, which was designed to promote harmony and unity within Canada by allowing Canadians to learn the languages and cultures of various homelands, and then says that it wishes to do the same thing with a foundation that is not mandated to even come close to offering the same service.

As my colleague from Eglinton—Lawrence said, the heritage languages funding from this government is very minimal, yet we have a minister who says: "No more. We are going to do away with it". What is the signal it sends out to the ethnic communities of this country? Does it send a signal that it is supporting their work? Does it send a signal that yes, we want to promote race relations? No, Mr. Speaker, it sends quite the opposite. It sends a signal out that it would like them to come to Canada, it would like them to bring their different heritages, but it does not support them.

The minister was brave enough to stand up and respond to the pressure from his colleagues, the backbenchers of the Conservative Party, who are feeling pressure from some of their constituents, especially the backbenchers from the west. We can see clearly that the pressure comes from the new party, the Reform Party, whose platform is more or less based on white supremacy in Canada. So the members of the Conservative Party who are trying to hold on to their seats in the west forced the minister to take such an position, which was a great change.

Second, I believe that the level of funding for this foundation is so low as to be laughable, $24 million. That is not even a drop in the bucket. What is $24 million going to contribute to such a foundation?

I see the minister is nodding and I thank him for agreeing with me.

**Mr. Volpe:** Look at the money the guys at Harbourfront are getting in that sweetheart deal.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** There you go. My hon. colleague from Eglinton—Lawrence refers to the sweetheart deal in Harbourfront.

It is very laughable to think that $24 million is going to be entrenched in order for us to project in the year 2000, in order for us to say to the new minorities that are coming to Canada: "We are going to have harmony. We are going to have equality. We are going to be tolerant of each other".

This $24 million is so laughable, it is incredible. I see the minister nodding his head and I want to thank him for agreeing with me, but that is not enough. I would have foreseen perhaps twice or three times the amount. The government that is spending money left, right, and

centre so carelessly could have found it in its heart to allow a few more bucks.

It is very important that we have a budget which is operational. Its yearly operating budget will probably be less than $3 million. Out of this will come the salaries and expenses of the staff. I see the minister nodding his head. He knows what it is like to fly in a director from one coast to another. Five to ten trips a year, and the money is gone. Then there are the rents in downtown Toronto where the minister is proposing to put this foundation.

**Ms. Mitchell:** Put it in Winnipeg.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** The critic from the dormant third party says to put it in Winnipeg. I would like to point out that the hotbed of ethnic relations and newcomers is mostly in Montreal and Toronto.

It will be in Toronto, which is in the central part of Canada. I want to congratulate the minister for choosing my home town. It will serve the western part of the country: Vancouver, Calgary, Saskatchewan, and Winnipeg. It will also act as a liaison to the east. Toronto is going to be the hotbed of race relations to come.

However, it is limiting because of the funds. It is a small drop in the bucket and it will not be able to function. By the time one picks up the phone to call Vancouver, with a three-hour time difference, at the peak time, the funds will be gone. When all the expenses are taken out, the money that will be left over for the program and core funding will be such a small amount as to make the entire foundation a useless shell. I find this totally unacceptable.

I see the minister nodding his head that we need more money. It is interesting that the minister is in the House and he agrees with that. I know that even as members of Parliament we have such constraints running within budget that sometimes we do have a separate office, beside the constituency office, in order to operate. Some members or some ministers might.

I also have the problem with the interference that the minister responsible would be able to cause in the running of the foundation. Clause 15(3) states that the deputy to the minister be advised of all meetings and shall be able to attend all meetings of the board. Also, Clause 5(1) of the bill states that the foundation must undertake to conduct research studies, reports and other documents that the minister requests. I question this. The minister has a department. He can do all these things through them. Why would we tell the foundation to do extra? Is it that we want to use it for other things? Is it that we want to use it to promote the governing party? Is it that we want to use it for political hand-outs? We have seen the government clearly use foundations and hand-out contracts.

• (1050)

**Ms. Mitchell:** What about the Liberals?

**Mr. Karygiannis:** It is interesting that the NDP talks about the Liberals. May I point out to the NDP that, in Ontario when it was just elected, Bob White flew right into the Skydome. Before you start talking about the Liberals and what the Liberals did, look in your own back yard.

These clauses give the minister a great impact on the direction taken by this organization and could lead to it becoming nothing more than a mouthpiece for government policy. It could lead to the assumption that the foundation is more of a political organization than one of a proactive association for the needs of the furtherance of race relations.

This is very important as we head into the 21st century. As we are inviting more groups of visible minorities to come to Canada, it is important that this foundation is allowed to function properly. With $24 million, it is going to be nothing but a tokenship of "we have it here, we are trying to bring everybody together". I see the minister nodding his head that he agrees with me that, first, this will not be acceptable. Second, it will not be able to work. Third, we will need more funding.

It is also interesting to note that the minister said it is a charitable organization and can also fund raise. Are we going to try to use the $3 million that we will have yearly in order to raise funds and send out letters? Or, are we going to give it a real mandate and say: "You can work. You can do what you were set out to do"? If that is the case, then we need more funds for this. We need more funds in order to make it a viable tool to bring all the races right across the country together.

There are countries where the groups within it, the same countrymen, cannot live with each other. I would like to point out that we can learn lessons from Pakistan. In Pakistan, there is an Islamic republic in which there are three different sects of Islam, two being the Sunnis and the Ahmadis. The Sunnis outlawed the Ahmadis, telling them that they are not Muslims, that they cannot

walk the streets and say greetings in the Islamic religion. If they do, they will be put in jail.

This foundation, I hope, will act as a means and a tool for those people from different lands who come over bringing hatred with them. From Sri Lanka, there are the Tamils and the Sinhalese. From Pakistan, there are the Ahmadis and the Sunnis. From many other countries there are different divisions. From India, there are the Hindus and the Sikhs. When they come here, they tend to bring their conflicts to this country.

This foundation will also have to act as a means and a vehicle for the hatreds that are brought over to be forgotten. It is very important when we come to Canada that, first and foremost, we pay allegiance to this country. Second, we must educate those people who are coming over to live in this country that we must live in harmony.

The funds that are available will not allow the foundation do that. The funds that are available for this foundation will act only as a means and a vehicle for the government of the day to put out its policies. It will act only as a vehicle for the government of the day, which today is formed by the Conservative Party, to place into position people who are supporting it. Probably, it will put as president of the foundation somebody who raised funds for the government. We saw clearly what happened in the other place.

**Mr. Volpe:** Not another Tory hack.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** My hon. colleague from Eglinton—Lawrence says: "Not another Tory hack".

We saw clearly what happened in the Senate. The Speaker of the other place was promoted and put there by the government. What did he do? He more or less closed debate. We have the GST that passed through.

I say to the minister across the way, and I hope that he takes this to heart, that all the appointments that will be made will be very neutral. I cannot tell if the minister is agreeable to carry it through or not. The government will probably appoint another Tory hack which is incredible.

I remember the Prime Minister saying, in 1984: "We are going to place every living, breathing Tory". We are going to have another Tory appointment to this board. We realize that the Tories did such a bad job with multiculturalism that now they are trying to come back and do a little bit of vote-buying. Well, it ain't going to work.

We have seen in the recent past a great rise in the number of racially-motivated attacks on ethnic minorities in Canada, a trend which will only increase unless the government takes seriously the impact that the large influx of new Canadians is having upon Canadian society.

We know that this proposal would act only as a shell. It will be nothing but a big bag of wind.

**Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to debate at third reading Bill C-63, an act to establish a race relations foundation in Canada. I expect that we will finish third reading today and that this bill will, very shortly, go into law and, hopefully, the foundation will be established in the very near future.

However, as I have said many times, I truly and very sincerely regret that we did not have acceptance from the government, particularly from the minister, to strengthen this bill. We tried very hard in the spirit of non-partisanship to propose positive amendments which would have helped to strengthen this bill and, specifically, would have made it very clear at the outset that this foundation has as its major purpose the elimination of racial discrimination and racism.

I would like to thank all of the witnesses who appeared before the committee. Unfortunately, there were many, many, more who wanted to appear but we did not have agreement with government members to hear more than 10 witnesses. They were from across Canada, but there were many others. I apologize to people who would have liked to have appeared that there was not the opportunity for them to do so. We do thank them, and we thank them for their submission as well.

The establishment of a race relations foundation is a very important component of the redress settlement which was a government commitment to Canadians of Japanese origin who suffered from racial discrimination and displacement during World War II. I would like to

join today with my colleagues in paying tribute to these Canadians and to the elders who are no longer with us who suffered so much during this period in our history.

I know that most Canadians feel that this was a very disgraceful period and I commend the government for achieving redress. It helps all of us to wipe out some of the shame of the injustices that Japanese Canadians suffered. They were Canadians, many of them born here in Canada. I pay tribute to these Canadians and particularly to the Japanese Canadian Citizens Association. By having this redress and by putting the facts into the history of Canada, our children will learn about these injustices. They will also learn that as Canadians we condemn these injustices and we put our money where our mouths are, through redress.

One of the results, of course, of the redress is the fact that half of the $24 million which is committed as capital for the foundation came from the—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

[*Translation*]

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** It being eleven o'clock, 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*]

### SEASON'S GREETINGS

**Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond):** Madam Speaker, the holiday season is around the corner, and soon we will be starting a new year, full fo hope and promise.

I want to take this opportunity to wish all Canadians, my colleagues and especially my constituents, a Christmas full of peace and love. May the New Year bring you health and happiness and may you succeed in every endeavour.

During this time of family celebrations it is good to renew the bonds of friendship that the current pace of modern life prevents us from savouring as often as we would like.

I hope you will take advantage of this opportunity to get together with your relatives and friends, so that you will be able to start the new year, with fresh reserves of energy and optimism.

Personally, I shall continue to defend the interests of my constituents and to consider it a privilege to represent them here in Ottawa.

A Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year!

* * *

[*English*]

### CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Ms. Catherine Callbeck (Malpeque):** Madam Speaker, due to this government's lack of funding, CBC has been forced to use its dwindling resources to produce only news and information, eliminating all extra activities. Unfortunately, this includes such extra activities as telethons.

The lack of support that this government has provided to CBC has placed in jeopardy the future of the Izaak Walton Killam Hospital for Sick Children's telethon.

The IWK Hospital for Sick Children is the only paediatric hospital that serves Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. The loss of this telethon will be devastating for the service that this hospital provides to the maritimes as it raised $3.5 million last year.

This government's lack of support for CBC is having deep-reaching effects in our communities across the country. I call on the government to look into this matter to ensure that these telethons will not become another victim of this government's cutbacks.

* * *

[*Translation*]

### AIR TRANSPORT

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Madam Speaker, the National Transportation Agency of Canada announced on December 5 that a refusal by Ontario Express to transport Mr. William Hoch because of his disability

constituted undue interference with his ability to travel. The complainant, a paraplegic, was denied access to the aircraft, a Jetstream 31, because he was unable to get on the plane without assistance.

In September 1990, the NTA ordered the carrier to make its airline accessible to disabled persons. In response to this order, as of November 26, 1990, *Partenaire canadien* agreed to drop its policy of denying access to certain disabled individuals, thus making its airline accessible to all.

* * *

[*English*]

## FAMINE

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** Madam Speaker, events in the Persian Gulf are diverting world attention away from major famines looming in Africa.

This week the United Nations confirmed what relief and development NGOs have been saying for some time, that over 10 million people face imminent starvation in Africa. At least 5 million people face starvation in Sudan alone. The food and agricultural organizations say that a major and immediate relief effort is required to avert large-scale food shortages and human suffering in the coming months.

The FAO is calling for $1.3 million tonnes of food aid if disaster is to be avoided in the Sudan. In West Africa, countless continue to die from hunger and lack of medical attention as the result of the bloody civil war which has torn Liberia apart. Again, the UN and other agencies indicated this week that food and medicine are needed immediately if a disaster is to be avoided. These are only two of the distressed areas in Africa.

I call upon the government to take immediate steps to provide additional emergency aid to those parts of Africa where lives are in serious risk.

* * *

## AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Geoff Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia):** Madam Speaker, Focus on Inputs is an association of some 10,000 prairie farmers who seek to reduce agricultural input costs. These farmers through Focus on Inputs are contributing over $1 million of their own funds to establish a pilot plant to determine if generic glyphosate, a herbicide, can be made economically on the prairies.

Western Economic Diversification yesterday announced a repayable contribution of $750,000 to assist Focus on Inputs with this pilot project which fits in well with the objectives of Western Economic Diversification by encouraging new production and import replacement.

If the production of generic low-cost glyphosate is feasible in western Canada and leads to a commercial scale operation there would be significant benefits to farmers and prairie agriculture through reduced input costs, increased chem fallow and soil conservation practices and better weed control.

We salute Focus on Inputs and Western Economic Diversification for getting together in partnership on this very important project for the betterment of western agriculture.

* * *

## JUSTICE

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre):** Madam Speaker, I wish to speak of a travesty of justice. I speak of the plight of David Milgaard who has spent the last 21 years of his life in prison for a crime he did not commit. Yet for the last two years the Department of Justice has been sitting on an application to reopen his case.

The facts are overwhelming. One of the main witnesses now admits that he had lied at the trial. Dr. Ferris, a well-known forensic pathologist, has stated: "I have no reasonable doubt that the evidence presented at the trial failed to link David Milgaard with the offence and that in fact could be reasonably considered to exclude him from being the perpetrator of the murder". Investigators have also identified the person who is most likely the true killer.

But rather than review these conclusive reports, rather than appreciate the agony and trauma of the Milgaard family, the Minister of Justice has refused to act.

I am sure the House will join me in asking the minister to reopen the case. Too many years have been wasted and a human life irreparably affected. The time to act is now.

*S. O. 31*

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca):** Madam Speaker, I have here a copy of a letter dated December 6 written by the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta and addressed to Ms. Joy Langan, MP for Mission—Coquitlam, regarding the statement made by the member for Mission—Coquitlam on December 6 which included the following:

> Across the country are those who would like to deny the reality of violence against women. The Speaker of the legislature in Alberta refused to allow any remembrance of the event. He said it would not be an appropriate observation for the Legislative Assembly of Alberta.

I go on to quote:

> Unfortunately this statement is not only totally untrue and misleading but also contains selective references from a memorandum of mine to a member of the Alberta Legislature for Edmonton Avonmore, Marie Laing, released without my knowledge and consent.

Ms. Langan had requested that 14 roses be placed in the Legislative Assembly of Alberta by way of remembrance. Both correspondence from Ms. Langan and the Speaker were sent to Joy Langan so that she would not in fact take any comments out of context.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member's time has expired. I apologize.

* * *

## CANONIZATION OF MARGUERITE D'YOUVILLE

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** Madam Speaker, there was great rejoicing in many churches throughout the world last Sunday and perhaps particularly in many cities, towns, and villages in Canada, and certainly in the federal constituency of St. Boniface, as Sister Marguerite d'Youville was canonized by Pope John Paul II.

Let me quote a short excerpt from His Holiness' remarks on this historical event:

> For the first time in history a woman of Canadian birth is inscribed among the Saints whom the church has raised to the glory of the altar.

[*Translation*]

Although we are all very proud of the fact that this brand new saint is a Canadian, we are especially proud of her accomplishments. She founded the Congregation of the Sisters of Charity, later known as the Grey Nuns. From the outset, the Grey Nuns looked after the needs of the poor, providing shelter, food, and clothing, and cared for the sick and handicapped. This excellent work continues today in such places as St. Boniface, where the Grey Nuns are still involved in the St. Boniface Hospital which they founded.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member's time has expired. The hon. member for Vancouver East.

* * *

[*English*]

## SUPREME COURT OF CANADA

**Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East):** Madam Speaker, we applaud yesterday's decision of the Supreme Court of Canada which overturned the Alberta Court of Appeal's ruling in the Keegstra case. Canadians value freedom of speech but do not want our society poisoned by hatred and racism. The court confirmed this by deciding the Charter of Rights and Freedoms does not allow the right to promote hatred against identifiable groups of Canadians.

Some suggest that minorities may be hurt more than others by this decision, but no one has the right to promote hatred. Lawyer Doug Christie's statement that western Canadians have a different view of free speech is particularly offensive. The court decision clears the way for a similar decision in the New Brunswick Malcolm Ross case.

• (1110)

The Supreme Court has spoken. Now the government must demonstrate its commitment to eliminate racism by strengthening hate propaganda to prohibit distribution of racist paraphernalia by enforcing mandatory affirmative action in the Multiculturalism Act. It must provide adequate funding for the Human Rights Commission and must make the elimination of racism a primary goal of the new race relations foundation.

* * *

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie):** Madam Speaker, finally, after 50 years of discussion but inaction, Canadians are going to have a federal sales tax system that will no longer be outdated, inefficient, unfair, and unreliable.

Out with the MST and in with the GST. Why will the GST be good for Canadians? The GST will replace a tax system that is estimated to lose annually $9 billion in revenue and jobs for Canadians. The GST will stop penalizing our Canadian manufacturers, which, under the present system, have been at a competitive disadvantage in world markets as exporters and importers. The GST will be fairer than the current system because it provides refundable tax credits for low and modest-income Canadians.

The 8.7 million families and individuals earning less than $30,000 annually will benefit because they will receive a credit cheque four times a year.

By next week the first cheques will be sent to those 8.7 million families and individuals before the GST goes into effect on January 1, 1990.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry. The hon. member's time has expired.

* * *

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Madam Speaker, I am here to tell you about the GST that stole Christmas. In fact, the tax man cometh.

The greatest parliamentary fraud in the history of Canada was perpetrated on the taxpayers last night. The second greatest fraud is that Canadians are going to save money as a result of this initiative.

Let's look at one specific area, the brewing industry. One would argue that since the FST is gone, we should save money in that particular area. Not only has the federal government slapped a 45 per cent increase on excise taxes, the effect of the GST on beer will mean an increase of 73 per cent in federal government revenues across this country.

In one week, I have collected 600 signatures from my riding. I can tell you that Canadians do not want a 76 per cent increase in federal taxes on beer. If that is the kind of savings that Michael Wilson is bragging about, I say to Michael Wilson and the GST, a pox on both your houses.

*S. O. 31*

## AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Walter Van De Walle (St. Albert):** Madam Speaker, the federal government places a high priority on our agricultural food industry.

Since 1984 the federal government has spent $22 billion in support of the Canadian agriculture industry. As well, on November 23 Agriculture Canada tabled supplementary estimates seeking parliamentary approval for $316 million for the fiscal year 1990-91 to assist farmers hard hit by depressed commodity prices and dwindling markets.

Farmers, as well as consumers, realize that the future of the agri-food industry may rest on the success of the negotiations between the federal and provincial governments on the GRIP and NISA proposals, the long-term safety net insurance and stabilization programs. This government's record clearly demonstrates our commitment to the farming community and its future economic success

* * *

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mrs. Diane Marleau (Sudbury):** Madam Speaker, on behalf of all Canadians I want to thank my Liberal colleagues in the other place for fighting the good fight against the GST.

They and they alone stood in the Senate against this government, clearly out of control and out of touch with Canadians, and stood to fight on behalf of 80 per cent of Canadians who oppose the GST.

They alone fought for the protection of our parliamentary rules and traditions as the Conservatives chose to trample over the rights of parliamentarians and the laws of this country in a desperate attempt to save a dying agenda.

To the Liberal senators, we owe them a profound debt of gratitude.

* * *

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Madam Speaker, now that the cruel, brutal, mean, unfair and disastrous goods and services tax is a reality, let all Canadians know that

such is the case because the Conservatives introduced the legislation and the Liberal senators allowed it to become a reality.

The Liberals in the Senate had the majority and could have defeated the GST when leave was sought to introduce the GST, when the vote was taken at first reading stage, and when the vote occurred at second reading.

The Liberals also had the majority and could have defeated the GST when it was in committee during April, May, June, July, August, September, and October.

Madam Speaker, let all Canadians know that if the GST is a reality today, it is because the Conservatives forced the legislation through the House of Commons and the Liberals allowed it to pass in the Senate.

---

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister. Last night, in a flagrant violation of parliamentary procedure, the artificial Conservative majority in the Senate forced though the GST, the most unpopular, the most unwanted tax in Canadian history.

Speaking about the GST, the President of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business said: "It is going to be extremely messy".

Given the views of so many business people, given the views of the overwhelming majority of Canadians who say they do not want this tax, I ask the government if it will take this one last chance, listen to reason, and not have the GST given Royal Assent today so that it will not be imposed on the backs of Canadians.

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday I told this House that at that time there were over 900,000 businesses that had registered and prepared for an implementation date on January 1. I am glad to announce today that, as we sit here in this Chamber, we are quickly approaching the 1 million mark of registrants in the business community.

We have systems and technology in place to be able to go through and process all the forthcoming registrations. We expect between 1.2 million and 1.4 million businesses to register at the end of the day.

Revenue Canada has been preparing, at the advice of the Auditor General, for the last 18 months precisely for this period of time. As of this morning in a press conference I made it very clear that we intend not to work against members of the business community who have not yet registered, but with them by providing them with the tools, by providing them the information, by providing them the necessary assistance to make it as smooth and as easy for the change from the federal sales tax to the GST on January 1.

Therefore there is no question in our minds that the GST is to go ahead on January 1 in relatively as smooth a fashion as possible.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, Canadian business people and Canadians generally simply do not believe this minister and this government.

Today, Statistics Canada reported that the rate of inflation is 5 per cent. This government has said that its GST will add 1.3 percentage points to the rate of inflation, an increase of more than 20 per cent above the current rate.

I ask the Acting Prime Minister: Will the government assure Canadians that it will not respond to the inflation caused by its own GST by having interest rates go up? If this happens it will push the economy even further into recession than it is already.

Better still, will the government take this one last chance, listen to reason and not have the GST given Royal Assent, so it will not come into force at all? Will it take this one last opportunity to show it has the interest of Canadians at heart?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Madam Speaker, it is a fact that the CPI rose to 5 per sent in November. It is up from 4.8 per cent in October. If we were to exclude food and energy—and energy is the major factor—we would be at 4.2 per cent in November, virtually the same as October at 4.3 per cent. It is indeed going up and, as we have said, it is very important to contain these inflationary pressures. This is what we are trying to do. The GST, as we have agreed, will of course cause a one-time

increase of 1.25 per cent or 1.5 per cent over a period of time. The governor of the bank has indicated that in his mind this could easily be fitted in.

• (1120)

It is a one-time increase, but we have to maintain the discipline at the same time and make sure that these pressures go down. We have been successful. We saw the bank rate go down this week by 15 basis points, basically two points over the last four months. We are heading in the right direction.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, the President of the Treasury Board speaks about a one-time increase in inflation. If this government were serious about inflation, it would agree with me when I say that this one-time increase due to the GST is one time too many and not talk about discipline, which is a hidden signal that this government wants interest rates to go up again.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, if the government will not come to its senses and prevent the GST from receiving Royal Assent today, when will the minister at least table the amendments the government is suggesting to lessen the impact of this tax? More specifically, when does he intend to lessen the impact of this tax by exempting books and periodicals?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has covered a great deal of ground with his question. I suppose if I took the trouble to respond to every single point, hon. members would think I was taking far too long.

He says that we want interest rates to go up. That is entirely false. We want interest rates to go down. This is necessary and essential for our industry, for our economy and for all Canadians. We want interest rates to go down but we also want them to stay down. With an overly generous money supply policy, inflation might resume, and in fact today, according to the latest reports, the Consumer Price Index has gone up from 4.8 per cent to 5 per cent. So we must maintain a policy of consistently and constantly monitoring these movements.

As for the GST, the Leader of the Opposition refers only to certain aspects. In fact, he zeroed in on one particular aspect. However, the GST will also have extremely positive effects on the economy, something the opposition has never acknowledged, which includes removing the burden of a disastrous tax that has prevented our small businesses from being competitive.

* * *

[*English*]

## FISHERIES

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

This morning in St. John's, Newfoundland, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans abdicated his responsibility for the fisheries in Canada. He ignored the Harris report and the Dunn report which called for cuts in total allowable catch to conserve and preserve fish stocks for future generations. He set a three-year quota that is too high. He ignored the total collapse of the cod stock in the gulf region. He indicated absolutely nothing would be done to stop the continued overfishing by European fleets off Canada's 200-mile limit.

I want to ask a question of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, in the absence of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. Given that cuts are continuing in Canada, given that thousands of fishermen and plant workers are being displaced by low catches, stocks that are absolutely shattered, why is Canada accepting the fact that the Europeans who caught 70,000 metric tonnes of fish last year, far too much fish, are announcing that they are going to catch 70,000 metric tonnes this year in the face of our conservation measures? Will the minister redirect some of his Rambo-like tendencies to the Europeans and save our fish?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Madam Speaker, we do not accept that practice by the Europeans, not at all. We are very disappointed at the recommendations of quota levels that have come from the technical committee of the community, and it is coming before commissioners of the European Community.

We are intervening with those commissioners directly to indicate to them that not only would those higher quotas recommended by the committee not be in the interests of fishing anywhere because of their effects upon depleting stocks, but neither would they be consistent with the tone of the discussions that have occurred

between Canadian ministers and representatives of the European Community over the last several months.

We are making those representations now, and we hope to be able to have some success in causing the European Community to recognize that not only do they have a bilateral obligation to Canada, they have an overriding obligation to ensure that their practices do not destroy basic fish stocks which are of fundamental importance to us, and indeed of interest to them.

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte):** Madam Speaker, in the last six years thousands of fishing families have been displaced. Thousands of fishing families have had their livelihood, their homes, and their communities shattered. For six years we have heard the same buzz words: disappointed, intervening, can't understand it, nasty, naughty tone, diplomacy. For six years nothing has happened.

Whether or not the destruction of the cod stocks on the east coast of Canada is a national issue, it is a question of Canadian sovereignty and is in the national interest. Will the nation respond to preserve the fishing communities of eastern Canada and respond now?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Madam Speaker, of course it is a national responsibility and a matter of profound national concern.

The member asked me a question as to whether it is a matter of national concern. I told him it was. He then said the answer to the specific question he asked is something he knows already. If he knows it already, why does he detain the House of Commons asking questions, the answers to which he already knows?

**Mr. Tobin:** What are you going to do, Joe?

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** With regard to what we are going to continue to do, I have just told the hon. member who is perhaps more interested in making a dramatic Rambo-like case on the floor of the House than he is in having a resolution to this problem—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** I have just told the him that what we are going to do is make it very clear to the commissioners of the European Community that the recommendations they have received with respect to quotas are not acceptable to Canada and are not consistent with the representations that they have given to us in meetings between Canadian ministers and commissioners of the European Community.

* * *

## THE ECONOMY

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister.

Once again we have seen the inflation rate go up. Consumers are now going to be hit with a 7 per cent tax on everything from books to funerals to hamburgers, whatever Canadians are going to buy or whatever service they are going to get, because this government insisted on ramming through a tax at the worst time in our economic history caused by policies of this government.

What the government has said is that the inflation rate will go up by 1.3 per cent. The minister said that this can be fitted in. Other economists say the inflation will go up from 3 per cent to 4 per cent. What this government's economic policies have done is create over a million unemployed in this country.

When will the government bring in some economic policies that will really address this difficult situation and get Canadians back to work instead of destroying the economy?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Madam Speaker, from time to time we hear in this House very conflicting views. When we explain to the hon. Leader of the NDP that interest rates are high because there are inflationary pressures, she rushes to tell us that it is not the case. When they are there, she wants us to reverse our policy.

We are intending to maintain the course of a sound economic policy because it has worked in the past. We are the party that has provided the highest rate of growth of jobs in Canada ever. We intend to continue this road of prosperity once we have settled the problem that

arises from a transition to record growth from slower growth. We are doing that now, and I think that it is working. Interest rates are coming down, and I think this will help everybody.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Madam Speaker, I would like to speak to the minister about contradictory messages. On the one hand, the government stands day after day and says that its main goal is to fight inflation. It has to keep those interest rates high that are killing businesses, killing farmers, making it impossible for consumers to buy anything. The government says: "Our main task is to fight inflation". Today it is asking for Royal Assent on a measure to ram through the GST, which is going to add to inflation, and it expects Canadians to buy it. Canadians are not stupid, Madam Speaker. The government also said that the manufacturers' sales tax was a silent killer of jobs. It seems to me the government has put the most noisy killer of jobs in place, the trade deal and the GST.

• (1130)

I want to ask the government how many more jobs does Canada have to lose before this government comes to its senses?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Madam Speaker, one of the very great qualities of the GST is precisely that it helps businesses and helps create jobs. The hon. member does not seem to understand that we have presently built into the cost of all our products in Canada a very destructive tax, the federal sales tax, which makes it so that a huge country like Canada, with a small population, which needs to export more than anybody else, is the only clumsy country that maintains this system. We are changing it to allow all of our businesses and our companies to compete, both at home and outside. This is a modern reform and this is the bill which will receive Royal sanction today.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Madam Speaker, I have a supplementary question. I presume that this is the same modern reform that has cost 165,000 Canadians their jobs since the trade deal came in.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, hundreds of thousands of businesses did not register for the GST; hundreds of thousands of businesses did not buy the material they need to comply with the Bill. Business is not ready and neither is the government. The government is still working on the regulations concerning the GST.

There is confusion everywhere. My question is this: What will the government do to put an end to that confusion?

[*English*]

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue):** Madam Speaker, if there is any confusion anywhere, it is between the ears of the hon. member who just asked the question. I repeat what I said in answer to an earlier question, and that is that close to one million businesses have already registered and prepared.

Let me quote a Deloitte-Touche independent study done on the retail sector over a month ago. The majority of the retail sector is comprised of small businesses. According to the independent Deloitte-Touche study, 60 per cent supported the GST in the retail sector, 89 per cent understood the legislation and 82 per cent had prepared, at that time, for the implementation of the GST on January 1.

It is true that there are still between 100,000 to 300,000 businesses which have yet to register. We have an outreach program, a pro-active program, that is reaching out to those businesses in a fair, tolerant and co-operative manner. We will be working, not against those businesses but beside them, to make the system as easy, as beneficial, and as simple for them to comply with as possible.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I am sure the hon. minister will have other occasions to answer the same question.

* * *

## FISHERIES

**Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs and it follows along the line of questioning of my colleague, the hon. member for Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte, to which the minister said that we are going to do nothing more than we have done, for the last six years, and that is whining and complaining to the Europeans. When is the government going to show some guts? When is it going to impose Canadian quotas that adequately reflect conservation measures? When is it going to follow the advice of its own officials and set

Canadian quotas that are meaningful, to preserve the most important resource that we have?

Second, when are we going to show some guts with the Europeans? If the minister wants to know what to do, he should answer this question: why does the minister not now unilaterally extend jurisdiction over the nose and tail of the Grand Banks, because we are the only coastal state in the world that does not have jurisdiction to the end of our continental shelf? Will the minister do that?

**Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of Forestry):** Madam Speaker, as you know and as my colleagues know, the minister is in the maritimes today to announce the new multi-year program which will set the levels of groundfish that will be harvested in the region. The minister has struck—I think he is announcing it even as we speak—a balance that is responsible and proper considering the conservation needs and the economic imperatives in the region.

The minister will be back in the House on Monday to answer all of the questions on the details of the plan that he has announced.

**Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador):** My supplementary, Madam Speaker, is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration. There is one member of cabinet who has some compassion, some knowledge and some understanding in this House.

I want to ask her this. The question is very clear. The Government of Canada allows Europeans to overfish the cod stocks. The Europeans are allowed to fish outside the 200-mile limit and inside the 200-mile limit. The Government of Canada refuses, on the other hand, to give native co-ops and aboriginal people on the coast of Labrador access to northern cod in spite of the fact that the minister's own industrial adjustment committee recommended that this is the only alternative to preserve the jobs in those plants. Will the minister demand of the Minister of Fisheries that he accede to the recommendation of her own industrial adjustment committee and allocate a supply of northern cod to native aboriginal co-ops on the coast of Labrador? Will she do that?

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Madam Speaker, certainly the report from the IAS committee on the coastal problems in Labrador is something that we take very seriously in our department. We are always careful to accommodate the recommendations as far as we can.

I have been working closely with the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans on a package of measures that we hope will help people on the coast of Newfoundland and in other areas. I am always prepared to discuss with him potential solutions that are raised by the hon. member and I am certainly prepared to do so again.

* * *

## JUSTICE

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. I am hoping that she has something new to report today in the David Milgaard case. This case has been dragging on and on and on. People are frustrated, nerves are on edge. I do not know whether the minister is aware of it, but Milgaard himself is taking it very hard. He has spent many days in recent weeks in prison hospital.

Is the minister aware of this? Is she aware of the frustration? I want to know whether the Minister of Justice can give us a report today.

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, no I cannot.

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg—St. James):** Madam Speaker, I am very disappointed. It is typical of this minister's stonewalling. I want to make it very clear to this House. This minister has said over and over that if the Milgaard family would only stop giving new information and new arguments, her department could come to a decision. She knows very well that the Milgaard family has not provided any new information, any new arguments since summer. She does not have an excuse. It is time for her to make a decision.

I want to know from this minister. Give us a commitment, give us a promise as to when she is going to face her responsibility and make a decision.

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, it is regrettably the case than when the hon. member rises in this House he creates no traffic jam on the high road.

I take my responsibilities to review cases under section 690 of the Criminal Code with great seriousness.

**Mr. Harvard:** How many years?

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** The hon. member knows that I have never made the statement that he attributes to me.

**Mr. Harvard:** You have made it many times.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Harvard:** You are the minister of excuses.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order. The hon. member was offered the courtesy of being listened to. I would say that the hon. minister deserves the same. The hon. minister has the floor.

**Ms. Campbell (Vancouver Centre):** Madam Speaker, I have never made the statements the hon. member attributes to me, on the contrary. First of all I have never made reference to information put forward by the Milgaard family. I have referred to Mr. Milgaard's counsel who has carried the case.

• (1140 )

I have indicated on a number of occasions in this House that I am not prepared to see the case dealt with until Mr. Milgaard's counsel has, in fact, had the opportunity to bring forward as many submissions as he wishes to.

Over and over in this House, I have said that that is the policy of the department. I am advised by Mr. Milgaard's counsel that they have completed their submissions. The last interaction between Mr. Milgaard's counsel and the Department of Justice was a discussion on October 1 of this year.

The case is complex, and the advisory process is continuing. When it is complete, I will exercise my very serious responsibility under section 690 of the Criminal Code and make a decision based on the highest principles of justice and fairness.

I believe that is what I owe to all parties concerned, and most particularly to the system of justice in Canada.

* * *

## THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Madam Speaker, last week the CBC shut down its local broadcasting in Windsor. This week, as this memo from the Ontario Minister of the Environment indicates, CBC staff is discussing moving PCBs from Toronto to store at that Windsor TV site.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Langdon:** My question is to the Minister of the Environment. Will he see to it that the Windsor TV is not turned into a PCB storage site at the very time the community is working as hard as it possibly can to get government to recognize the need for local broadcasting once more in our community?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Madam Speaker, my hon. colleague knows full well our commitment to eliminate all federal controlled PCBs by 1996. I will be happy to look into this specific case and give him a very specific answer in the next few days.

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Madam Speaker, this is a case of adding dangerous insult to the massive injury which has already taken place in my community.

What I want to suggest to the minister is that this memo says very clearly that complaints have already been made. "The Windsor office of Environment Ontario was told by Environment Canada that any requests for improvements to the site would not be enforced. They laughed at us".

I want to ask the Minister of the Environment how he can possibly justify an attitude like that on the part of the federal Ministry of the Environment to complaints, concerns and statements that have been made by the provincial ministry of the environment in my city of Windsor? What is he going to do to protect our TV station for the future?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Madam Speaker, perhaps with a little less emotion, I would like to answer my colleague and say that I have already undertaken to look into this specific case very directly and answer him.

If he has any written material that I would benefit from, I would appreciate getting it from him.

## PENSIONS

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board.

Today, a group of former wives of armed forces personnel gave up on getting any justice out of this government. They are going to court to stop the injustice of military spouses of 30 to 35 years getting no pension at all and even being deemed to be dead, thereby denying them a pension.

Is taking the government to court the only way these women can get justice? Is this the only way they can get the government to admit that separated women are not dead?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Madam Speaker, I would tell the hon. member that this is a question that we are presently looking at.

We are looking at it very actively. We are working on the over–all problem of superannuation. These aspects are also included in it, and I am sure that fairly soon we will be able to report to her about it.

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Madam Speaker, five years ago the government forced private pension plans to conform with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, but it refuses the same justice for its own employees.

Thousands of women live in poverty because since 1984 the government has sat on this legislation and given Treasury Board absolute discretion over whether or not women get a pension.

Will the minister stop this farce now and, with the full and speedy co–operation of the Liberal Party, will he bring in a bill that gives fair pensions to these women in time for Christmas?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Madam Speaker, the hon. lady has raised a very serious issue and she knows that this government cares about that. She knows that I care about that and I am working on a particular government action with regard to this.

Since I have arrived at Treasury Board, I have made many gestures to indicate to her that I usually deliver on what I promise. I will come forward with some plan of action from the government on that particular aspect fairly soon, in the new year.

* * *

## INCOME TAX

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Revenue.

On October 29, I asked the minister about his department's practice of reassessing the disability deduction of disabled Canadians. Not only are these disabled Canadians being told they no longer apply for the disability deduction, but the government is asking them to repay the amounts they have already been granted, plus interest. Surely, the minister has to agree that this is a barbaric practice. I have written to the minister and have talked to him about this.

Can the minister now tell us what he is going to do to stop this vicious practice against disabled Canadians?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue):** Madam Speaker, it is true that the hon. member and I have had discussions on this matter. It is true, as well, that I have looked into the matter and have asked my officials to study it as clearly as they possibly could.

It is also true, to confirm what I told the hon. member on the floor of the House last month, I believe, that the policy, in as far as Revenue Canada is concerned in this respect, has not changed from the previous policy which even the former government, of which he was a member, operated under at that time. It is the same policy today as it was in the past.

Having said that, we are in the process of reviewing the situation to try to see how more compassionate we can be with the reassessment procedure because we want to take every possible step and effort to be as fair and compassionate with disabled people as with any other Canadians across the country.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Russell MacLellan (Cape Breton—The Sydneys):** Madam Speaker, with due respect to the minister, there

have been changes in this practice. The department is canceling this disability deduction without even giving these people the benefit of the medical examination.

Surely the minister can also see the stress that he is causing to these people with disabilities when they have to worry about paying this money back to the government, money which the government had approved to them in the first place.

Why is the government persecuting these people? These people deserve to be treated as more than just a file.

**Hon. Otto Jelinek (Minister of National Revenue):** Madam Speaker, I do not accept for a moment that we are persecuting these people or any other people across the country through the tax system.

It is also not correct on the hon. member's part to say that there are no medical examinations in the reassessment. In fact, there are medical examinations that take place by professional MDs, approved by the Department of National Health and Welfare.

As a result of the hon. member bringing this matter to my attention, previously and today, I repeat what I have just finished saying. That is, I have directed my officials to look into the situation to try to improve a system that has been place for a very long time, even under the leadership of the government which the hon. member represented.

* * *

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Geoff Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the acting Minister of Finance, who knows that medical services are exempt under the GST, but that medical practitioners have to pay GST on approximately half of their business input costs. Under the GST, medical practitioners are not able to claim a rebate of those input costs, nor in most cases are they able to pass on the incremental costs.

• (1150)

Now that the nonsense in the other place is over, will the minister examine this situation and will he consider reviewing it insofar as to allow medical practitioners to claim a rebate of the tax paid on the input costs in their medical practices?

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I would like to remind him and the House that physicians currently pay a very substantial amount of direct federal sales tax on office equipment and supplies, such as computers, office furniture, medical equipment and telecommunication services. These taxes will be removed.

The government's objective in developing its policy in the health care field was to ensure that Canadians do not pay GST on basic medical services. This objective is met in Bill C–62. There is no GST on services of physicians, hospital care, and prescribed medical devices. So, they will not pay GST on their inputs, as they are presently paying the FST now.

* * *

## THE SENATE

**Hon. John Bosley (Don Valley West):** Madam Speaker, the hon. member's question concluded with an interesting concept that suggested that the nonsense was over in the other place.

My supplementary question is this: Will the government, now that the GST is through, finally bring in a motion to finally abolish the Senate?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** I suppose part of the question, Madam Speaker, is whether, with the best will in the world, one can protect the Senate against the grotesque behaviour by some of its members, particularly on the Liberal side last night.

* * *

## EMPLOYMENT

**Mr. David Barrett (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister, the former Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister-in-waiting.

The current office-holder of the Prime Minister's Office made the statement three years ago that there would be massive adjustments available to those who lost jobs through the free trade agreement. He then appointed the deGrandpré commission that recommended a $3 billion budget be established for readjustment payments and training for those workers.

One hundred and sixty-five thousand workers have lost their jobs. They are now facing a very bleak Christmas. Three years have gone by.

Can the Acting Prime Minister tell me what the government intends to do to make good the promise that the Prime Minister made to provide retraining and assistance to those people who were replaced in those jobs?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Madam Speaker, I am amazed at the question because the hon. member and his party did not support the $800 million that we are putting into retraining under Bill C-21. That is exactly what it is directed at, regardless of whether or not the need for training comes from free trade.

Training is a high priority with workers. It is a high priority with employers in Canada as they look to globalization of trade in the future. It is something that we are taking a lead on with business and with labour in terms of the programs that are being put into place.

I think the hon. member should be congratulating us on the kinds of breakthroughs that we have established for training in the country.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. David Barrett (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca):** Madam Speaker, I would thank the new Acting Prime Minister for her answer. The reality is that no such transfer payments took place. As a matter of fact, the $800 million the minister speaks about was taken from other programs. No new $3 billion was created and, furthermore, $3 billion was cut from unemployment insurance by the government.

**Some hon. members:** Shame.

**Mr. Barrett:** It is a bleak Christmas for those people.

Is it Scrooge over there, or is it a sense of fairness? What is the government going to do for those people this Christmas who have had their lives ruined by the free trade agreement and the fact that it has not kept its promise? Fess up and do something for those people.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Madam Speaker, I had the unfortunate experience of living in British Columbia while the hon. member was premier.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mrs. McDougall:** Let me just tell you what we have done for the economy and the prospects for the workforce in that province.

We have added by way of our new programming additional programming for Community Futures, additional programming for the long-term unemployed, additional programming for older workers and additional programming for social assistance recipients. Just hang on to your hat, Madam Speaker, and watch it all.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## HARBOURFRONT CORPORATION

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Madam Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Public Works did not provide satisfactory answers to questions posed by the hon. member for Eglinton—Lawrence and the hon. member for York Centre.

I remind the same minister that the councillors of the City of Toronto have made it very clear that leasing the land versus selling it would make Harbourfront self-sustaining and still provide the benefits for the taxpayers who own it.

Why is the minister abandoning the people of Toronto in favour of the developers, when these same people are the hardest hit by the recession, which I might add is caused by his own government?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works):** Madam Speaker, I welcome this question because at least it is not prefaced by the kinds of wildly inaccurate figures that were put on record in the House yesterday.

As my colleague knows, this particular concept for Harbourfront was, in effect, interrupted a year ago by the then Liberal government of Ontario. Since that time there have been negotiations that have been looked upon with great favour by Duncan Allan, who at that time was acting for David Peterson, and by the mayor of Toronto.

Any of these disputes involving the values of property, or the concepts of leasing can very well be provided for the hon. member, but I should remind him that the object of this is to give the waterfront back to the people of Toronto, to fund proper programs, and to do it in a far more business-like and expeditious way than was formerly possible.

I suggest to him as well that nothing has been abandoned. Nothing has been perverted or anything else. If he wishes more information, I would be glad to give it to him. So would other people who could provide him with the kind of detail that he obviously needs.

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** The minister is still skating around the real issue which is the swap scandal of the land. My supplementary question is to the same minister.

On Wednesday in the House, I asked the Minister of the Environment what his so-called green plan was going to do to clean up the Toronto beaches. The minister did not give me an answer.

Will the Minister of Public Works reconsider this Harbourfront land swap scandal, recommended by the Tory hand-picked liquidator, Darcy McKeough, and commit instead that $36.4 million to clean up our Toronto beaches?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Elmer M. MacKay (Minister of Public Works):** What Mr. Darcy McKeough, a very distinguished Ontarian, did was largely to ratify and to modify to some extent, what the Liberal government of Ontario then recommended, as well as agree with David Crombie, another expert in this area.

There is no scandal. There are no difficulties. The figures that were put on the record yesterday by some of his colleagues are completely inaccurate, as anyone can understand if they would just take time to look at it.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## CANADA'S GREEN PLAN

**Mr. Jim Jordan (Leeds—Grenville):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of the Environment. He is aware, I am sure, that in dealing with matters of the environment we can no longer afford to say that this is a provincial matter or that this is a municipal matter. We are all in this together.

The minister knows that a good deal of the pollution in our water systems is caused by the inadequate treatment of sewage from municipalities.

How much of the $3 billion provided in the green plan over the next five years will be available to municipalities? How much will there be to help them improve sewage treatment facilities which are among the main causes of the deterioration of our water quality in Canada? How much?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Madam Speaker, first, we have a significant amount of money to provide for better water and sewage treatment under federal jurisdiction on native reserves. With respect to the municipalities, I believe the municipalities are creatures of the provinces. We want to respect the jurisdictional lines. We will certainly encourage the municipalities and the provinces to do the job they have to do on their side.

• (1200)

**Mr. Rex Crawford (Kent):** Madam Speaker, my question was for the Minister of Agriculture, but I will direct it to the Minister of the Environment.

A serious problem exists in southern Ontario along the Sydenham River basin which drains over half a million acres of the best farmland in North America, while thousands of tonnes of agricultural chemicals and fertilizers violate the Sydenham every year.

Will the Minister of the Environment consider as part of the green plan the $3 million commitment the Deputy Prime Minister made to this project when he visited my riding in 1988?

**Hon. Robert de Cotret (Minister of the Environment):** Madam Speaker, the problem that my colleague opposite raises is a problem that exists in many communities across this country. We are already undertaking discussions with farm organizations. We want to get to the root of it. We want to make sure that farmers throughout the country will be able to participate fully in dealing with environmental problems that we know of through that kind of situation.

## NORTHERN BENEFITS

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of State for Finance. Last week the government announced a program on northern tax benefits. As a result of that program, some communities which have no road access whatsoever are not even going to receive the 50 per cent northern tax benefit.

I again ask the government: Will it allow an appeal process for those communities that have been affected by the government decision to ensure that it is not just a decision by bureaucrats and by the cabinet, but that it does allow public participation so those communities can make their case and explain why they deserve a northern tax benefit?

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** I think we understand well the preoccupation of the hon. member, Madam Speaker. The decision we have taken comes at the end of a long process where there has been a lot of consultation throughout by experts. We will stand by our decision.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I have received notice of a question of privilege. I see someone else rising now, but I have not received notice of it. I will recognize the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

* * *

## PRIVILEGE

### CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING PERSIAN GULF

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre):** Madam Speaker, I want to raise a question of privilege which again goes to the fundamental right of Parliament to be the first court of public information from this government.

On Monday, during the course of the proceedings in the standing committee on external affairs, the minister mentioned that he had submitted a letter to the U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. Baker, containing various proposals on behalf of the Canadian government. At that time I specifically requested of the minister that he would table the report and make it public, so we knew exactly what would be in the report and we could respond at the committee and in Parliament. The minister categorically refused.

On Wednesday night it was drawn to my attention that during a CBC report, the contents of that letter had been given to a CBC reporter who had enumerated point by point the contents of that letter. Once again, it was clear that the government considers it more important to give its information to a CBC reporter than to members of Parliament.

I consider that to be a real derogation of the rights of Parliament and it is indicative of the general disdain with which the government holds this House.

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Madam Speaker, on that alleged question of privilege, the hon. member is alleging that there has been the publication of a letter which has not been published. It has not been published to the committee. It has not been published to him. It has not been published to anyone.

**Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre):** It was given to a CBC reporter.

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** It was not. The hon. member is making an accusation that I categorically deny. It is false.

**Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre):** Who's the leak in your office?

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** I understand, Madam Speaker, that when the Liberal Party has no policy, as it has no policy either on the gulf or on support for the United Nations, then it has to indulge in this kind of misleading position in the House of Commons.

**Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre):** You know what our policy is. Our policy is against your policy, that is what it is.

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** There we are, Madam Speaker. He and this party of great principle say their policy is against our policy.

Our policy is in support of the United Nations. The Liberal Party says—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order. I have listened very carefully to the comments made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre. This obviously arises from the work of the committee. It is my understanding that there was no formal motion made in committee for that document to be made available.

I think the hon. member would have another avenue if he wants to pursue that line of thought rather than make it a question of privilege, which I do not think it is at this moment.

COMMENTS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence):** Madam Speaker, just a few minutes ago in Question Period, we heard the Minister of Public Works refer to figures introduced by myself in the House yesterday as being wildly exaggerated and completely unfounded.

For the instruction of this House, I want to give an indication of just where those figures came from. They came directly from a report made by the Harbourfront Corporation, which is directly responsible to the government.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** It is very difficult for me at this time to let the hon. member go on.

It is not a question of privilege, but a question of debate.

**An hon. member:** It is not debate.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** For one member to say he or she does not agree with another member's statement is not something very uncommon in this House.

I do not think that members' privileges are abused any time one member disagrees with another. I do not see it as a question of privilege at this time.

I will hear the hon. member further if he has something else to bring forward.

**Mr. Volpe:** Madam Speaker, I feel that my privileges were abused inasmuch as I gave very specific references yesterday. I even cited a source. Today, I was told that they were in fact lies. They are not such. They come from an appraisal by an independent source, funded by government finances.

If the minister will just take a look at the board, the corporation that is responsible to him, he will see the same sources and come and give this Parliament the facts that we need to have.

**Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** On the same point, Madam Speaker, I think the hon. member has made a very clear reference.

The issue at stake here is germane to the entire debate. The minister of the Crown can take time away from the House to allege that the hon. member is incorrect, and is using false figures on a very important issue.

I think it is germane to the debate we are talking about. I believe that there is a case here of privilege.

**Mrs. Coline Campbell (South West Nova):** Madam Speaker, I would suggest that at least the hon. member should be able to have a "late show" on it to debate the issue.

I would suggest that today he be at least allowed to bring that point into debate or to use the "late show" as soon as possible.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I think what is happening now is what we call a dispute as to facts. I do not think there is really a question of privilege.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

### OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

TABLING OF SECOND ANNUAL REPORT ON OFFICIAL LANGUAGES IN FEDERAL INSTITUTIONS

**Hon. Gilles Loiselle (President of the Treasury Board and Minister of State (Finance)):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2) and in accordance with Section 48 of the Official Languages Act, I welcome this opportunity to table, in both official languages, the Second Annual Report on Official Languages in Federal Institutions, for the year 1989–90.

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

* * *

[*English*]

### PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table in both official languages the government's response to 18 petitions.

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

[*Translation*]

## INTER-PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION

CANADA-FRANCE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION—PRESENTATION OF REPORT ON PRELIMINARY MEETING

**Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the report on the preliminary meeting for the twenty-third annual assembly of the Canada-France Inter-Parliamentary Association.

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

* * *

• (1210)

## COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS—PRESENTATION OF EIGHTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present the Eighth Report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

[*English*]

The eighth report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts is one of major historic significance to the House of Commons for it is the first time in parliamentary history, since the ruling of the Supreme Court of Canada in August 1989, that the Public Accounts Committee has considered and concluded on the denial of access to information by the government to the office of the Auditor General.

The Public Accounts Committee considers the denial of access to ministerial travel receipts by the government to the office of the Auditor General to be a most serious infringement of the rights of the Auditor General as it in effect limits the Auditor General's ability to fulfil his statutory responsibility under the Auditor General Act. Such a denial of access to information, in your committee's view, undermines and weakens the financial process by which the House of Commons can hold ministers accountable for their travel expenditures, sets a very untimely and dangerous precedent and erodes Parliament's control of the public purse.

Madam Speaker, the Public Accounts Committee strongly supports the principle of audit as a critical function in the parliamentary accountability process. For, without audit, how can members of Parliament be assured that all expenditures by ministers are spent in accordance with parliamentary authority? Your committee, Madam Speaker, recommends that the government consider allowing the Auditor General of Canada access to ministerial travel documents to the extent that he can discharge his statutory duties by means of an authority and attest audit of the accounts of Canada under the Auditor General Act.

I want to thank all members of the Public Accounts Committee of this House for their constructive and forthright input relating to this report. Madam Speaker, your committee has requested a response in writing from the President of the Treasury Board by March 31, 1991.

BILL C-260—REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

**Mr. Bill Kempling (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the report of the legislative committee on Bill C-260, an act to amend the Canada Pension Plan (spousal agreement), with amendment.

BILL C-88—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-88, an act to provide for the membership of Canada in the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, with an amendment.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the members of that committee, who acted with such alacrity and dispatch. We had our organizing meeting just three days ago and were able to move this right through to report today.

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

* * *

## PETITIONS

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to present two petitions, signed by residents of the city of Toronto. Both of these petitions have numerous signatures and concern the goods and services tax and the unfair, unjust, and

really quite wicked application of that tax to books and to the printed word.

Canada is going to become one of the very few countries in the world that taxes the printed word in this way, if this particular bill receives Royal Assent, and I note that it passed, lamentably, in the Senate last evening. I know, in presenting this petition, that it calls upon Parliament to reject this bill. Parliament has three constituent parts: this House, the other place, and the Governor General.

I urge the government to advise His Excellency, the Governor General, to refuse to give Royal Assent to this bill so that the wishes of these petitioners could be complied with in that regard.

FISHERIES

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Madam Speaker, I rise, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present a petition to this House.

This petition deals with the issue of drift-net fishing in the Pacific. It draws attention to the real ecological disaster that is occurring in the Pacific with drift-net fishing, particularly from Japanese, Korean and Taiwanese fishing fleets.

It calls on the government to use every possible measure to deal with this disaster including, if necessary, economic sanctions against the countries that are offending.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Madam Speaker, I rise once again and it is with a sad heart. After thousands and thousands of petitions this government has refused to listen to people who feel that their democratic, cultural, educational and literary skills are being impacted negatively by the goods and services tax. I would implore you to call upon the Governor General to refuse to agree to the goods and services tax on books.

The people of Halifax and across this land from as far as the Vancouver Island call on this government to reconsider a very negative and hurtful tax on the literacy of this society.

**Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq):**

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

I rise, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present a petition protesting the tax on books. The government should reconsider its intention to tax books, especially during this International Year of Literacy.

**Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the pleasure to lay upon the table four petitions from people as far away as Kentville, Halifax, Dartmouth, Truro, Tatamagouche, and other communities throughout the province of Nova Scotia.

All petitioners, in view of what took place yesterday in the upper chamber, call upon the Government of Canada to advise His Excellency the Governor General to withdraw the provisions of the goods and services tax, in particular as it applies to books, newspapers and magazines.

It should be duly noted that this tax, if proceeded with on January 1, 1991, will have extreme negative effects on Canadian consumers across the country as well as on small and medium sized-business.

**Ms. Ethel Blondin (Western Arctic):** Madam Speaker, I rise, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present a petition on behalf of some concerned Canadian citizens.

I would like to make specific reference to the publishing industry in the north which is aggrieved about the GST being imposed. It has made a valiant effort in developing an industry in publishing using northern authors and settings. Now that is going to be threatened with the 7 per cent GST, because it already operates under a very high overhead.

Pursuant to Standing Order 36, I present a petition on behalf of Canadians to exempt the books from tax.

* * *

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Madam Speaker, if Question No. 393 could be made an Order for Return, the return would be tabled immediately.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House that Question No. 393 be deemed to have been made an Order for Return?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Text*]

SMALL CRAFT HARBOURS

Question No. 393—**Mr. McGuire:**

For the fiscal years (a) 1989–90 (b) 1990–91, were any expenditures made in the province of Quebec under the Small Craft Harbour Divisions and, if so, by (i) federal riding (ii) harbour location, what were they?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

**Mr. Cooper:** Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### CANADIAN RACE RELATIONS FOUNDATION

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Weiner that Bill C–63, an act to establish the Canadian Race Relations Foundation, be read the third time and passed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The hon. member for Vancouver East has 15 minutes remaining.

**Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, before Question Period I was speaking about the Japanese redress and paying tribute particularly to the National Association of Japanese Canadians.

The race relations foundation, as we know, will have $24 million committed as capital for an endowment fund. I am sure it will be very short of funds, particularly for initial operation, even though there will be some start–up funds transferred from the race relations directorate.

• (1220 )

We are very concerned that these funds may be far too limited to do an effective job. New Democrats support the establishment of a race relations foundation and therefore we must support this bill even though we are very disappointed that our amendments to strengthen the bill were not accepted.

We worked very hard on these in committee and I will not take time to repeat the details. The political rigidity of the minister is very disappointing to us and I am sure to groups across the country. The main purpose and thrust of the bill must be to eliminate racism. We do not want a passive research centre located in some ivory tower in the middle of downtown Toronto that is going to be inaccessible to native people and others across this country who are the victims of discrimination and racism.

We also feel that the foundation should be based on sound analysis. It should not just document examples and put out educational materials. It must analyse the causes of racism in order to develop and recommend positive strategies to eliminate discrimination, to change attitudes in our society, and to help create improved legislation that will ensure equal opportunities for all Canadians.

We also hope very much that the government will take steps before the foundation is established to deal with the question of redress for Chinese Canadians regarding discriminatory legislation in the past such as the Chinese head tax and the Exclusion Act. We would like to see this done before the remaining elderly survivors leave us.

We deplore the escalating racism in our society and have spoken many times against these acts. I will mention just a few: the racism in our justice system and law enforcement agencies which lead particularly to injustices against native people, and the systemic discrimination that still exists in our own Public Service exemplified by the cases of Dr. Ben–Tahir, Dr. Chander Grover and others.

Canadians were sickened last summer by the over–racist attitudes when effigies of native people were burned. We saw this on television and also saw people throwing stones at native women, children and elders.

For 200 years black people in Nova Scotia have lacked equal opportunities. In B.C. there is a chronic outcry against Asian immigrants. Racist fears are often fanned by media stereotyping.

This government inflamed racism across the country by refusing for many months to change policies to allow Sikhs who join the RCMP to wear turbans, until it was finally forced to do so as a result of the charter.

I can cite many more examples but unfortunately there is not time. There are many examples in our history and these we must not forget. I hope the foundation would document these so that school children and all other Canadians will be much less complacent and more aware of the need for positive intercultural relations and the elimination of racism.

There is no question that we need a race relations foundation, but it must be a catalyst for change. It must promote better understanding of where the problems exist. It must put pressure on the government to improve legislation such as the employment equity bill which should be mandatory. It must challenge racist attitudes and stereotypes in society and promote positive intercultural relations.

We have a number of concerns which I would like to recommend to the new board of the foundation and the staff it hires. We hope that this new board will be accountable to the community and regret that it was not structured to always ensure that.

The foundation must be accessible to users to be effective.

We oppose Toronto as a location because it is too isolated from other parts of Canada. Also because, being probably the most multicultural community in Canada, there are probably many resources there. It would be nice to have a centre in all parts of Canada including Toronto.

However, that is where it is going to be. We must recommend strongly to the foundation that it operate in a decentralized way with an outpost in the Atlantic region; in the prairies, particularly in Winnipeg so that it will have some relevance for aboriginal people; and in British Columbia where the concerns of Asian communities, in particular, are uppermost. French language services must be available, especially in Quebec.

Perhaps this kind of outreach can be done by hiring decentralized workers operating out of local facilities, but it must be done. We urge the foundation to consult all organizations concerned with racism and intercultural relations as a first step, in order to solicit their views and concerns, to determine their priorities, and to find out what they are doing.

We anticipate that some of the following urgent issues will require analysis in the beginning; analysis of the causes of racism and solutions that will be formulated and hopefully advocated by the foundation.

First, systemic racism and discrimination in government and public institutions, with solutions for more effective means to eliminate discrimination against visible minorities. Second we want racism and stereotyping in the media analysed, with solutions for changing attitudes and methods of reporting on the part of journalists and others to promote positive race relations.

We want discrimination in the justice system and law enforcement systems of Canada analysed, with solutions to change attitudes and practices of judges, police and even governments.

We want an analysis of organizations and movements, which we have seen on the increase in Canada, that promote hatred and racism, with solutions to curtail hate propaganda. We are pleased with yesterday's decision of the Supreme Court in regard to the Keegstra case.

Public myths and misinformation which promote discrimination regarding immigrants and immigration is another priority and requires, solutions to promote positive public education and change attitudes. I know there are many more concerns that we could list, and there will be very limited resources, as the minister himself has acknowledged, to deal with these effectively.

It is evident that one of the first priorities must be for all of us, including the government, to help to find new sources of funding to develop a computerized data base that will be essential to put out publications, and to make sure that they are serving all of Canada, not just metropolitan Toronto. I do not have anything against Toronto, but I would have loved to have seen this foundation in Vancouver, as I mentioned in committee.

The foundation must not be just a passive research centre. It must analyse the causes of racism and actively promote positive changes in governments and in our broader society. This is a very difficult thing. It is difficult to change attitudes. We must ensure that this foundation has the resources and the kind of staff and board that will really bring about changes that will allow all citizens of Canada to be treated equally and have the opportunity

to work and live without discrimination. This is a very tall order. We know that more funding will be needed.

However, I do not want to extend the debate too long. In the interests of getting this bill through today we are just putting up one speaker. We have expressed many views on this in the past and will continue to work in any positive way we can to support an effective foundation.

We wish the foundation every success in this most important task of changing attitudes, eliminating racism and discrimination, and promoting positive intercultural relations in Canada.

• (1230 )

This is one of the very important tools we hope will help to make Canada a country that recognizes and treats all people equally, regardless of their race or country of origin.

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence):** Mr. Speaker, I too want to add my views with respect to this bill.

Having served on the legislative committee that deliberated the merits and demerits of the bill, I think it is appropriate for us to think for a moment about the kind of bill that we are going to put through this House.

I would like to concentrate on a couple of aspects of the bill itself. For one thing, we can accept the principle of having a race relations foundation. I do not think anybody in this House or elsewhere can be against this principle.

If we are going to be for something, we need the mechanisms, resources, accessibility and the means whereby we can at least achieve the objectives outlined in those principles. And so, what have we?

All of the witnesses before the committee said that this foundation cannot be allowed to be a passive resource centre. The only way to ensure that it would not be that would be to give the foundation, or at least its executive director—and I use the words of one of the witnesses—some sort of subpoena powers in order to ferret out information that would be appropriate for decision making.

As my colleagues have pointed out, it is absolutely useless to have a foundation that is going to gather information on race relations in one city and not in others, especially when all we are doing is collecting a library.

The University of Toronto, like many other universities throughout the country, already has vast resources of material available for the general public. We had witnesses who came from St. John's, Newfoundland as well as from as far west as Victoria, B.C. who have the same kind of resources.

All we are doing is allocating more of the passive research type of resources for a foundation. We are not giving any powers to this foundation or to its director to ferret out information that is important for integration and that relates, for example, to employment practices both in the public sector, which is extremely important if we are going to demonstrate leadership, and in the private sector, especially among the larger employers.

If we are not going to have access to that kind of information, how in heaven's name are we going to engage in the promotion of multicultural ethic and inter-racial harmony? If we do not have the material before us that would give us the opportunity to analyze the status at which we find the various levels of Canadian society, how can we make a decision on the appropriateness of any initiatives we might begin?

Once we begin, what do we do? Where do we go? Do we have any enforcement mechanisms? Do we have any monitoring mechanisms? Do we have any means whereby we analyze what is happening on jobs for job discrimination or social integration or for what is happening in the Public Service?

Have we found the means by which this foundation is going to do its very best to succeed where other policies have failed? Let me give just one example, Mr. Speaker. Under Secretary of State, there is already $7 million in the budget. I think those were the figures that were given to us by department officials before the committee. There was $7 million last year for race relations.

That sounds like an impressive figure. It is not an indifferent figure, but the foundation's total operating budget will come from a $24 million fund, at the very best. If the real rate of return is 11 per cent per annum, we are not going to get much more than $3 million per annum. However, we will not be able to take out 11 per cent.

The very best we are going to be able to take out is about 5 per cent, so we are looking at an operating budget of just over $1 million. What in heaven's name are we going to accomplish with $1 million in terms of race relations, harmony, co-operation and integration? If we are truly serious about doing something, how do we ensure that the 40 per cent of Canadians who do not have origins which are English or French are integrated into the other two mainstreams? We have to put money where our mouth is.

We have heard a lot of good philosophy about multiculturalism. We have heard a lot of good ideas about where we are going in this country. I notice I have awakened one of the members way off in the deep recesses of the corner and I am going to ask him a question or two concerning this debate as well, Mr. Speaker. He comes from a part of the country that, as the minister said earlier on in the day, is challenging the very principles that the minister enunciated as being germane and central to the government's philosophy or policy of multiculturalism.

If we truly believe in racial integration in a multicultural society, we might do better than we did last year in our public accounts where of the total amount of money spent on multicultural programs, running the whole gamut of heritage language, cultural programs and any other variety of recreational or social activities that do not fall under any other umbrella other than those that we would normally attribute to ethnoculturally different Canada.

How much money did we put into those activities? Well, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker. Of the total budget of Canada, a grand total of .076 per cent was spent on multiculturalism. We have a party developing in western Canada, the Reform Party. One plank of its platform is getting rid of multiculturalism because it costs too much.

What do we do as a Parliament, as a country, as a government? We stand in this House and say that we have to be sensitive to these kinds of movements and we have to respond. Then we cut the funds for multiculturalism which, as I said earlier, was .076 per cent of all money spent in Canada. It seems to be the target of all our cuts. As I said earlier on an amendment moved by a colleague, heritage language receives a grand total—I was generous and gave it a grand total of $21 million last year and we have received cuts. That $21 million as a percentage of all government expenditures is a mere .015 per cent.

But when the government had to cut the deficit, where did it go? It went to heritage language programs. When we come back into this House the government has the unmitigated gall, despite the very high-flown principles enunciated by my colleague the minister opposite, to say that it is doing something for multiculturalism, doing something to bring this country together again.

The Prime Minister said in the House yesterday that we have to heal the wounds that tear this country apart. How do we do that when we do not have the resources to heal those wounds? Well, if the resources and mechanisms are not provided, the opportunity to bring people together is lost. Do we have to create a fund that comes at the expense of other programs in the same area?

Mr. Speaker, those of us who want to have a more harmonious development of peoples look with great admiration at Secretary of State policies that said we were going to spend $226 million last year for the promotion of official languages, both English and French, throughout the country. It is an admirable effort. It means that the Government of Canada is really serious about turning this into a bilingual country. Those of us who make an effort to learn a second, third, or fourth language applaud these kinds of efforts because they are backed up by dollars. If we believe in something we should get behind it, put our resources behind it. If we do not believe in it, at least shut up.

That $226 million is a substantial amount of money. About nine million Canadians who would have access to a mere $21 million, which is the figure I gave a few moments ago with respect to heritage language programs, in order to maintain a sense of dignity and self-worth while they integrate themselves into the mainstream can hardly be impressed by the government's desire to cut and then establish a race relations foundation that has the same sort of high-flown principles without the basis and resources to carry them out.

• (1240 )

I did not want to elaborate too much on it because it is important for us to understand that there are no resources behind this idea. It therefore remains simply an idea, something that is empty.

On the subject of emptiness, one can get absolutely enraged as a parliamentarian when one sees what is happening in Toronto at Harbourfront, for example. I have pointed out figures that come from a government appraisal of some of the land deals that have been swapped so that the government can privatize some cultural programs and some other activities. $36.4 million is going into the hands of three developers.

We could have done so much with that government money. Those are public funds that could have been put towards either heritage language or race relations. $36.4 million. We are scrounging around for a measly $24 million to establish a fund. One does not know whether to laugh or to cry at this initiative.

I had occasion to be in Vancouver and met with groups of people who were involved in racial integration on a daily basis. They do it through language. They do it through social and recreational activities. They bring people of different origins, from different linguistic groups, religious groups, racial groups together.

I do not know how it happened but they decided to finally get up the courage to protest the cuts in heritage languages. They gave me the petitions they had gathered, petitions that have been ruled completely out of order. But for those people who come from B.C., at least I can give them an indication that there are several thousand people who objected to those cuts and who felt there was no one to hear them.

If we are going to be talking about a race relations foundation, I think we would do well if we listened for a moment to our own rhetoric. We say, here is an institution that epitimizes the best in democracy. If we understand what we mean by democracy, it means little more than empowerment.

If we empower the citizens of this country to participate in the decisions of this government and Parliament, then we have to put resources behind it. Those resources are not there. Not only that, we do not even have the regulatory mechanisms to make this a viable foundation.

All of those people from those communities who want to be a vital and vibrant part of Canada and its mainstream regret the weaknesses in this bill.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**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):** The motion is agreed to.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

## CANADIAN POLAR COMMISSION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C–72, an Act to establish the Canadian Polar Commission and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** On the Order Paper, there are three amendment motions at the report stage of Bill C–72, an Act to establish the Canadian Polar Commission and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

[*English*]

All three motions were moved and disposed of in the legislative committee. Pursuant to Standing Order 75(5), they will not be selected for debate. We will therefore proceed to the concurrence motion.

[*Translation*]

MEASURE TO ENACT

**Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development)** moved: that Bill C–72 be concurred in at the report stage.

Motion agreed to.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** When shall the bill be read the third time? Now?

**Some hon. members:** Now.

[*English*]

**Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development)** moved that Bill C–72, as amended, be read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Murray Cardiff (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, we have before us for third reading Bill C–72, an act to establish the Canadian Polar Commission.

A little over a year ago, on November 24, 1989, during the Prime Minister's visit to the Soviet Union, he announced that the Canadian Polar Commission would be established. This announcement was made in recognition of the need in Canada for a more focused and integrated approach in order to maintain and improve polar knowledge.

The Prime Minister has continuously acted on his commitment to enhance Canada's role in the international forum. The establishment of the Canadian Polar Commission is a culmination of this leadership in advancing Canada's role in circumpolar and scientific affairs.

Based on a concern for the state of polar research in Canada, as well as the rapidly changing nature of polar science, two studies were commissioned by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. The first, *Canada and Polar Science*, a report produced by an expert study group, was released in 1987. It strongly recommended the creation of a Canadian Polar Commission. A subsequent report released in 1988, *The Shield of Achilles*, by Professor Thomas Symons, studied the feasibility of establishing a commission and once again recommended its creation.

It is clear that a polar community as geographically dispersed and institutionally buried as Canada's requires a co–ordinated system to provide access to information on the Arctic and better serve the Canadian public.

The decision to create a Canadian Polar Commission was the result of extensive consultations and discussions with territorial governments, aboriginal people, private enterprise, research institutes and universities. It is very important to note that it had been their continued support and active involvement that has brought us to where we are to date in the establishment of this commission.

I would now like to highlight some of the specific purposes the commission will pursue that have been established. The commission will monitor the state of knowledge about the polar regions in Canada and elsewhere. In response to concerns raised by the legislative committee on Bill C–72, this term "knowledge" is now specifically defined to include traditional and aboriginal knowledge.

The Canadian Polar Commission will promote development of such knowledge by co–operating with organizations, institutions, and associations, both private and public, national and international, in the determination of scientific and other priorities.

The commission will also encourage Canadian organizations, institutions, and associations, both private and public, to support the development and dissemination of polar knowledge and it will provide information about polar research and Canadian organization.

Moreover, increased access to polar knowledge will, in accordance with Canada's foreign policy, enhance Canada's international profile as a circumpolar nation by fostering international co–operation and by increasing international attention on the Canadian Arctic. It will address such issues as resource development, legal and jurisdictional questions, security concerns, and global environmental problems including the greenhouse effect, the depletion of the ozone layer, and water and airborne contaminants in northern regions.

The commission is not intended to be a funding body for basic scientific research, nor is it expected to carry out such activity. The two reports I mentioned before strongly recommended against this since Canada already has such institutions.

• (1250 )

The creation of the Canadian Polar Commission will lead to the development of a comprehensive Canadian polar information system which will build upon and be linked to currently existing government, academic, and industrial scientific data, information and biographic systems. It will also be compatible with the international polar–related information systems.

The commission will provide support for the publication of studies on polar subjects, as well as recognize achievements and contributions in polar matters. It will initiate, sponsor, and support conferences, seminars, and

meetings. In this way it will give prominence to scientific research and its application in Canada's polar regions.

During these times of fiscal responsibility, funding for scientific research obviously cannot be lavish. But the commission will bring a greater focus and efficiency to the diverse and dispersed Canadian polar research community and will link research efforts more effectively.

The Canadian Polar Commission will receive core government funding of approximately $1 million annually, but it will be encouraged to seek non-government support for its endeavours through cost-recovery initiatives, such as information services or by entering into contractual agreements to study particular polar problems and/or issues. The commission can also receive additional funding through donations and bequests.

The activities of the commission will be managed by a board of directors consisting of up to 12 members, including a chair person and two vice-chairpersons. It will be appointed by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and will serve term appointments of three years.

Persons appointed to the board of directors must have knowledge that will assist the commission in the furtherance of its purpose and membership will include northerners and will reflect the ethnic, linguistic, and regional diversities of Canada's polar region.

Amendments made by the legislative committee to clauses 13 and 14 of the bill allow the commission to establish such offices in Canada as the board considers necessary for the furtherance of the commission's purpose. Keeping in mind that the commission has a mandate to promote polar knowledge within federal ministries, national granting councils, and other national bodies, clause 14(1) stipulates that one office of the commission must be in the national capital region. To enable the commission to maintain close constant contact with the full spectrum of interests represented in the north, clause 14(2) stipulates that at least one other office must be established in a place north of 60 degrees north latitude.

Under clause 5 of the legislation, the commission can exercise powers to initiate a wide variety of activities to address its purpose.

The commission's legislative mandate will be primarily that of an advisory body. The commission will provide advice to the Canadian government at a senior level and will be responsible for periodically reviewing the needs and progress of polar research in Canada, for recommending steps to be taken by the federal government to improve the relevance and effectiveness of Canadian polar research, and for facilitating international and domestic liaison and co-operation in polar research.

It is expected that the commission will report on these matters to Parliament through the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. The commission may, however, be asked from time to time to investigate specific problems or issues in the polar regions at the request of the government.

In conclusion, I would like to thank all the members of the legislative committee who worked together to improve Bill C-72, the legislation that is before us. I know that they share with me the sense of how important this commission will be and what it can achieve.

This bill is a significant step toward enhancing Canada's future as a northern and polar country, and as a leading member of the circumpolar community of nations. It also ensures that this commission will be dynamic and responsive to northern issues as they emerge.

**Ms. Ethel Blondin (Western Arctic):** Mr. Speaker it is my pleasure to be able to speak to Bill C-72. I hope that, in years to come, Bill C-72 will be a reflection of what I see the Arctic as portraying.

Bill C-72 will perhaps express itself in the eventuality of having the Arctic as a peace zone and eventually having the development of a world-class centre for excellent environmental studies in the north and perhaps even the development of a university of the north where we could specialize in such things as cold weather climate technology.

With the creation of the polar commission, we could also work in the area of winter city studies and also further the efforts to date in the whole area of traditional knowledge.

Another area that will be expressed through the efforts of a polar commission would be cultural studies in the area of languages and the arts, which is very important to the people of the north.

As the member for the Western Arctic I am pleased to speak on this long awaited bill to establish a polar commission. In my previous work as assistant deputy minister to the Government of the Northwest Territories, I attended the first meetings to explore the idea of a polar commission. I had the opportunity to share with the people who were behind the establishment of a polar commission, Dr. Fred Roots and Dr. Symons.

Having said that, there have been efforts of many who will go unnoticed in an effort to establish a polar commission. I want to take the opportunity to say that their efforts are much appreciated, specifically people like Walter Slipckenko, who is responsible for circumpolar matter especially as it relates to the Soviet Union and their exchange.

Since I have become a member of Parliament and travelled extensively across the country, I have noticed that for most Canadians the Arctic remains an enigma. I have realized that knowledge and appreciation of the range of northern policy issues is limited to a small minority of Canadian public.

Over the past 30 years the Arctic has experienced substantial changes, many brought about by activities in foreign regions, including the foreign north. All of these activities are having increasing influences in the Canadian north. For example, there are resource exploration and industrial development in foreign circumpolar regions with their attendant environment disturbances and impacts; atmospheric and oceanic pollution, including climatic change because of world-wide pollution; the depletion of marine stocks; international social, economic, and political developments including greater native participation in government; and the formation of international native organizations, such as the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, the World Council of Indigenous People, and Indigenous Survival International.

Specifically, in looking at the developments taking place, Greenland, with its Home Rule and its devolution of powers, is having an effect on what is happening in other parts of the world. In Alaska, there is the implementation of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, the movement toward tribal sovereignty which affects native people throughout the world, the recent United States Arctic Science Policy initiatives, the International Porcupine Caribou Agreement, and the possible developments in the Arctic National Wildlife Range. In the Soviet Union, there is the offshore oil and gas development with the possibility of sales of offshore equipment, and there is air pollution occurring in a number of their large industrial centres. Of course, this air pollution is occurring all over the world.

Whether the issue is military, strategic, political-economic, environmental, or some combination of all these, new ways of thinking about the regions are required if national and international policies are to meet the gathering challenge of change.

International Arctic science co-operation extends back 100 years to the creation in 1879 of the International Polar Commission which led to the International Polar Year of 1882-83. Eleven nations, including all polar nations, sponsored 14 polar research expeditions. In 1932-33, the second International Geophysical Year was initiated, with scientific investigations in both polar regions. In 1958, the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research was created as a scientific committee of the International Council of Scientific Union.

A series of different types of scientific activities with Arctic components have taken place which can be grouped under seven extended categories: first, large co-ordinated regional or circumpolar single programs, such as the polar segment of the International Magnetosphere study; second, Arctic components of complex and highly organized world-wide or global research programs, such as POLEX; third, scientifically focused wide-ranging programs to explore new concepts, gather data or compare phenomena such as the Arctic Ice Dynamics Joint Experiment conducted in the Beaufort Sea from 1969 to 1976; fourth, programs for collaboration by a number of researchers or agencies in one area or for taking advantage of an outstanding opportunity will benefit many others; fifth, studies that are so sophisticated and so expensive that no one country can provide the expertise or facilities so that international collaboration is essential, such as the Marginal Ice Zone Experiment and the Greenland Ice Sheet Program; sixth, programs designed to facilitate the sharing and exchange

of experience and knowledge or to compare the results of similar studies, such as the 1984 Canada–U.S.S.R. Arctic Science Program; seventh, programs designed to combine data or information from several sources into a common format or synthesis that can be useful to many countries, such as the Bathometric Map of the Arctic Ocean produced in the General Bathometric Chart of the Oceans series.

• (1300)

I would like to go on to the whole issue of bilateral agreements. The initiative to develop a co–operative ethic with our northern allies began in earnest with Lester B. Pearson when he visited the Soviet Union as Secretary of State for External Affairs in October, 1955.

The following is a sequence of main developments concerned with Arctic co–operation with the Soviet Union. I think this is a particularly interesting area to go into in that it is reflective of what is happening these days. The walls between countries are coming down, the barriers are coming down both politically and in a sense from a defence perspective. I think it is interesting that here we have in a zone, which I hope one day will be a peace zone, a nuclear–free zone, that we are developing a polar commission that will express itself in a number of activities that will bring even more freedom and sharing among circumpolar allies.

Canada, prior to the 1989 agreement, was involved in three bilateral agreements with the Soviets dealing with environmental, cultural and scientific arrangements.

First, in 1983 the agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Denmark for co–operation relating to the marine environment which covers ships and offshore pollution under which research and other areas is possible was established. The second is the Canada–United States Agreement on Arctic Co–operation which generally agrees to facilitate navigation by ice–breakers in Arctic waters and which provides for the sharing of research information in order to enhance the understanding of the marine environment. The third is the Protocol of Canadian–Soviet Consultation on the development of a program of scientific and technical co–operation in the Arctic and in the north which was signed in 1984 and renegotiated on February 26, 1987, and which has become known as the Canada–U.S.S.R Arctic Science Exchange Program and provides for the development of a program of scientific and technical co–operation in the Arctic and in the north.

I would like to speak about the Canada–U.S.S.R. Arctic Science Exchange Program as I feel that it has demonstrated real northern co–operation between Canada and the Soviet Union. The Government of the Northwest Territories record of circumpolar relations dates back to the early 1970s.

At that time the head of the government, Steward Hodgson, went to Greenland and in 1971 to the Soviet Union with the former Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Jean Chrétien. Dick Hill, who founded the research lab in Inuvik and Walter Slipchenko, who is now Director of Circumpolar Affairs for the Government of the Northwest Territories, were also along. It was the start of what became a series of formal and informal exchanges between officials, local residents, and business people.

These exchanges have demonstrated to northerners that the people of circumpolar countries share common problems, be they social, economic, cultural, scientific or technical. On many occasions there is greater commonality or understanding between ourselves than northerners have with national central agencies in Ottawa.

This leads me to the discussion of Bill C–72 and the several points I want to review. The bill proposes that the headquarters of the Canadian Polar Commission be located in the nation's capital region and that one regional office be located north of the 60th parallel. When the Prime Minister announced the establishment of a commission last November in Moscow, he stated that one of the regional offices would be in Quebec City. I wholly support that in that I feel the headquarters should be located in the north. That was the amendment which we put forward and which was defeated. There is no reason why we should not have the polar commission located north of 60.

In a time when we have recession in full swing, in a time when we have the high overhead that we have, there is always the pull to withdraw regional offices first. What we need is a commitment to have this particular headquarters north of 60 in that it gives it the credibility that it is just not another Arctic club where the name polar is used but, in fact, it is out of its location. This was our objection and this was something about which we

were sad because the government would not agree to have the headquarters actually north of 60.

My position is that polar issues should be studied in polar regions. I am extremely concerned that this may become one more Arctic club, none of which are based in the Arctic. The people I have consulted on this matter have told me, frankly, that we must avoid the general game of the old boys club and, if there is one thing I have learned since I have come to Ottawa, it is that you really have to put forward a strong case on a regional basis to be heard.

The north has the infrastructure to house the Canadian Polar Commission. There is a science institute in both the Northwest Territories and the Yukon and, as well, both territories have Arctic colleges. There are federal agencies in both northern capitals which manage the environment, fisheries, geological surveys, energy, mines, and resources. The GNWT is responsible for forestry, housing, public works, and construction in the Arctic. There are research labs in Inuvik, Igloolik, and Iqualuit. We have a consortium of experts in the scientific community in the north who have worked there for years and have contributed. I would guess that they are some of the outstanding scientific people in Canada and they would contribute to the polar commission. They would help us build those circumpolar alliances and that would bring down the walls even more for more freedom and sharing with our circumpolar neighbours.

There are so many possibilities in having the north being the centre for the Canadian Polar Commission, in which case the National Capital Region could locate one of the regional branches. It is about time this government started to break up the central bureaucracy and spread the resources around the country. The United States has focused its northern studies out of the University of Alaska, in the northern region. The Science City of the Soviet Union is in Siberia in Nora Sabers. Its Permafrost Research Centre is in the Yakuts region which is very remote.

The directors of the commission is another issue that we took to task and on which we put forward an amendment. We wanted 50 per cent of the directors to be from north of 60 if it is going to be a polar commission, and that was defeated. I do not believe that there was any tangible reason, any viable reason, for defeating that amendment. If you have a South American region or a South American institution, you get predominantly South Americans on the committee because they have the expertise and the knowledge. There are northern residents with doctorate degrees in geology, geography, and communications, and many who have tremendous experience with the polar land, the environment, and the polar peoples. We wanted those people on the commission but that was defeated. We wanted to have the highest lines of reporting to the government on this one.

In addition, the bill states that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development will be responsible for the commission. Again, the people with whom I consulted agreed that there needs to be discussion on this point. Is an institute with global, external, and international responsibilities, best directed by a minister who does not participate in the inner cabinet? I believe, because of the circumpolar implications of this bill, that we need the absolute highest authority if it is to be recognized and be credible because it is going to be begging for international co-operation and recognition. We need the highest lines of authority to be expressed in whom this commission reports to.

The authority of the commission will be legitimate, depending on the budget allocated to it. If they are not the kind of allocations that are required, what you will have is a commission in name only, not in what it can actually do. We cannot depend on anything but legislative commitment, so we wanted that.

• (1310)

Never before has the need for Arctic co-operation been so pressing. Never before has the need to learn and to develop global solutions to Arctic problems been so great.

From an environmental perspective, to many Canadians the Arctic has always symbolized all that is good; clean water, clean air, majestic landscapes, an abundance of wildlife resources, fish stocks and a richness in underdeveloped mineral and petroleum resources.

Let me present you with a truer picture. In the early years, chicken pox, measles, the flu, and other European diseases imported to the Arctic by explorers just about decimated our northern population. Later on, it was starvation. Today, it is AIDS, Arctic contaminants, and trying to cope with the anxieties created by advanced cruise missile testing, low-level military exercise, the

possibility of nuclear-powered submarines and the European boycott of trapped furs, the decimation of our traditional economy of hunting and trapping.

The true north strong and free? People in the Northwest Territories would like to think so. But maybe that is not the case anymore. Maybe the polar commission gives us a small door or window of opportunity to be able to achieve these goals to which we aspire. Maybe we can be the true north strong and free, and maybe the rest of Canada can help us with that, but only if they commit the resources and the political will in expressing exactly in those amendments we put forward to have 50 per cent of the membership of the commission being residents of north of 60, to have the headquarters located in the region and to give very, very specific concern and care to the fact that we want traditional knowledge to play a huge part in the polar commission.

Let me ask a few questions, Mr. Speaker. What if levels of airborne toxic chemicals carried to the Arctic from other areas of the northern hemisphere increase to the point where contamination of the northern food chain forces our population to abandon its traditional dependence on country foods? This is one way in which people manage their budgets in an area where the cost of living is 40 per cent higher than anywhere else in Canada. When all else fails, people go back to the land and hunt and trap. They supplement their diet with country foods. You cannot do this if the food chain is contaminated with pollution.

What if a cultural lifestyle that dates back one thousand years or more is destroyed by the anti-trapping movement? It has been. The trappers of the north will tell you that this is a tough year for trappers. Canadians will know that their commitments can only be expressed in a statement that I made years ago, that fur built this country. This is how this country was created.

What if the guidance system on the cruise missile breaks down shortly after being launched over the Beaufort Sea and it crashes on Main Street, Inuvik? That is a possibility. It has happened before. Trappers have found parts of satellites with contaminated elements in them in the Arctic areas.

What if the United States is asked to test a cruise missile along a corridor originating in northern Ontario and terminating a couple of hundred miles north of Ottawa? Would the decision to allow the tests have been the same?

What if you do not have freedom from anxieties? Is it still possible to have global peace and security? Can anyone out there relieve Arctic anxieties by explaining the probabilities, the technicalities and the scientific theories to a population that speaks eight different native languages, none of which have the appropriate word equivalences and a whole different psychology with which to deal?

There is a tendency to overlook the people who live there, to forget they have strong opinions and beliefs and an abundant capability of managing their own affairs.

The Northwest Territories is the homeland for a native majority that considers the land a sacred trust. That has been and always will be for the aboriginal people, and where any developments must take serious consideration of that reality.

Equally important, it is a place of residence for people who are determined to exercise control over their land. It is a home to people who want to decide their own political and constitutional futures rather than having them shaped by someone else in a distant national capital by other premiers and the Prime Minister at a First Ministers' Conference through such instruments as the Meech Lake Accord which definitely left us and our Yukon neighbours out of the process, even though we cover 40 per cent of the Canadian land mass.

It leads me to conclude that the time has come to make our voices heard in a manner that will prompt national and international political leadership to respond to the issue of Arctic peace and security referred to by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in Murmansk in October, 1987, when he proposed a conference of sub-arctic states to co-ordinate research in the Arctic, including co-operative arrangements in polar scientific, environmental and economic endeavours with Canada and other western countries.

At the same time he proposed that the Warsaw Pact and NATO begin consultations on scaling down militarization and restricting naval and air force activity in the Baltic, Greenland, Norwegian and North Seas. "Such actions", he said, "could lead to demilitarizing the top of

the world", and, as I stated before, turn the Arctic into a zone of peace.

For these reasons I support the principle of Bill C–72. I believe, however, that we need to discuss the logistics, but I want to conclude with the essence of what makes the Polar Commission so important.

Arctic nations share many common problems which require research and scientific data from other regions. Arctic research is difficult and costly, but the results are vitally important nationally, internationally, and particularly to the northern people, the native people who are the majority. Arctic science requires the financial and scientific support, not only of polar but also of non–polar nations. Environmental and social concerns have emerged as among the most important Arctic issues today. Social and political developments in the Arctic regions have altered the demand for knowledge and exchange of information.

I feel strongly that this polar commission is a step forward, not only for science but for the northern people. I am certain that our circumpolar contacts will continue to increase because of the new commission.

I want to say, for Canada and for the people of the north, I hope that the Polar Commission will be a small window of opportunity to achieve peace and freedom and to bring down all those walls that obstruct us from dealing with each other as human beings.

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have an opportunity to speak on behalf of my party in support of Bill C–72, which would create the Canadian Polar Commission.

The structure of the legislation adheres rather closely to the recommendations of the previous studies which examine the feasibility of this commission, most particularly *The Shield of Achilles*.

One of the elements that interests me about that latter study by Dr. Symonds was that, in spite of the tendency to emphasize scientific knowledge with respect to the work of this commission, he is quite careful to point out that the breadth of knowledge that is to be treated by this commission should extend beyond the merely scientific. It should extend to include the kind of historic observations that the peoples of the north have made about the north, which give them a more powerful understanding of the north, even in scientific terms, than could be provided in a brief period of time of conventional scientific study.

In that context, I want to state my admiration for the picture that was developed by the hon. member for the Western Arctic. In her speech she provided an inkling of the kind of knowledge, sensitivity, and indeed love, for the delicate character of the north that few in the rest of the country have an opportunity to share, being preoccupied, as we are, with our own regions and our own preoccupations. The hon. member comes to her knowledge by virtue of her indigenous roots and the sense of historical context from which she derives.

• (1320)

It is equally possible that someone can leave an area, such as that in which I live, and come very quickly to the realization that the north is important. It offers a livelihood which is in balance historically with the environment, an environment that reflects a very delicate ecology, as the hon. member has pointed out an ecology that if it is to be respected is going to require the co–operation of all who share a circumpolar presence.

My leader is one who has adopted the north, or perhaps it would be preferable to say that the north has adopted her emotionally, psychologically, and in terms of her commitment. She shares with equal strength the commitment to this bill and to the north which it expresses.

The bill represents a response to opportunity and responsibility, opportunity that has been too long delayed in its exploitation, in a country that having a true north could have, as it could have done in so many other contexts, developed its own niche in terms of scientific and other kinds of research in the development of a broad scope of knowledge in an area of the world that not many other nations have an opportunity to examine; both in terms of the achievement of pure knowledge and in terms of finding the opportunities that are available in science and technology, in environmental management and so on, that could have provided us with leadership in respect to the rest of the world.

We have then another example of what has happened in Canada for too long. That is the failure to provide the kind of thrust and momentum in scientific research generally; scientific research that on the one hand can create jobs and can create economic growth, scientific research that shall demonstrate the limits of that kind of development, scientific research that would ensure the maintenance of the balance so delicately structured in

the north, and knowledge that would allow us in the rest of Canada to have an opportunity to learn, so that when we think of Canada we are not thinking of a part of it but all of it.

The bill also responds to responsibility, responsibility that goes beyond our immediate opportunities and our immediate possession of a portion of the north, a responsibility that recognizes that as an ecosystem we do not govern it all, nor does anyone else, and that all who share a circumpolar existence must not compete for opportunities to exploit it at its expense, but must co–operate to enhance our knowledge of the north, to monitor the knowledge that has been created, to stimulate new science, and to ensure there is an appropriate diffusion of all the knowledge that can be gleaned from there so that all can share in it and protect that delicate, beautiful area of the world, even now threatened from great distances by even tiny amounts of pollutants that can be tolerated here but which can be so disturbing there.

By and large this is a good bill. It does what should have been done, and it does it reasonably well.

There are of course some concerns, and the member for the Western Arctic has cited those. We share in common our concern about the inevitable presumption that all that is good and has value somehow must derive from some portion of central Canada, in this case Ottawa, designated as the place of the principal office.

I cannot understand that. I cannot understand it in any other terms except the preoccupation as is too usual in this part of the nation, in this place, that if there is to be focus, if there is to be leadership, if there is supposed to be real understanding and co–ordination, that somehow it must be here.

I think it most regrettable that the government rejected amendments that would have provided the appropriate location of the principal office in the north. It is something that at least one office will be in the north. We must also be disturbed, although it was argued by the parliamentary secretary that in spite of a lack of specification there would be appropriate representation reflecting the population of the north on the board of directors. It seems to me that it would have been much more satisfying and symbolically significant if the government had accepted, as we tried to get it to accept, that a minimum of half of the board of directors should be from the north, but it ignored that.

There was the possibility of circumventing the problems of rejection of this amendment by ensuring that, as in other similar commissions and institutes, the structure of nominations to the board would have been such that all three parties would have had to approve the nominees, thus eliminating the unnecessary implication of partisan considerations and perhaps patronage in the appointments, and instead had an opportunity to ensure that there was going to be no compromise on appropriate representation on that board of directors.

That is all by the board now. We are going to have the polar commission. It is a significant step forward. It recognizes the need. It recognizes the realities that we must confront. So we cannot but join with the official opposition and the government in applauding this piece of legislation with which we will not burden too long a discussion because we want it completed today. That is our mission to say: "Let's get it done today as quickly as possible".

**Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq):**

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be speaking on this third and final debate on Bill C–72, the Canadian Polar Commission Act.

The bill before us today is a little better than the bill that was introduced last June, as a result of amendments made in the legislative committee. It is still not as good as we would like, or as it could have been, or should have been. I will touch on these defects a little later, but at first I want to elaborate on the background of the legislation.

Bill C–72 will create a corporation to be called the Canadian Polar Commission. Its purpose is to promote and disseminate information and knowledge throughout the polar regions of the world. It will monitor, encourage, and support the development of knowledge about polar regions in Canada and elsewhere. For the most part it will not conduct its own research, although it may

do some. Rather its primary function is to co-ordinate and facilitate the research activities of others in Canada.

It will help develop a comprehensive Canadian polar information system. It will foster international co-operation and attention to polar issues. It is meant to enhance Canada's international profile as a circumpolar nation.

There was a general consensus among interested parties that Canada needs a polar commission.

• (1330)

The need for a polar commission is due to the current lack of co-ordination among Canadian research activities on polar issues and the need to provide a focal point for these efforts. There is much research being undertaken, but it is being done by a number of very different organizations sponsored by different interests and for a variety of purposes. There is not enough sharing of information between all the players and there is not enough support being given to the polar research community.

In September, 1985, the then Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development established a working group to study the feasibility and advisability of establishing a national polar institute in Canada.

The report of this working group entitled "Canada and Polar Science" was released publicly in March of 1987. It recommended then the establishment of a Canadian polar commission.

The subsequent Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development commissioned a follow-up report on the mandate, structure, composition, accountability, activities, budget and location of such a commission. Known as *The Shield of Achilles*: The Report of the Canadian Polar Research Commission Study", this study was completed in May of 1988.

Both of these reports confirmed the existence of serious problems respecting polar research in Canada. Both reports identified a need for a more co-ordinated, integrated system of research, science and knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Polar Commission we are approving today has been announced at least three times over the past few years. In 1988, the government announced the establishment of the Canadian Polar Research Commission. On November 24, 1989, the Prime Minister announced the establishment of this commission. The Prime Minister's press release outlined the mandate and structure of the commission and identified the location of its offices. The Prime Minister's announcement was virtually identical to the recommendations in *The Shield of Achilles* report.

On May 25, 1990, the Canadian Polar Commission was announced again, when Bill C-72 was tabled in the House of Commons by the current Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

After so many announcements, we are happy to see this long-awaited project finally come to fruition. We hope that it will not take so long to get the commission actually established and working.

The commission will be managed by a board of directors consisting of up to 12 members, including a chairperson and two vice-chairpersons. The directors are to be appointed by the Governor in Council under recommendation of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. They will serve term appointments of three years. Members—and I stress this—must have knowledge related to the commission's work and should reflect the ethnic, linguistic and regional diversity of Canada's polar regions.

In our view, the quality of these commissioners will be a critical factor in the credibility and the integrity of the commission. I want to make the following recommendation to the government, which we have done through amendments, but I will do so once again. At least half—and we are being generous by asking for half—and preferably a majority of the 12 commissioners should come from north of 60, and aboriginal people must be well represented.

We proposed such an amendment to the bill in committee, and it was rejected by the government members.

We are disappointed that the government did not place the location of the commission's head office in northern Canada. The original bill, as introduced in June, actually placed the head office in Ottawa, and suggested a regional office in the north.

On this side of the House we recommended the reverse. It makes no sense to have a polar commission which is meant to focus attention on the north, with a

head office in Ottawa. I proposed an amendment in committee to put the head office in the north, and a regional office in Ottawa. Unfortunately, the government did not accept that amendment.

Instead the government introduced its own amendment which would leave the location of the commission's offices to the discretion of the commissioners.

I can take some comfort from the fact that the government backed off the Ottawa head office location, but I regret that it would not agree to put that head office in the north. I am very pleased that the government has accepted this.

I am sure that they really had no choice but to accept it. It is the recognition of aboriginal knowledge in this bill. We were advised by the government in committee that the use of this word, in addition to the term "science" was meant to incorporate aboriginal knowledge. "The recognition was implicit," they said.

We wanted the recognition to be explicit. We wanted the recognition to be clear. I, therefore, moved an amendment in committee that defines "knowledge" to include traditional and aboriginal knowledge. That amendment was accepted by the government and passed in committee. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the committee for their support.

I believe that for the first time in legislation, northern and aboriginal people now have their intimate understanding and awareness of their environment, and the wildlife recognized and affirmed.

We have had difficulties in the past with scientific and biological research. Much activity has gone on without our participation and involvement.

There have been conflicts between the traditional knowledge of aboriginal people and the scientific data bases of non-aboriginal researchers. In the second reading debate on this bill, I mentioned a past conflict over the counting of a caribou herd in the Keewatin, and an ongoing dispute over beluga whales in the Baffin region.

We hope that this polar commission will help to avoid these problems by fully involving northern and aboriginal people in the ongoing and future research into our region.

We canvassed a great number of organizations, aboriginal and non-aboriginal, on the concept of a polar commission. All were very supportive.

Some concerns were expressed, however, concerning the mandate of the commission. It was thought, for example, that the commission should be able to advise the government at any time, and not just when requested, as the bill is currently written. In committee, I moved an amendment which would have given the commission the freedom to advise the government at any time, but that amendment was rejected by the government.

We still have some concerns about the adequacy of the commission's budget, and about its independence from the government. We regret that the government did not seem to want to hear from any witnesses on this legislation. We were told that we would risk losing this bill if we took the time to hear from interested organizations.

None of the groups we talked to wanted to take the chance of losing this bill, so we moved forward, but I still believe the committee could have benefited from the comments of those directly involved in northern issues research.

In conclusion, our members on this side of the House support this bill. It is an initiative which is long overdue.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

[*Translation*]

**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):** The motion is agreed to.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

[*English*]

## YUKON PLACER MINING ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-68, an act to amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act and the Yukon Quartz Mining Act and to make provision for the application of certain orders as reported (with amendments) from a legislative committee.

**Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development)** 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.

Motion agreed to.

• (1340 )

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Cadieux (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development)** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Murray Cardiff (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief because I understand there is agreement on this piece of legislation. We know that there have been some technical amendments proposed in two different areas.

I want to thank the legislative committee which considered the bill and received presentations from various interests. I want to express my appreciation for the contribution of the committee which did all of this work. I also want to commend the members of the committee for their time, their input, and for their co-operation in ensuring this bill's prompt review. I hope that we can deal with this piece of legislation very rapidly.

**Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq):**

[*Editor's note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be very brief but you must also realize that we do have some comments on this bill. I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak at third reading stage of Bill C-68.

When I spoke at second reading I indicated, on behalf of my party, the Official Opposition, my support for this bill but with some reservations. We support this bill because it corrects an oversight, a negligence of the government. We support the corrective steps in this bill which strengthen the protection of lands withdrawn in the Yukon for the purpose of lands claims settlements.

We continue to regret the negligence of the government which had the unfortunate effect of infringing on the aboriginal rights of the Yukon Indian people and, in particular, those represented by the Kluane Tribal Council. We continue to caution the government that it must take its constitutional trust responsibilities toward aboriginal peoples much more seriously.

The government initially wanted to pass this bill, in all stages, on a single day. We insisted that it should go to a legislative committee so that groups affected by the legislation would have an opportunity to express their views and recommend any changes they thought were necessary.

This was a very useful exercise, as the government will agree because, after hearing witnesses, the government brought forward amendments to its own legislation. It is interesting that the amendments introduced by the government responded to concerns expressed by the mining industry and prospectors. The government did not bring forward any amendments to respond to the concerns of the Yukon Indian people.

I would like to take a few moments to communicate to this House what the Kluane Tribal Council and the Council for Yukon Indians had to say about this bill in committee. They reminded committee members that the need for this bill arose out of a failure of a federal Order in Council which was supposed to protect a portion of the unsurrendered homelands of the Kluane Tribal Council from mineral staking. I want to describe to this House the history and background of the bill and the issues we are dealing with today.

For the past several years, Mr. Speaker, the government has, from time to time and for various public purposes, including the settlement of aboriginal land claims, withdrawn various parcels of land in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories from this position.

As hon. members know, all of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories are the subject of land claims negotiations with aboriginal peoples. These aboriginal people negotiating these claims have long been concerned about the alienation by third parties of lands which they are claiming while negotiations are ongoing.

The federal government has, in response to these concerns, ordered the freezing or withdrawal of certain lands designated by aboriginal claimants from disposition, pending settlement of the particular land claim under negotiation. The withdrawal of these lands has removed the possibility of third-party interest being created in such lands, at least for the duration of the withdrawal order.

Negotiations between the aboriginal people and the government determine which lands will be withdrawn. There is a general criteria which describes lands which cannot be withdrawn; such lands are lands which are already privately owned. In each land claim area there are more specific criteria used by the federal government in the decision-making, but these criteria are not public nor are they made available to the aboriginal claimants.

In the Yukon, the Council for Yukon Indians has been negotiating a land claims agreement since 1973, and in March, 1989, negotiators for the Government of Canada and the Council for Yukon Indians ratified an agreement in principle.

Several parcels of land have been withdrawn for Yukon Indians pending final settlement of their land claims. Section 23 of the Territorial Lands Act permits governments to designate and withdraw from dispositions certain parcels of land.

In addition, Section 98 of the Yukon Placer Mining Act permits the Governor in Council to prohibit entry on certain lands for the purpose of locating a claim or prospecting for gold or other precious minerals or stones. The Yukon Quartz Mining Act contains no provision to withdraw lands or prohibit mining on certain lands. However, Section 14 of the Yukon Quartz Mining Act does provide for exceptions to the general right to acquire mineral rights.

It has been the position of the government that a withdrawal made under Section 23 of the Territorial Lands Act should be considered a reservation within the meaning of Section 14 of the Yukon Quartz Mining Act. The government's position, however, was challenged in court by an individual prospector. The prospector had staked 265 mineral claims in an area withdrawn for settlements of the Kluane Tribal Council land claims. These claims were refused by the mining recorder because they were staked on lands withdrawn for the settlement of the Indian land claims.

The prospector brought the matter to Federal Court on July 12, 1988. On February 12, 1990, a judgment in favour of the prospector was handed down. The judgment was based on the fact that subsection 3(3) of the Territorial Lands Act states that "nothing in this act shall be construed as limiting the operation of the Yukon Quartz Mining Act, the Yukon Placer Mining Act, the Dominion Water Power Act, or the National Parks Act". The judge decided therefore that any withdrawal orders made pursuant to the Territorial Lands Act could not have an effect on the Yukon Quartz Mining Act. In other words, he said that claim staking under the Yukon Quartz Mining Act could not be curtailed by orders pursuant to the Territorial Lands Act. The judge ordered that mining recorder to accept the prospector's claims.

The day after the court decision, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development announced in the House that the government would be introducing legislation to amend the Yukon Quartz Mining Act and the Yukon Placer Mining Act. He also announced that legislation would be retroactive to February 13, the date of his announcement.

On March 9, 1990, Bill C-68 was introduced. This bill amends two pieces of legislation, the Yukon Placer Mining Act and the Yukon Quartz Mining Act. It will clarify and confirm the government's right to prohibit mineral claims staking on certain lands which may be required for the settlement of aboriginal land claims by specifying this purpose in both of these acts. The changes are essentially technical changes, and as I mentioned earlier, they are retroactive to February 13, 1990.

This bill closes a loophole in the Yukon Quartz Mining Act which allowed a prospector to stake mineral claims on lands selected by the Kluane Tribal Council and withdrawn by the government for the settlement of their claim. It provides for a greater certainty in the Yukon Placer Mining Act. As such, it is an improvement on the current situation pending a final court determination.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government on March 7 filed an appeal on the February 12 court decision with the Federal Court of Appeals.

There are no strong objections to the remedy provided by this bill. The mining associations of the Yukon are generally concerned about the amount of land which has been withdrawn, but support the land claims settlement process and the bill because it provides for great uncertainty for the industry.

The CYI concluded, however, after reviewing Bill C–68, that it does not go far enough in terms of protection which is to be provided to the unsurrendered lands of the Kluane Tribal Council and the other Yukon first nations. Their primary recommendations to the committee was to amend Bill C–68 so as to prevent staking or mining on the unsurrendered land of the Yukon First Nations until such time as their claims to those lands have been settled, or they have otherwise expressly consented to such staking or mining.

• (1350 )

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that my office did try to frame an amendment between the time the committee had finished with the bill and this debate today to respond to that concern expressed by the Yukon Indians. We were told by legal counsel, however, that our amendment would be out of order because it went beyond the scope of this bill.

Unfortunately, this bill is not constructed in a way that permitted us to strengthen the position of the Yukon First Nations. We regret that, and we wish we could have done more to protect the rights of the Yukon Indians. We recognize that the bill before us at least takes a step in that direction.

In conclusion, we support this bill because it closes the loopholes the government was not aware of. It corrects a mistake caused by the government's negligence. It is an improvement on the present situation but, I stress, it does not go far enough to protect the unsurrendered aboriginal lands from third–party alienation.

Aboriginal people involved in land claims negotiations continue to see their lands alienated, despite the fact that no settlement of their claim has been reached. This occurs in the Yukon, in the Northwest Territories, and in British Columbia. Revisions to the land claims policy are needed to better protect aboriginal interests, rights, and titles.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, I must say that I had a long speech to give on this Bill C–68, but my hon. friend from Nunatsiaq has laid it out for the House very thoroughly and comprehensively. I feel I now have to emphasize only two or three points that he made at the very end of his presentation.

I would like to congratulate him in terms of laying out the history of this whole issue, and also to acknowledge the fact that much was done in committee in a very co–operative way to advance the situation that existed in the Yukon. As my hon. friend from Nunatsiaq has indicated, there are still some problems with this bill.

The fact that the Kluane Tribal Council and the Council of Yukon Indians maintain that this bill does not go far enough in protecting their unsurrendered lands in their continuing negotiations over land claims, is something that we, as members, ought not to take lightly.

We are pleased in terms of the progress that it has shown, not only in terms of the land claims settlement in the Yukon, but also the progress shown in this bill. It is also important to acknowledge the fact that these outstanding issues and concerns remain.

Both the tribal council and the Council of Yukon Indians wanted Bill C–68 amended to prevent staking and mining on their unsurrendered lands until the land claims are settled, or they have given consent for this type of activity. The Council of Yukon Indians maintains that our Canadian constitution requires the land claims be settled before their homelands are opened up for use by others. I recall that a legal opinion by Tom Berger supports this claim that the Council of Yukon Indians makes.

Perhaps I can give a moment or two or background in the time remaining. When the British North America Act established the Dominion of Canada back in 1867, the Yukon First Nation land was not part of Canada.

Canada wanted to acquire Rupert's Land in the northwestern territory in order to extend Canada to the Arctic Ocean. The conditions, Mr. Speaker, that you probably will recall as a student of history, as well as constitutional history, set up by the Senate and the House of Commons in 1867, said the homelands transferred "—will be considered and settled in conformity with the equitable principles which have uniformly governed the British Crown in the dealings with the aborigines". Does that not sum it up, Mr. Speaker, clearly for all of us?

This was accomplished through various treaties which allotted lands for settlement by non-natives. This existed until the Klondike Gold Rush, from which time to the present, the Council of Yukon Indians says represents a breach by the government in allowing lands to be used, and if I may say abused, as well, while no attempts were made to settle claims on the unsurrendered lands. Natives claim that Canada is not honouring its constitutional duties to natives in the Yukon because unsurrendered lands are not being protected.

As well, the Council of Yukon Indians, does not wish to reverse development, just to freeze it, until land claims can be settled in order to prevent alienations in the future.

I would refer to the the claims staked by the miner, Mr. Halferdahl, in an area that was desired by the native people. The miner was able to retain these because of a loophole in the Territorial Lands Act. He took these claims to court, as my hon. colleague has already pointed out, and his position was upheld. The point is that if Bill C-68 was made retroactive to 1987, he would lose his claims and would have to be compensated according to the government. Fair enough. If he keeps his claims by virtue of Bill C-68 being effective in February 1990, will the government compensate the Council of Yukon Indians? I think this is a critical question now that we must pursue.

The Council of Yukon Indians has said that it has been involved in negotiations for compensation for many, many years while this particular miner has only been involved briefly and yet the government is prepared to offer compensation to him.

While we in the New Democratic Party support Bill C-68, let us all acknowledge that much work remains to be done and we look forward to the appropriate committee and those interested members of the House to continue with their interest in this issue in terms of improving it even more in the future.

[*Translation*]

**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.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

## ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A PORT WARDEN FOR THE HARBOUR OF QUEBEC

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-82, an Act to provide for the appointment of a Port Warden for the Harbour of Quebec and an Act to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the office of Port Warden for the Harbour of Montreal, and to valic' te certain fees and charges established pursuant thereto, as reported (without amendment) from a legislative committee.

**Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (for Minister of Transport):** moved that Bill C-82, as reported (without amendment) from a legislative committee, be concurred in.

**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 a third time?

**Some hon. members:** Now.

**Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (for Minister of Transport):** moved that Bill C-82 be read the third time and passed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

[*English*]

**Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond):** Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Kingston and the Islands and I have had very long speeches prepared to give on this particular bill, but in view of the shortness of the hour, we would concur that the bill be proceeded with and passed at all stages in the spirit of Christmas.

There are a number of problems which our critic has raised and we just wish to echo those which are contained in *Hansard* for November 5, 1990.

[*Translation*]

**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):** I declare the motion carried, on division.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

[*English*]

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** 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 C-62, an act to amend the Excise Tax Act, the Criminal Code, the Customs Act, the Customs Tariff, the Excise Act, the Income Tax Act, the Statistics Act and the Tax Court of Canada Act, without amendment.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## ROYAL ASSENT

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

*Private Members' Business*

Rideau Hall
Ottawa,

December 14, 1990

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. John Sopinka, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 14th day of December, 1990, at 2 p.m., for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain bills.

Yours sincerely,
Judith A. LaRocque
Secretary to the Governor General

[*English*]

It being two o'clock p.m. the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

# PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—BILLS

[*English*]

## CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

### MEASURE TO AMEND

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops)** moved that Bill C-332, an act to amend the Canada Elections Act, be now read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for seconding my motion to allow it to be presented.

This particular bill enables young people 16 years and over to vote in federal elections. I might say that I think all of us have had innumerable experiences as we have met young people in our careers as parliamentarians and recognized and acknowledged the fact that many young people, age 16, 17, and perhaps even a lot younger than that, are quite capable of making a judgment when it comes to who ought to represent them in the Parliament of Canada, which political party, which political persuasion if you like, the kind of person. I hope one day that we can expand this so 16-year olds will also have the opportunity perhaps to elect senators and be senators, to represent a more democratic approach to political decision-making in our country.

I want to make my case by first of all acknowledging the discussions I have had with groups of young people, particularly in a formal sense, from Cariboo University College, from Brocklehurst Secondary School, Norkam Secondary, Kam High, Westsyde Secondary, Barriere

Secondary, Clearwater Secondary, Chase Secondary, Logan Lake Secondary, as well as a whole host of junior high schools. Also, on a number of occasions with the more senior years in elementary school where we discussed what age would be appropriate in terms of people voting in general elections. After these discussions and recognizing the understanding that young people today have of international affairs and national affairs, the understanding of the legislative process, it is with no hesitation that I say that I believe it is appropriate that we change legislation to empower those youngsters who are 16 and 17 years of age to be able to vote in our general elections.

The reasons for this are many. At age 16 young people are able to join the Armed Forces of Canada. I believe if we say to a young man or young woman that at age 16 with parental consent you are able to join the Armed Forces of Canada and go off to represent Canada in perhaps, unfortunately, places of conflict, they ought also to have the right to decide on those people who will represent them in the nation's Parliament.

At age 16 young people are able to get married legally, again with parental consent, but marriage and the responsibilities of marriage surely indicate that at that age people are capable of taking on the responsibilities of very serious decision-making.

Of course, at age 16 young people are able to drive vehicles, high powered cars, and take the responsibility of driving safely and manoeuvring an automobile down our crowded highways. Surely with that responsibility, we can assume that young people have the ability to make very thoughtful decisions in terms of those representing them in Parliament.

We also recognize that many young people aged 16 are working full time, or part time at least, as a result of supporting themselves through their senior level of school. As a result, they are subject to the minimum wage. At age 16 the minimum wage becomes effective. Again we recognize that particular age of change in a young person's life.

We also recognize that as these young people work, they need a full time or part time job, they are contributing to the unemployment insurance plan. They are paying their taxes if their incomes are of a particular level and contributing to society in a regular way.

I might say also that many young people take on responsibilities now that I am impressed with. I almost consider it to be awesome in terms of the way they approach their studies, the way they are involved in community groups and organizations and make contributions in very serious ways.

I have sat with friends of my sons and discussed national political issues only to be moved after hearing the extent to which these young people are aware of issues and how they are able to articulate their concerns, maturity, thoughtfulness and wisdom of the views that they hold. They are not necessarily always the same as my own.

I recognize that people view a particular item or an issue—nationally, internationally, even locally—with different biases. As a result, they have different views. But I have always been impressed with their ability to analyse.

It is fair to say that these days, as a result of the sophisticated educational programs, of the communications systems that enable young people to be instantaneously informed about issues around the globe, these young people are quite capable of deciding, if they wish, who ought to represent them in the nation's Parliament.

Some people react by saying: "These people are simply too young to make a decision. They are too inexperienced. They just do not have the background". I hate to say this, but not too many years ago people made those same claims about native people. It is almost one of our national disgraces when we think that it was only back in the 1950s when native people were permitted to vote. Again, a very dark mark on Canadian history.

If you look back at the debates of that time, people were saying: "Do native people have the information, experience and the background to make an intelligent decision?" Well, of course, they did and to even think about it and question it now would be an embarrassment.

Not too many years ago, on May 24, 1918, the decision was made to give women the vote. When you look back at those debates and those discussions, it was the same thing: "Are women able to make a serious decision?".

When we think back now, it is laughable to even think that those discussions took place.

When people scoff at or reject the idea outright that young people aged 16 and 17 are incapable of making a decision, let us remember that these same young people are capable of making decisions in terms of participating in the Armed Forces, participating as drivers on our highways, participating meaningfully in the workplace or entering into a state of matrimony.

For those reasons, Madam Speaker, I submit to you that we ought to consider changes to legislation in order to provide young people aged 16 and 17 an opportunity to vote in national elections. I can hardly pass without making the observation that, in all of the discussions I have had with young people who are interested in the state of affairs of the day, and I will acknowledge that many are not, young people do not lay awake night after night worrying about our trade with Bolivia or many of the other items that we concern ourselves with in this House, but many do. The fact is that many young people do take the issues before us and our national political agenda very seriously.

• (1410)

I must say that the times I have spent in discussions, either with clubs in schools or universities and informal and formal organizations across the country, these people are—and I am hesitant to say it but I think it is very true—much more informed than many people who are participating in the electoral process. I often wonder what it is that motivates people to cast ballots in certain directions. I think we probably are not as bad as the United States, but we see sort of creeping into our electoral system reasons for casting political decisions that are somewhat suspect in terms of their intellectual weight and wisdom.

However, it is time that we provide an opportunity for these young people ages 16 and 17 to vote. That is not saying that we require every person at age 16 to vote because many are not interested and perhaps do not feel an inclination to participate in the electoral process. But for those increasing numbers who do, who recognize that the decisions made in the House of Commons of Canada will have a profound effect on their lives, and I do not have to go any further than to refer to what we will do later today, that is the final stage of the implementation of the 7 per cent goods and services tax—

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Riis:** I recognize that my Conservative friends applaud the tax. They think this is a good idea. But I think when young people realize that every video they rent, every cassette they purchase, every time they get a haircut or go to the local movie theatre, buy hockey tickets, or whatever, they will pay a 7 per cent tax to the Mulroney government. Obviously, it will have a profound effect on their lives. If a young person works and spends hundreds and even thousands of dollars during the year, they will have to add a 7 per cent extra tax now to this federal government as a result of the goods and services tax that has been imposed on Canadians. This will have a very special impact on the lives of Canadian young people.

Whether you look at the tax system as it affects young people and the educational policy of the federal government in terms of their futures, colleges, universities and technical and vocational schools, whether you consider the support or lack of support by the federal government in terms of research and development, in terms of economic development, when you look at regional development programs and whether they create more jobs or result in job loss, these are all issues that most young people are very concerned about.

Post-secondary education. When you look, Mr. Speaker, at what the government is doing in terms of post-secondary education, this is a major implication for the young people of today. When you look at fiscal policy, monetary policy, foreign policy, social policy, they all directly affect the lives of our young people. They have a very serious vested interest in the future because they are going to live the rest of their lives there. For that reason, I believe it is appropriate that all of us recognize the value of this bill. It is something that I and my party have recommended to the Royal Commission on Electoral Reform, a Royal commission that toured the country earlier this year seeking input from various groups and political parties on necessary changes, and I am proud to say that it was the federal New Democratic Party that made this recommendation that when the changes to the electoral laws are drafted, consideration be given to have age 16 as the year where Canadians would be eligible to vote in federal elections.

I look forward to the support from my colleagues in the House of Commons from the Liberal Party, as well as the Progressive Conservative Party, and look forward to the day when we provide the opportunity for young people to be empowered so that they are involved in a serious meaningful way in deciding on the next federal government of Canada.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Guy Hudon (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I know that my speech will probably be interrupted by a number of knocks on the door later on, when we are asked to— I don't want to be rude and ask the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, when he comes from the Senate, to wait a minute—we have been waiting for quite some time—nor would I want the newspapers to report tomorrow that a masterful speech by the hon. member for Beauharnois was interrupted by a member of the Senate.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, since we are talking about the right to vote, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to one country in particular, Haiti, which next Sunday, will exercise its right to vote. I worked as chairman of the Commission of Inquiry on Haiti with my colleagues from Windsor—St. Clair, Papineau—Saint-Michel and Chicoutimi, and our friend Léo Duguay, who is no longer with us. I therefore want to wish Haiti good luck. I have visited the country and travelled there at least three times, and I know that to them it is extremely important. While we are discussing lowering the voting age from 18 to 16, they are anxious to exercise their franchise undisturbed, for once.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the motion presented by the hon. member for Kamloops concerning Bill C-332, whose purpose is to amend the Canada Elections Act.

Elections constitute the foundation of our political system and our democracy. It is the way we choose our governments and express the values that influence our public decision-making. That is why the right to vote is so important. I would first like to give a short history of the right to vote in Canada and then explain why the present voting age is 18.

In our first elections, which date back to the 18th century, the vote was limited to male property holders. From 1867 to 1920, the federal franchise was often manipulated in a blatantly partisan fashion by the political parties.

Until 1884, the federal franchise was based on provincial laws and included a property qualification, thus depriving large sections of the population of the right to vote.

During World War I, Canada adopted the War Time Elections Act and the Military Voters Act in 1917. These measures enfranchised members of the Canadian Armed Forces and their female relatives, while disenfranchising conscientious objectors and British subjects naturalized after 1902 who were born in an enemy country or habitually spoke an enemy language. We have come a long way since then.

In 1918, women were first granted the right to vote federally.

In 1920, Parliament adopted legislation establishing the right to vote across the country and thus constituting the foundation of our present system. In 1948, the last statutory disenfranchisement of Asians was removed. The federal franchise was extended to the Inuit in 1950 and to status Indians in 1960.

It is now 1990. Canada has matured as a democracy and as a nation. Under our Constitution, Mr. Speaker, Canada now has a virtually universal franchise. All Canadian citizens 18 years of age and older are eligible to vote. The only exceptions are federal judges, inmates of prisons and mental institutions, and any person disqualified for corrupt or illegal electoral practices. These exceptions are specified in the Canada Elections Act.

Mr. Speaker, the present voting age is 18. It was lowered from 21 to 18 in 1970, and I think we should look at the reasons why changes were made at the time and see whether they put a new perspective on today's debate.

Voting rights for young people were a major legislative concern in many countries at the end of the 1960s.

In the Throne Speech on October 23, 1969, why the voting age was lowered. And I quote:

> A disturbing element in many countries of the world has been the rising tide of unrest, particularly among young people. It has expressed itself in many ways, in public debate, in peaceful protest and sometimes in violence. Our profound disapproval of the excesses must not blind us to deeply felt and legitimate aspirations. Many citizens in our own country believe that they are entitled to assume greater responsability for the destiny of our society. Such demands, insofar as they do not

> conflict with the general welfare, are the expression of a truly democratic ideal. They must be satisfied if our society is to attain its goals of peace and justice.

• (1420)

This was taken from the Throne Speech read on October 23, 1969.

A look at the debate on lowering the voting age as reported in *Hansard* shows that the proposal was very well received in the House of Commons. In 1970, it was felt that lowering the voting age from 21 to 18 was both appropriate and inevitable. This meant that 1,200,000 young people would have the right to vote.

At the time, it was felt that these were students who were well informed, interested and intelligent, and very much concerned about the problems and injustice of this world. Courses in civics, political science and related disciplines were becoming increasingly widespread.

Many people expressed the view that these young people would have a major impact on Canadian governments and their policies, an impact that would be very beneficial to the Parliament of Canada and the entire country.

There were other reasons for this initiative, Madam Speaker. First of all, it was the logical outcome of a process that had been going on for quite some time, especially since the last World War when 18 year-olds had been given technical and often dangerous jobs. Originally, the right to vote was very restricted, in one way or another, and for many years it was considered a privilege of the elite. The age of 21 was considered the age of maturity. In 1970, however, circumstances changed considerably. The decision to lower the voting age reflected a desire to channel the enthusiasm and energy of young people and get them interested in the country's politics, the theory being that out of boredom they might otherwise create a disturbance and get involved in reckless and often subversive activities.

Mr. Mazankowski was also very much in favour of lowering the voting age to 18. On November 3, 1969, at page 427 in *Hansard* he said:

> We hear suggestions from our youth that political parties are irrelevant. They want more than mere participation at the polls at election time. They are looking for, a meaningful sense of participation. We in the various political parties all say that the future of our parties depends on the involvement of youth. But what are we doing to encourage the youth of this country to become more active in political affairs? I hope possession of the franchise will instil in them a real sense of enthusiasm for the building of this country; God bless us, there is a great deal to be done. I am sure it will lead to much the same enthusiasm as many of us experienced in our election campaigns last year.

The feeling in 1970 was that by lowering the electoral age of majority, the government was attracting young people to the centres of decision.

Madam Speaker, at the time parliamentarians were almost unanimous in their support for lowering the voting age from 21 to 18. Most people felt that 18 year-olds were well educated, socially responsible and capable of making their own political decisions.

It is clear that the voting age was lowered for two main reasons: 18-year-olds were considered to be sufficiently mature to take part in our electoral system, and it was also clear that young people between the ages of 18 and 21 were demanding a bigger say in the government's decision-making process.

Personally, Madam Speaker, and these will be my final comments, I think 18 is the right age to have the right to vote.

I don't have the impression society has changed to the extent that we should give young people between the ages of 16 and 18 the right to vote. And I don't think young people under 18 are demanding the right to vote.

Madam Speaker, I think the Canada Elections Act should remain unchanged and should not be amended to set the voting age below 18.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to take part in the debate this afternoon. The previous speaker certainly made a major contribution to this debate. The hon. member for Kamloops who presented the bill expressed an idea that may be new but is nevertheless in the general interest. I am proud to support his bill and I also want to thank the hon. member for Cape Breton—Richmond East who seconded the motion for second reading of the bill presented by the hon. member for Kamloops.

[*English*]

As election reform critic for this party, I had the opportunity to appear before the Royal Commission on

Electoral Reform and Party Financing in connection with its study of the electoral laws of Canada.

In the course of our party's presentation, in which I was a participant before that Royal commission, I was asked a question about lowering the age to age 16. I believe the New Democratic Party had been before the commission just before and had proposed the idea embodied in the bill that has been introduced since by the hon. member for Kamloops. I was asked my opinion of it, and I gave my opinion then.

I will give it again to this House. I am not opposed to reducing the voting age. It just seemed to me there was not a hue and cry in Canada for a reduction in the voting age. If the consensus in the population is that we should leave the voting age at age 18 and not lower it, then I would go along with that.

I said that quite deliberately before the commission. I am repeating my own words because I know the hon. member for Kamloops was not there to hear them. He may find these new. In my view the Canada Elections Act is probably the most public act of any in Canada, except the Constitution of course. In so far as Canadians are concerned, it is the act they feel most close to in terms of interest in it and the way it applies to them. During the course of every election campaign thousands and thousands of Canadians become aware of some provision or another of the Elections Act. It touches our lives very directly. It may only be at specified intervals, every four or five years, but the fact is it does touch our lives at those times in a most direct way. Canadians have a very real interest in the Canada Elections Act and feel more possessive, I suggest, toward that act than almost any other that has been adopted or could be adopted in this Parliament.

For that reason, public input on this issue is vital. The royal commission is doing studies. The royal commission, I am sure, will be conducting some surveys in determining what Canadians feel about various aspects of the electoral law. I look forward to reading those surveys and to seeing the studies that are conducted by the commission before finally making up my mind on this issue. I believe this issue will be before Parliament, not just in the form of the bill introduced by the hon. member for Kamloops but in a comprehensive bill to amend the Canada Elections Act which I believe will be forthcoming from the Royal commission. At that time, if the commission proposes a voting age of any number, I am sure that there will be a committee of this House studying the matter, returning to this House and asking us to approve or not the change in the voting age.

I hope that the hon. member for Kamloops, should this bill not have been passed by the time the Royal commission report comes to Parliament, would propose his amendment again at that stage so that we could discuss it and make a decision on it. It is important that the elected representatives of people make a decision, having heard the views of their constituents and of the public. I certainly would be interested in hearing those views. I would welcome correspondence on the issue at any time.

My impression—and I stress that it is an impression—is that there is not much clamour for a reduction of the age from 18 to any other age, be it 16, younger or older. There is general satisfaction with the age of 18 as is currently the case in the law.

I was interested to look back at the *Debates* when the voting age was lowered. When I was 18 years of age, I could not vote. I had to wait until I was 21, which dates me somewhat. I believe it was 1970 that the voting age was lowered to 18 from 21. There was a debate in this House about the act at that time. I ran across a quotation which was against lowering of the age, and it was a view that did not prevail. I want to quote it because it was a very distinguished member of Parliament who was a neighbour of mine. He was the member for Frontenac—Lennox—Addington. His successor in this House would be the hon. member for Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington. Mr. Alkenbrack was the member at that time. He made a speech on this very subject. I would like to quote from his speech at page 7461 of *Hansard* for May 28, 1970:

> I am opposed, however, to lowering the age limit to 18 for those who stand for public office. I do not agree we have to go that far to show our young people that we are with them and that we think it is time for them to become active in government. No man or woman who has just reached the age of 18 has had a chance to receive either a full education or an appreciable degree of practical experience.

• (1430)

I do not necessarily share the views of the hon. member who spoke, but it is obvious that the people of Canada, by and large, shared that view. I do not believe an 18 year-old has yet been elected to hold a position in this House, although we have had some fairly young

members, none have been that young. Although the age has been lowered—

**Mr. Malone:** I was.

**Mr. Milliken:** Is the hon. member suggesting he was 18 when he was elected? I find it hard to believe. I did not realize he had been here so long.

**Mr. Malone:** In the last election.

**Mr. Milliken:** In the last election? There was one who was 18 who was elected? The hon. member is trying to suggest he was 18 in the last election. I appreciate that and I wish it were so for all of us. It is not quite the fact.

Given that, I think that the public at large makes some choice in deciding who will represent the public in Parliament. The preference seems to be for persons who are older than 18. There have been 21 year-olds elected, I am aware of that and there were some in the sixties. But it is unusual to have them as young as 18 years of age.

The other thing that was interesting going back in that debate in 1970 was to find out why the age of majority was put where it was, at age 21 at that time. It has been lowered to age 18 since.

I came across an interesting quotation in the debate at page 7399 of *Hansard* on May 27, 1970. The member who was speaking quoted from Holdsworth's "History of English Law". The quotation is from that. It is not really from the *Hansard* of that date but the speaker on that occasion used it. I would like to read the short section:

> In Roman law young people were divided, like Gaul, into three parts. First, there was *infantia* which was ultimately fixed as under 7—it is perhaps ironical that it is this word whose descendant has come to be used in our law for everyone under 21—

Of course, that has been changed by statute to 18.

> Roman historians state that the barbarians reckoned their young were old enough to carry arms and be counted as grown up at 15. And 15 became the general age of majority in Britain and northern Europe during the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries, though not specifically linked with fighting ability. But by the time of the Norman Conquest there was a change of emphasis. The role of the mounted knight became more and more important, the armour heavier and heavier and the horses more enormous as time went on. By the time of Magna Carta the age for those holding in knight service had been raised to 21 and there is strong authority for the view that this was directly linked with the ability to hold up a heavy suit of armour and lift a lance or sword at the same time.

Perhaps that is an explanation of how we got to 21. Perhaps hearing that explanation our legislators in 1970 decided that 18 was a more appropriate age. In any event, that is the age we now have.

The hon. member for Kamloops and the members of his party have evidently, in convention, voted to lower the age to 16. I know this is party policy. I assume it was adopted at a convention.

The hon. member has introduced this bill. I am pleased to support it in principle at second reading in order to allow for the matter to be studied in committee in this House where I hope the committee could review the provisions, hear from the public, and ultimately recommend the bill back to the House or not, with or without changes. I am happy to assist in seeing that the bill go to committee. I believe it is one that should be studied and then, if we choose to deal with it in a different way at third reading, we can each make up our own mind, having heard the evidence and having looked at the views of the people of Canada who, I think, will have something to say on this important subject. Those are a few thoughts on the matter.

I should add one more caveat about the Royal commission. The hon. member for Kamloops has this bill to amend the Canada Elections Act before this House. I also have introduced a substantial bill to amend the Canada Elections Act in a more comprehensive way. I have urged the government to accede to a request to refer all of these bills to a committee for study so that we can make a significant number of amendments to the existing Canada Elections Act, in order to have it in shape for the next election.

I have stated before and I will state again my concern that the Royal commission is not going to report in time to allow this House to deal with its report and make the changes to the Canada Elections Act that are necessary, if we are to run another election properly in Canada. I believe that, notwithstanding the very good intention of the Royal commission we, in this House, need to take the Canada Elections Act very seriously, look at it in a serious way and effect changes to it on a prompt basis, if

we are going to be able to run an election in this country without having the courts make the decisions that should be made in this House and in this Parliament.

So I urge hon. members to look through the Order Paper, study the 10 or so bills that have been introduced to amend this act, and see if agreement could not be achieved to refer those bills to a committee for study and to see if we could not get unanimous agreement among members of the House to adopt those bills as a means of effecting a reform of our electoral law.

**Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot):** Madam Speaker, every once in a while when Canadians have come to the conclusion that this place cannot get any more foolish, that this House of Commons cannot get any more silly, when no member anywhere in the Parliament of Canada can come up with a more ridiculous idea, along comes the member of the New Democratic Party and saves us all from that notion that there is no bottom.

What we have before us today is the proposal that we lower the voting age to 16. The argument put forward was that there are capable people at age 16 who know how to vote. I want to say to the hon. member for Kamloops: He is absolutely right.

But, having said that he is absolutely right, exactly the same argument can be made for 15 year-olds, 14 year-olds, 13 year-olds, 12 year-olds, and 10 year-olds. There are, here and there, though in diminishing numbers, people of lower and lower ages who have the capacity to make the intellectual judgments about the running of the country and who are every bit as capable as an adult. But I submit that is not the question. One of the roots of the question here is whether or not we have a right, in this society, to make arbitrary judgments. We make arbitrary judgments in many things. We make arbitrary judgments in respect of our driving patterns and our driving laws in this country.

If the NDP would admit for a moment that we should remove those, then we would take down the stop signs which, arbitrarily, tell people at an intersection that they have to stop, look both ways, and then proceed. It is absolutely arbitrary in North America and in much of Europe today that you drive on the right-hand side of the road. We cannot justify that it is better to drive on the right-hand side than the left-hand side.

So the question really comes to, why do we have a voting age that is defined in any process at all. I think most Canadians would start from the presumption that you have to, in a free and democratic society as is granted by the Charter of Rights but within the reason of democratic capacity to put some judgment to it, not allow everybody from birth to vote. That simply means that you would then have a situation where the adult in that family would bear more influence if they had more children because they would exercise their vote through their children.

When we come to these questions as to whether or not young people ought to be able to vote under a certain age, it seems to me that it is appropriate to ask the question: what was the first principle of Parliament? The first principle of Parliament, some 730 years ago, was to control the King's purse. From the first principle, it has remained the most important principle every since. The most important reason why we assemble here is to control the expenditures of Parliament. That is what Parliament is about. It is about controlling public expenditures. There is no principle more important than that.

• (1440)

The truth of the matter is, in today's society, persons age 16 by law are not supposed to be obtaining permanent work. Yes, they get part-time work and they will work in some places with some dominance such as McDonald's fast food outlets, but they are unable to enter into contract. It seems to me that, at an age where they cannot enter into marriage of their own judgment, cannot enter into contract, cannot take on permanent work, that it is not the kind of life experience that then allows them to come to Parliament or to vote in Parliament for the question of asking the process: "Should I or should I not be able to make a judgment *vis-à-vis* the question of the public accounts of Canada?"

This silly idea of lowering the age simply because we know some people who are capable begs the question as to how far down do we go. Like the hon. member for Kamloops, I too could name those people in equal numbers to him. I do not know where we would stop but

I know of 10 year-olds whose capacity to comprehend Parliament astounds me and for which I give them tremendous credit.

Is Canada better if we open up that process? Is there not also to be viewed a notion that democracy itself is to be so cherished and so privileged that there may well be a benefit from the waiting period and that we come to a level of maturity, understanding, experience, and economic relationships before we are able to exercise our right to vote and to influence our country?

Surely, it seems that if we lower—and for the same reasons that the hon. member for Kamloops said today, I could lower it another year next year—I do not know how low we could go, but I think we could go a long way down and still justify it on the same basis. Is this notion of the vote to have no criteria attached or no privilege? The best judgments might well come from those who have had to observe and experience for a while before exercising their franchise.

I might say, as an aside, if I were to give the hon. member for Kamloops an award—as the hon. member for Nickel Belt would do—for the most foolish idea of the year, the first runner-up would be the Reform Party who I would presume would want to have the voting age raised to age 65.

We talk about this arbitrariness in, for example, driving cars or consuming alcohol. In my province of Alberta, the legal age for the consumption of alcohol is 18. In the province we are in at this moment, Ontario, it is 19. Those are two arbitrary ages and they are different. We know that there are persons who probably could consume modest amounts of alcohol at younger ages without harm, and there are some of them at the age of 53 years, or some other age, who may not be able to consume alcohol, wherever they may be, or ought not, or should not, and never will be able to.

We make those arbitrary decisions in life. We make them about entering into contract.

There are persons who are 18 years of age who should not enter into contract. We say they can because they are 18. There is no other reason. They lose their shirt and everything. It may very well be that, if they had waited until the age 30, they would still have lost their shirts.

There are historical examples of people who entered into business when they were 14. E.B. Eddy, who started across the river here, is one Canadian example. At 14 years of age he entered into the business world. Sir John A. Macdonald was a lawyer when he was 16 years of age. Nevertheless we take society as we see it in the broad overview.

I want to come to another aspect of this question which I think should cause us to pause and reflect. What is the value of youth? What is the value of being a child? Is there not to be a period in our lives when we are carefree, when we have fun, and when we can take life from the imagery and imagination of being youthful, doing those kinds of things ought to be set aside for the purpose of children. They ought not to bear the burden of the workplace. They ought not to bear the burden of raising incomes. They ought not to bear the burden of having to vote or run for public office.

I submit for all the arguments that the hon. member for Kamloops used today to have the voting age go down, the same argument would be just as valid for 15 and 14 year-olds, perhaps even for 12 or 10 years of age. But somewhere along that line we encroach on something more important. We encroach on childhood, young adolescence, and on that period where there ought to be a time for not bearing the burden of the adult world. I submit the development of a human body is as important to protect as is the extension of rights that they ought to vote.

Give children the chance to have time to play. They grow up too fast now. Physical relations are too soon now. Alcohol consumption is too soon now. Why go one step further to ask that they now bear the burden of public office when they can bear in just two years later at the next election. Eighteen years is not a long time to wait to be granted for life the chance to run for public office, to vote, and to take part.

No one is doubting their capacity or their ability. It simply is a better approach to say: "Let them be children as long as they might".

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Marc Ferland (Portneuf):** Madam Speaker, this afternoon I would also like to speak to the important tonic raised by the hon. member for Kamloops. Of course, it sounds good to say we will set the voting age at 16 instead of 18.

I remember—it seems it was only yesterday—when we were eligible to vote at 21. Most members of this House will recall that they all voted for the first time at the age of 21.

In the 70s, the voting age was lowered to 18. I have noticed, and I am not saying this is due to the fact that the voting age was lowered to 18, that we have had a number of problems since then which I intend to address here. Since the 1970s, parents seem to have shown progressively less interest in their children.

We often hear people say: "You are 18 now, so pick up your things and go and live your own life". This may be due to the fact that at that age they are now considered to be adults. Before, we used to hear this when a young person turned 21. They use to say: "At 21 you can stand on your own two feet, so go out and live on your own". Now this is being said to 18 year-olds. And across Canada, we see all the problems that young people are having. I very much agree with what the previous speaker said: Why do we want to take away the right of our young people to be young? I think that at 16, young people want to be young. They do not want to have more responsibilities than they can handle. At 16 they want to enjoy their youth.

• (1450)

My son is 20, and when he was eligible to vote, at 18—his first time was in 1988—he told me: "I am proud to have this responsibility but I think it is a little too soon". He said: "I may be privileged in having parents who helped me over the years to find out about the history of my country". He didn't necessarily learn all this in school. We told him about the history of our country. In any case, he felt better prepared than some of the kids in his group. He often told me: "Dad, lots of kids at my school went to vote, and they didn't even know why they were voting or who they were voting for". They had not yet developed an interest in government. They didn't realize what being eligible to vote was all about. In fact, it is a major, fundamental responsibility.

When I look at the way parents react and how they perceive their relationship with their children, I wonder whether we should really encourage this trend so that soon, parents will be saying: You are 16? Good. You are eligible to vote, so you can leave home and stand on your own two feet. I am not so sure a 16-year-old would be able to stand on his own two feet and make his way through life and support himself. That just isn't so. I never believed that and I still do not. I do not think we, as parliamentarians, have the right to take away from our youngsters the right to be young and to have time to mature and to develop their personality.

It seems the hon. member's proposal comes in response to demands made by young people. There are young people in my riding, 15 and 16 year-olds, who are extremely mature. But they are the minority. And where do we find these young people? In all political organizations across the country, whether they are NDP, Liberal or Conservative. They come and they start learning how democracy works. They learn to work within the electoral process in a riding. They gradually form an opinion on how a country should be administered and governed. But they get this opportunity at the age of 12, 13, 14, 15 or 16. I agree that as they get more involved in the political process, they become increasingly anxious to vote. Well, they are eligible to vote at 18. People say: "Sure, but they can drive a car at 16".

I am still not convinced that letting a young man or a young girl of 16 get behind the wheel of an automobile is the best decision we could make in our lives. I am not sure that young people of that age are all very mature. I am not saying that they are all immature, but I am not convinced they all have the same level of maturity. Maybe 1 out of 100 or 10 out of 100 are mature enough to be allowed behind the wheel of an automobile. A car is just as dangerous as a firearm if you don't know how to use it. However, we cannot say yes to some and no to others. I am not convinced it was a very good idea to give them the right to drive at this age.

I remember that when the voting age was lowered to 18, people said that if they were old enough to vote, they were also old enough to have a pint in a tavern. So, naturally, the drinking age was also lowered from 21 to 18. I remember distinctly that I had my first beer in a public place at 21 years of age. If you were caught drinking under age then, you would get into serious trouble with the police, but mostly with your parents.

At 18, it's all right. You are capable of voting and you are capable of controlling your drinking. At 16, I am not so sure people are mature enough to assess their drinking capacity and keep it within reasonable limits as we say. I am not convinced.

I have hardly a minute left, Madam Speaker, so I will conclude by saying that the idea is interesting and that many of our young people of 16 or 17 are indeed mature enough to vote wisely, but not to assume all the other responsibilities associated with that right. With a decision like this we, parliamentarians, would deprive a lot of our young people of two years of their youth, two years which they could enjoy freely without all these new responsibilities. The right to vote is the most important right given to an individual in Canada, and that right must be assumed.

I remember the first time I was told: "Mr. Ferland, you will be voting at such a place". When I entered the booth the first time to mark my ballot, I was quite nervous. It was a big responsibility. I did not spoil my ballot. I made my choice and I knew very well what the consequences were. Why impose such pressures on our young people? I think they have enough pressures as it is, in our society, without adding this new burden two years too soon.

[*English*]

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Peace River):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to enter into this debate for a couple of minutes. I think that the issue before us is an issue that has obviously been one debated simply not in the House, but across the country. In fact I can remember as a 16–year–old myself taking a look at this issue and thinking it was an important issue and that I was mature and therefore I should have the right to vote and that I, as a young and responsible member of society, ought to have an opportunity to express my opinion on who should lead the country. I do not think I was unique in that.

I can remember several of my friends at the time being quite excited at the prospect of being able to vote at a younger age. Of course at that time it was very much tied to the question of the consumption and purchase of alcohol. At that time in the province of Alberta, one had to be 21 years of age in order to buy alcohol. Of course, many a 16 year old to 19 year old very much felt that that was the kind of thing they should be entitled to do. We would get into these long and great philosophical discussions about the importance of the issue.

I in fact believe that this issue is important enough that I move:

*Private Members' Business*

That this House continue to sit beyond the ordinary hour of adjournment for the purpose of continuing consideration of the second reading stage of government Bill C–332, an act to amend the Canada Elections Act.

**Mr. Milliken:** I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker. The item under consideration is not a government order. The standing order that my colleague has referred to permits him to move that the government business under consideration be considered after the adjournment, but it does not allow for Private Members' Business to be extended in this way. I submit therefore that his motion is out of order, since this particular bill is not a government bill. It is Private Members' Business.

**Mr. Cooper:** Madam Speaker, first, I think my friend is not accurate. I am a private member, the same as are other members of this House. We have an opportunity to participate in a debate such as this one. This is an important issue in which a number of members of the House would like to participate. It is very clear that in fact the situation would allow members to rise to participate in this debate and to extend the sitting of this House to allow that participation.

In fact, what we see is an issue that is important to a number of Canadians. Madam Speaker, my hon. friend from Kamloops has picked an issue. He has put that into the draw. He felt that issue was important enough to warrant his time and the time of the House. In fact, that is what happened. The issue was drawn.

• (1500)

There were a number of members rising when I rose to speak. My colleague from Surrey—White Rock was rising to speak as well. So, you can see, Madam Speaker, that there are several people who are keenly interested in this bill. I think we should have an opportunity to continue at second reading.

It is very clear that if we look at the whole issue you will find that this is not a unique request. In fact, there is a precedent established by my hon. friend's colleague, the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway. On another issue during Private Members' Business at another time, the hon. member rose to request that this House have an opportunity to continue the debate on the issue that was before the House in Private Members' Business at that time.

If my memory serves me correctly, in fact what happened is that there were not 15 members rising to dispose of the motion. As a result, the debate did continue on for some time and a number of members were able to then put their opinions on the record. As a result of that, ultimately the House came to divide.

My memory fails me as to the particular issue, but you will find that in this circumstance, and as you know, there were members rising. There were members who wanted to participate in this debate. I do not believe that we are involved in anything unique here. I think we have every right to move this motion. We have every right to request that this House not see the clock for the next little while to allow two or three other members who would like to make an intervention have every right and every opportunity to participate in this debate. It is important to all of us who are elected to this House, because this question has much more significance to us, because it—

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ferland:** A point of order, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** On the same point of order? The hon. member for Portneuf.

**Mr. Ferland:** Very briefly, Madam Speaker. I am amazed that my colleague from Kingston and the Islands would hesitate to extend the debate, for he was in favour of this motion. I doubt that my colleague from Kamloops would also refuse his consent since this is his motion.

Madam Speaker, a number of my colleagues in the House want to speak to this important motion concerning the young people of this country. I am really amazed to see that my colleague from Kingston and the Islands does not want to extend the debate, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member seems to be getting into debate right now.

[*English*]

**Mr. Riis:** Madam Speaker, what we are doing is highly out of order. Standing Order 26(1) makes it perfectly clear that what is going on now is unacceptable, and I suggest, Madam Speaker, that you call it three o'clock immediately.

**Mr. Hughes:** Madam Speaker, on the same point of order, and following up on the points that were made by my colleague from northwestern Alberta, I believe that there are several members here who would like to speak to this very important issue. I am one. The member has legitimately put forth the intention and the interest in that proceeding. On that basis, I just want to let you know that there are other members here who have speeches prepared and are prepared to proceed. I just want to bring that to your attention.

**Mr. Friesen:** Madam Speaker, you did recognize me to speak on this subject at about four minutes to the hour, so I think you understand that I was prepared and willing and wanting to speak on this motion.

It does seem strange to me that the members opposite who now want to call it three o'clock are the same members who usually complain that there is not enough debate.

Here we are giving them an opportunity to debate an issue that obviously is of some interest to our colleague from Kamloops.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry, I must interrupt the hon. member.

Reading Standing Order 26(1), it does say: "except during Private Members' Business." This motion can be moved, but not during Private Members' Business.

Standing Order 24(3) tells us the time of adjournment of the House.

I am in the hands of the House. Should the House give unanimous consent for this debate to go on as long as the hon. members want it to, I am quite prepared to extend the sitting.

**Mr. Cooper:** Madam Speaker, I do not think this is a matter of consent.

I think that we have very clearly on our records in this House of Commons the right, as was established not by members sitting on the government side or even members sitting in the Official Opposition, but in fact by a member who had sat in the very party of the hon. member for Kamloops. He in fact moved this, and it was accepted by this House.

I would ask that, at a very minimum, before you make a ruling, Madam Speaker, what you would do is take the time to look up that precedent. It is very crucial. We do not want to do anything that is contrary to the rules. Far from that. In fact, it is very important to us that we go by the precedents that have been established in this House.

As I said, to help the Chair, I want to indicate to the Chair that it was a motion moved, I believe, by the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway. I guess the thing that I find really surprising is that the hon. member for Kamloops, whose bill we are debating here at the moment, is not jumping up to his feet to support me.

It is his bill. We want to support him in it. We want to be with him, talk to him about it, encourage him and maybe even look at some amendments. It is very crucial.

**Mr. Friesen:** There was a precedent.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** There was a precedent.

When the Standing Orders were rewritten, the fact that during Private Members' Business it cannot be done was added at that time. Unfortunately, it is in our new rules and I cannot at this time do anything else.

**Mr. Cooper:** Madam Speaker, I did not hear. You said they changed the rules.

**An hon. member:** It is three o'clock.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** On June 3, 1987, a prohibition was adopted against moving motions under Standing Order 26 during Private Members' Business.

**Some hon. members:** It is three o'clock.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Madam Speaker, the House by unanimous consent at all times can do what the House chooses to do. On other occasions, a division is required so the expressed intent and the will of the majority of the members in the House can prevail. Given the present argument that has been going on about whether or not the House should continue, my colleague has tempted to use a specific part of our rules of order.

I would like to move that this House continue this sitting this day until a majority of the members of the House agree with an adjournment motion put by a minister of the Crown.

I would like to present that motion, seconded by—

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry, I must interrupt the hon. member. Such a motion would require a 48–hour notice. I think the hon. member knows that. The motion is not receivable. It would require a 48–hour notice.

Is there unanimous consent for this debate to continue?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

[*Translation*]

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** There being no unanimous consent I must say that the time allocated for the consideration of Private Members' Business has expired.

Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1), this order is dropped from the Order Paper.

It being three o'clock p.m., this House stands adjourned until Monday next at one o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 3.12 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Monday, December 17, 1990**

The House met at 1 p.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

[*English*]

## THE ROYAL ASSENT

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order. I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

December 17, 1990

Mr. Speaker,

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable John Sopinka, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, the 17th day of December, 1990, at 3.30 p.m., for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain bills.

Yours sincerely,
Judith A. LaRocque
Secretary to the Governor General

Pursuant to Standing Order 36, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

# PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—MOTIONS

[*English*]

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

GOVERNMENT PRIORITY

**Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Miramichi)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider means of ensuring that regional development remains a priority in all decisions to be made by the government.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity today to debate my motion on regional development. I know that this question has been addressed in the past on numerous occasions, but it seems that it will have to be debated over and over again for the regions of this country actually to see any benefits.

It is especially important now because the regions of this country feel a sense of alienation like never before. Whether it is in western Canada, in the north, in northern Ontario, in northern or eastern Quebec or in Atlantic Canada, these regions have one thing in common. They feel that their government in Ottawa has forgotten about them, and they feel that Ottawa does not care. This is a tragedy.

This is what is slowly killing the heart of our country. Whatever I can do to contribute to reversing this disastrous trend, I will gladly do. This situation has become particularly critical with the Conservative administration.

This government, as we all know, is running the country like a corporation, putting principles like corporate profits and good balance sheets ahead of the interests of people. It is not even doing that well.

As Atlantic Canadians have always known, when the national government operates purely on economic efficiency principles the regions are bound to suffer. The centrepiece, the *raison d'être* of the Conservative government's two mandates, is the so-called free trade agreement. With this agreement, Canada is now in a position where it cannot make regional development a priority. It cannot do that because the FTA is basically a bill of rights for the corporate giants, and their objectives become the priorities of this government without questioning.

• (1310)

What the corporate giants basically want, besides free access to our natural resources, is the creation of a level playing field which would use the American standard as a model. Therefore, on behalf of corporate America, the Conservative government is presently well on its way to changing Canadian standards to bring them down to those of the U.S.

This means that our social programs are being destroyed one by one and that anything considered a subsidy by corporate America is being dismantled. The federal government's financial involvement in creating

the circumstances which will enhance regional development is considered a subsidy by corporate America.

Even though the Prime Minister had vowed that free trade would not hurt the regions and that regional equality would be one of the benefits of the deal, there is convincing evidence that his heartless, big business oriented agenda is a betrayal of the Canadian concept of regional equality.

I would like to summarize the main consequences of this so-called free trade agreement on Atlantic Canada. When most of the country was well out of the 1982 recession, Atlantic Canada was still struggling. Instead of helping our region, the present government has made it worse. Many Atlantic Canadians believe that this situation is the result of vengeance by the Tory government and the Prime Minister, in particular, toward the citizens of this country who had the foresight to vote Liberal in the last election. Something that has really put our development in jeopardy has been the dismantling of our transportation system.

**Mr. Belsher:** Can you say that with a straight face?

**Mr. Dionne:** Yes, with a very straight face, and I could wipe the grin off yours too, maybe before this is over.

Privatization, deregulation and cuts in subsidies have sadly diminished our ability to transport people and goods in and out of Atlantic Canada, creating a situation where continuing development becomes extremely difficult.

The air transport companies are now in private hands. They operate wherever they choose, which is where the bigger profits are, and as a consequence smaller communities are losing an essential means of transportation or are left with second-class service. And the worst is yet to come.

Rail transportation is also under attack. We have witnessed the decimation of VIA Rail. On top of losing 447 jobs, maritimers now have only one Atlantic train, a combination of the Ocean and the Atlantic, from Halifax to Montreal six times weekly. We also lost the Halifax-Yarmouth run, the Halifax-Sydney, the Halifax-Port Hawkesbury, the Moncton-Campbellton-Edmunston, the Halifax-Moncton-Saint John routes. Moreover, we lost a bus route on to Prince Edward Island that links the province to VIA at Moncton.

By failing to promote an efficient rail transportation system the Tories are putting additional pressure on our roads, which will need major improvements since more truck traffic is evident on all of the highways in this country. The subsidies to railways for moving export grain and flour to eastern ports were also cancelled. The Atlantic Provinces Transportation Commission estimates that $14.4 million in activity will be lost to the region because of the termination of the At and East program. Should both Atlantic grain elevators be unable to continue their operations, which is likely, the resulting negative impact would be somewhere in the vicinity of $34.3 million.

The decision made by this government following the free trade agreement has resulted in the crippling of our transportation system which needed improvement and without which sustainable development for our region becomes impossible.

One good idea that this government has put in place, I must say, is ACOA. The good thing about this agency was that it was set up in the region. It was staffed by people of the region, and these people were making decisions on something that they knew.

Originally, the ACOA budget was $1.05 billion for five years, an humble investment but an investment nevertheless. The problem is that the Tory government found a way to turn a good thing into a bad one. The Prime Minister has a real talent for that.

With its incentive right wing agenda, it decided to spread the amount over seven years instead of five, which means a cut of 28 per cent. One of the consequences of these cuts is that ACOA officials have to deal with too many cases at the same time, which does not permit the proper counselling to allow success to happen as quickly as it should. People are becoming more and disillusioned with the program and are losing faith, which is a sad commentary on this government's record.

The Conservative government has also signed co-operation agreements with the Atlantic provinces. The agreements replace the economic regional development agreements that were put in place by the Liberal government. The result for Atlantic Canada is a loss of more than $300 million. We could surely use that amount of development in these tough times. We need it badly

to build an economic structure without which we will never be able to contribute positively to the wealth of the country.

The Conservative government is also cutting transfer payments to the Atlantic Canada. This means cuts to medicare and post-secondary education, which is totally unacceptable. There has been $17.7 million cut this year and $37 million will be cut next year. This is what Tories call progress.

On top of that, with its fiscal and monetary policies designed to suppress inflation concentrated in southern Ontario by high interest rates and an artificially high dollar which again come directly from the free trade deal, the Tory government has been killing jobs at an alarming pace in Atlantic Canada and in the rest of the country.

This is without mentioning the closing down of rural post offices, the cuts to CBC, to Radio-Canada, the mismanagement of the fisheries, and the delay in the Hibernia project.

Once the table is set for an economic and social disaster, what does the government do? It cuts our unemployment insurance program. Approximately 77,500 Atlantic Canadians will see a net loss in UI benefits this year. This could not have come at a worse time. Unemployment insurance has always been seen as a means for the federal government to achieve rough equality across the country and buffer sections of the regions experiencing hardship.

What is totally unacceptable once again is that corporate America believes our federal government's support of the UI program constitutes a subsidy and therefore presents an unfair advantage to Canadian companies and employers. The Tory government decided to lower our standards to U.S. levels. Now the total cost of the program will be borne by employees and employers and those who will suffer are the people and the regions of this country. Atlantic Canada will be especially hard hit.

• (1320)

I could go on talking about the mess which the Tory government, acting on behalf of the interests of corporate America, has inflicted on Atlantic Canada. What we have to do now is think of solutions. Are there any? I believe there are. Yes, there is a solution but only if there is political will.

Let us take a quick look at what the parties are offering as solutions. There seems to be a consensus that an effective regional development policy is vital for Canada. Unfortunately, however, no one seems to agree on how to accomplish this goal, primarily because no one seems to agree on what an effective regional development policy should be.

Let us take a look at the views that have been expressed in this House. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that examination of the varying approaches to regional development will reveal the strength of the Liberal Party's perspective.

The NDP has made it clear that it disagrees with current government policy on regional development. It is argued that we should go back to the way things were, when we had the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. It is argued that we must have a holistic approach to regional development. In order to develop such an approach, the NDP calls for the creation of a standing committee and a specific government department to deal with regional development. This department's mandate would cover the whole gambit of economic development in a certain region. For example, transportation, fisheries and economic development would be looked at as a whole rather than in isolation.

On this basis, the NDP has expressed its dissatisfaction with the government's decentralized approach to regional development. The creation of ACOA, for example, has been criticized. It is argued that its power and its mandate are far too limited and that the interests of Atlantic Canada would perhaps best be served if there was a department set up in Ottawa.

The Conservatives, on the other hand, defend their policies by saying that ACOA is effective precisely because it is centred in Atlantic Canada where Atlantic Canadians can play a leading role in determining what it does and how it functions. Moreover, they point out that even though the ACOA headquarters is located in Moncton, there are regional offices in each of the provincial capitals as well as Ottawa.

There are valid points made by both the New Democrats and even by the Conservatives. However, there are numerous misleading and, permit me to say, false statements as well. The view of the Liberal Party is based on a combination of the valid points and the elimination of the false ones. The NDP approach to regional development is regressive. The Conservative approach is corporatist. There seems to be a consensus that an effective regional development policy is vital for Canada. Un-

fortunately, however, no one seems to agree on how to accomplish this goal primarily because no one seems to agree on what an effective regional development policy should be.

Let us take a look at the views that have been expressed in the House. I am convinced that examination of the varying approaches to regional development will reveal the strength of the Liberal Party's perspective.

The NDP has made it clear that it disagrees with current government policy on regional development. It is argued that we should go back to the way things were before.

On this basis, the NDP expressed its dissatisfaction with the government's decentralized approach to regional development. The creation of ACOA, for example, has been criticized.

The Conservatives, on the other hand, defend their policies by saying that ACOA is effective precisely because it is centred in Atlantic Canada where Atlantic Canadians can play a lead role in determining what it does and how it functions. Moreover, they point out that even though the ACOA headquarters is located in Moncton, as I said earlier, there are regional offices.

The Liberals believe that if Canada is to be competitive, it is essential that regional development policies and public investment decisions be a fundamental part of national economic policy. We believe that this country needs the advantages to be gained from strong regional economies.

We believe that economic growth in the next two decades will be highly focused on knowledge and service-based activities. Industries will depend for their success upon an educated and productive labour force and upon cost-effective communications systems for the transfer of data and new knowledge. There will be no need to restrict these industries to the industrial heartland of Canada. Quality of life, communication services, personal transportation and information processing facilities will be dominant factors in determining where business in the future prospers.

We believe that the Canadian government can create the conditions that can attract knowledge-based and resource-based industries to slow growth areas of Canada, such as Atlantic Canada. In other words, we believe that it is possible to do the opposite of what is being done today by this Tory government.

Well-planned public investments can stimulate private sector investments. We want to direct public investment to slow growth areas. Atlantic Canada, in particular, still requires strong investment to develop further its basic infrastructure. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian government not only can intervene, but must intervene to achieve that end which will enable Atlantic Canada to eventually become a contributor to our national wealth.

**Some hon. members:** Time.

**Mr. Dionne:** Our leader, the Hon. Jean Chrétien, has already demonstrated this kind of leadership when as President of the Treasury Board in the mid 1970s, he put together a comprehensive government decentralization program—

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please! I will ask the hon. member to wind up his speech, because his time is up.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dionne:** Thirty seconds, Mr. Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Thirty seconds.

**Mr. Dionne:** Thank you. Our leader, the Hon. Jean Chrétien has already demonstrated the kind of leadership when he was President of the Treasury Board. More than 10,000 jobs were created. That can be done all over again.

**Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Mr. Speaker, in the short time that we have today to comment on the motion of this hon. member, I think it is important to put some information on the record and talk about what I think we can do in this country for regional development.

The motion is one that we can support, but I suspect that because of the way it is written the hon. member was perhaps being devious. He expects the government members to rise and support this motion as well.

**Mr. Dionne:** I am not expecting anything from the government.

**Mr. Gardiner:** He is not expecting anything from the government. Well, I suppose, it is what we have come to expect of the Conservatives.

He made some comments that bear some attention. What he was starting to get at was the whole question of hit and miss of regional development that we have had so far in this country under both the Liberals and the Conservatives. I would like to comment on some of the general programs of the government that act as regional development and some of the specific regional development initiatives that governments have taken. I would like to comment on the number of key agreements to date where the government clearly has failed.

• (1330)

Let us take a look at one of the general ways of regional development, VIA Rail. There is no question that all Canadians know that this current government, and the previous government under the Liberals, have not provided the leadership necessary to see that we develop a full-fledged, well run and well maintained VIA Rail network across the country.

The hon. member spoke about his leader when he was in office. What I remember when the Liberals were in office was how they cut up VIA Rail in the same way the Conservatives have done. The member also talked about the importance of developing an education policy that ensures the workers in our industries and workplaces develop the skills and technical ability necessary to compete in the world today. One of the ways to do that is through post-secondary education.

It is important to point out that for all the support hon. members have given post-secondary education, there is a very serious concern in provinces where, you will recall, Mr. Speaker, under the Liberals' six and five program, it took away the ruling that any federal transfer funds on health and post-secondary education had to be spent on that. Now we have to rely on trust.

I asked the Secretary of State if he could tell us whether federal funds meant for health and post-secondary education are being spent on that in the province of British Columbia. The minister would have to trust us that it is. It is an example of some of the ways in which the previous Liberal government allowed some of the provinces—and the allegations have been made in British Columbia—to spend money meant for health and education to pave highways. That is not the kind of regional development policy that we want in this country.

As well, let us take a look at some of the specific programs aimed at regional development. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the primary resources of this land have made us rich and wealthy. I suggest to you that in a number of specific areas such as our farms, fish and forests—the three *f*s if you like—this government has failed when it comes to a number of specific initiatives.

I have spoken about one a number of times in the House. The forest agreements are very specific initiatives between the federal and provincial governments to ensure that we do the replanting and research that is necessary. By using these agreements, the two levels of government can talk about the need to develop proper environmental policy when it relates to our forests.

What do we have? We are expecting the government to consider means of ensuring that regional development remains a priority. How high a priority have the forest agreements been in western Canada? As you probably know, the forest agreements in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba expired March 31, 1989. The agreement in British Columbia expired on March 31, 1990. Based on what the provincial forestry minister said about verbal commitments for new funding in the green plan, as you know, there are no specifics whatsoever in the green plan relating to providing the necessary funds to forestry in British Columbia.

So as I said at the beginning, it has been very much a hit and miss approach to regional development across the country. Just this morning in Halifax, where the latest mess is taking place, there was an announcement of another co-operation agreement being signed in that province. Again, we have a forest agreement that expired in 1989. It was renewed for two years. It is now coming up for renewal on March 31, 1991 and where are we? It is really hit and miss with each particular program. It certainly is hit and miss depending on the part of the country that you live in with this government and its policy on regional development.

We are hopeful I suppose, but we are wondering about the major emphasis of this new agreement signed this morning. It is really looking at, in a sense, getting into the incentives game that can often be very difficult for provinces and areas when they start bidding against each other. What generally happens is that the standards get lower and lower and we do not end up with the kind of

policy in place that really should be there. We have had hit and miss when it comes to the forest agreements.

We have certainly had a miss to date, at least in British Columbia where, in a recent letter I received from the Minister of Agriculture, he said that the agricultural subagreement under the economic agreement with British Columbia has been basically put on hold while they try to resolve a host of other problems. In fact the Minister of Agriculture suggested:

> My Department does not have an identified source of funds or vehicle for agricultural development programming to replace ARDSA, if it is not included as a priority under the ERDA.

That is the economic regional development agreement. If that is not a miss, Mr. Speaker, you tell me one. That letter is about agriculture in British Columbia, saying that the agreements are really not there.

We have to develop a regional development policy in this country. We need to put the country's resources back on track, as my colleague from Thunder Bay—Atikokan is doing, with his getting VIA Rail back on track policy. That is a general tool of regional development.

We need a policy that ensures we get on with these agreements. We do not need to hide behind a bunch of announcements trying to spin them out over the next two and a half years when this government thinks it may finally put together a regional development policy.

We support the motion. It is a vague one. I guess it is a Liberal regional development vague plan. Because of that, I think there is an opening for the government to support this motion. I know it will do that. I hope and trust that it has the best intentions at heart. We are not sure about that though, if we look at the track record. Let us hope we get a better one.

I am convinced that with the policies we have developed, after the next election campaign, the New Democrats will have the regional development policy for this country.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Plourde (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Science and Technology):** Mr. Speaker, the global economy has embraced a rapidly changing new order in recent years. Industrially and commercially, the essential characteristic of this new order is market globalization or the internationalization of business. For an extremely large and underpopulated country such as ours, this presents a number of challenges which are basic to the preservation of our standard of living, our social programs and our systems of values.

For Canada, and for Quebec in particular, this wave of economic change, although risky, presents novel opportunities for development and prosperity which should be explored.

In the last six years, our economic actions have been predicated entirely upon one fundamental goal: to ensure that all regions of Canada benefit from the emerging new economic order. From the start, we devised a long–range action plan that would enable us to reach this objective.

The problems of Quebec are related to a number of phenomena, such as the emergence of a new industrial order, market globalization, the increased role of competition in international trade and the increasingly vital roles played by research, development and staff training in opening up and maintaining markets. It is essential that these data be taken into account in any regional development policy.

Mr Speaker, for six years now, Quebec has recorded steady economic growth that has allowed it to make strides in the modernization of its industrial base. A good deal still remains to be done, however, before this modernization is completed.

Regional development problems in Quebec, moreover, must take into account one fundamental fact, namely, the dual nature of Quebec's economy. On the one hand, the central regions of the province consist essentially in urban areas comprising 85 percent of the province's population; the economies of these regions are centred on the secondary and tertiary sectors. On the other hand, the resource regions of Quebec cover more

than 90 percent of the province's territory, yet are home to less than 15 percent of the population. The economy of these resource regions is centred essentially on the primary sector and the exploitation of natural resources such as forest, mineral and fisheries resources.

• (1340)

Mr. Speaker, we signed with the Quebec government a master agreement on regional development which takes into account this duality and the different needs of the central and resource regions of Quebec. Let us take a closer look at the different needs of these regions.

In the central regions, such as greater Montreal, the Quebec City region, the Eastern Townships, the Bois–Francs region and the Outaouais, the economy is more diversified and more developed. Traditional sectors remain active here, but they have been eclipsed in importance by new sectors. We must now accelerate the modernization of production facilities and take steps to ensure that companies swiftly incorporate advanced technologies that will make them more productive, efficient and competitive in order that they may carve out market niches for themselves.

It is clear, in this context, that the economy of the greater Montreal region faces a number of special needs. Because this region is in direct competition with other major North American cities, and nearly half the population of Quebec resides within its boundaries, the economy of the Montreal region has a direct influence on the development of other regions in the province. It is therefore essential that the establishment and maintenance of modern economic sectors be stimulated in this region, since such sectors generate sustainable, quality jobs as well as considerable activity in other related sectors.

In recent years, the Montreal region has made significant advances in dynamic and forward–looking sectors. Aeronautics, for example, is strongly represented in the region by companies such as Bombardier, Pratt & Whitney, Bell Helicopter as well as Spar Aerospace, which has been commissioned to build RADARSAT, the first remote sensing satellite to be designed and built entirely in Canada. The decision to locate the Canadian Space Agency within the region, on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, will undoubtedly help to generate considerable local economic activity in the fields of aeronautics and telecommunications.

Montreal also developed a network a big and small businesses specialized in microelectronics, informatics, software development and the manufacture of printed circuits.

Other job–producing economic sectors have maintained their presence in the greater Montreal region. These include pharmaceuticals, biotechnology and consulting engineering (with such giants as Lavallin and SNC).

All of these sectors require advanced technologies and considerable value added. They provide quality jobs, and their export potential is high. It is vital that the Montreal economy rely more and more on these forward–looking sectors.

Of course, the various levels of government are prepared to do their share, set up programs and coordinate efforts in this direction. It is nevertheless clear that business must make an immediate commitment to the research and development inherent in economic development.

It is all the more essential, Mr. Speaker, that we devote efforts to our resource regions, considering that their industrial base lacks diversification and is often threatened, that these regions are located far away from major urban centres and that unemployment is definitely higher in these regions than in urban areas.

Initiatives have therefore been taken to turn our natural resources to good account by enhancing management and conservation with a view to sustainable development. The technical and professional skills of labour must also be improved.

For example, in the logging, pulp and paper and lumber industries, we are working with the Quebec government for the improvement of timber management, the construction of new access roads to these resources and above all reforestation, which is essential to sustainable development.

We also allocated funds for the diversification of regional enterprises, and for development programs in the agri–food and agriculture sectors.

In response to the need for modernization of production equipment we have set up a series of programs. Thus, the federal government's concerted Enterprise Development Program and Manufacturing Productivity Improvement Program are designed specifically to sup-

port small businesses engaging in equipment modernization and industrial diversification projects.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, it is most essential that everyone understand the challenges and the development possibilities involved, that objectives be mutually agreed upon and that everyone work towards the same end. For its part, the government will continue to allocate resources as judiciously as possible, and will also continue to inform Quebec businesses about how best to benefit from the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States.

[*English*]

**Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Nunatsiaq):**

[*Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.*]

For those who do not speak Inuktitut, I will continue in English.

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a pleasure to speak to the motion of my colleague from Miramichi on regional development.

I commend my colleague, the hon. member for Miramichi, for his motion and for keeping the issue of regional development alive. In his region and in mine, a continued strong federal presence and commitment to economic development is critical. In the north, we have seen, over the past couple of years, a declining commitment.

For example, the federal government has cut back its fiscal transfers to the Yukon and Northwest Territories. In 1984, the previous Liberal government had negotiated five-year formula funding agreements with the two territorial governments.

In the renegotiation of these agreements last year, the current federal government changed that formula. It reduced it so the two territories will receive less funding over the next five years than they would have received under the original formula. Specifically, the Northwest Territories will receive about $110 million less over the next five years. The Yukon government will receive about $80 million less.

In addition to these cutbacks, both territories are still waiting for renewal of the northern economic development agreements. They are now in the process of negotiations. I hope the government of the Northwest Territories will be successful in coming to a conclusion that is preferable for the Northwest Territories.

In 1984, the Yukon and the federal government signed a five-year economic development agreement worth $26.4 million. That general agreement and the subsidiary agreements negotiated under it, expired in March 1989. Almost two years later, we still do not have a new economic development agreement with the Yukon. It is true that the federal government has provided some interim funding to the Yukon government to carry on some activities, but not all the previously funded components received interim funding.

In the Northwest Territories, the picture is similar. In 1987, a four-year economic development agreement worth $38.3 million was signed. Two of the six subsidiary agreements negotiated under that general agreement expired last March. One of them, the tourism sub-agreement, received some interim funding.

The other four sub-agreements expire this coming March. For both of the territories, renewed economic development agreements are necessary for territorial economic growth.

• (1350)

In the Northwest Territories, the government is looking for a more flexible program which can be utilized in less developed areas and communities and which has less emphasis on profitability. We are anxiously awaiting announcements from the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development concerning renewed economic development agreements with both territories and we will be looking, as well, for adequate funding in these agreements.

The north continues to be extremely concerned about the effects of the goods and services tax on both northern consumers and businesses. With the highest cost of living in the country, the goods and services tax is going to affect the northern territories more adversely than anywhere else. I say this especially for the eastern Arctic, the area that I represent, where the cost of living in the area can be about two and a half times higher than that in the city of Ottawa. A litre of milk might cost $5 compared to $1 and some cents for a litre of milk in Ottawa. So, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to convince

this government that it has to do as much as it can for regional and northern development.

For the past couple of years, I and other northerners have been telling the finance minister that the GST is going to do us more harm than good. The finance minister stubbornly continues to insist that we will benefit, despite evidence to the contrary. The finance minister maintains that the north will be better off with the goods and services tax. I can point out that resource development might be better off—I say "might" with a question mark—under the GST, but the average person living in Pond Inlet, Coppermine, Pelly Bay or Grise Fiord will not be better off because the purchasing power of that individual will be a lot less and certainly the purchasing power for groceries will be a lot less because of having to pay 7 per cent tax on other goods which presently are not taxed under the MST.

The most recent confirmation of the negative impact of the GST on the north has been pointed out in a report by Ernst and Young, management consultants. This report was made public earlier this month by the Ontario government. It is a report that was commissioned by the provincial and territorial ministers responsible for economic development in the north. I will quote a few excerpts from this report for the benefit of hon. members and for anyone from the finance minister's office who may be listening.

As it is typical of the minister, in replying to my question on this issue in the House a couple of weeks ago, he picked out the only positive aspect of this report and quoted it verbatim to the House when I asked him a question about this report. On the negative side, I quote: "Small business, in all sectors, will be hit by high compliance costs which will be particularly onerous in the north, due to the lack of professional advisory services".

Arts and crafts is an important industry to the residents of the eastern Arctic. This report says that these activities, and I quote: "—will be negatively affected by the goods and services tax, since original works of art have been exempt from the FST but will be subject to the GST. The cost of transporting the art to southern markets will also bear GST, even where the artist can select to be exempt, as a result of having sales of less than $30,000 per year".

I would just like to read one more quote: "Municipalities, universities, hospitals and schools in the north will bear higher over all costs under the GST. Rebates for these institutions are to be based on a single national calculation of the increase in the tax burden associated with sales tax reform. However, because local mark-ups and transport costs did not bear FST, the FST content of institutional purchase in the north had been lower than in the south. The rebates will therefore not be sufficient to compensate for the additional tax burden under the GST. "

I would like to take this opportunity to support the motion of my colleague for Miramichi on regional development.

**Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Calgary Southwest):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to participate today and say a few words with regard to regional development. It is a priority of this government. The results are coming through loud and clear.

I also want to say a few words with regard to the Western Diversification Fund that was announced in 1987. The act was passed in 1988, allocating $1.2 billion to the four western provinces. The head office is in Edmonton, but there are satellite offices within each province.

The government has adopted a regional approach that reflects the special circumstances, the needs, the uniqueness, the strength and even indeed the weaknesses of certain areas.

Western Canadians know that we live with a very volatile resource base where oil, gas and agriculture unfortunately are not stable commodities but tend to have peaks and valleys. The Western Diversification program has been extremely successful. It is one that I have worked with quite a bit.

Over 1,866 regular projects have been approved, representing about $542 million since inception. I also want to say that the assistance is not being used to bail out or shore up businesses that are in trouble. It is not used to modernize plants nor expand existing businesses, but it works to promote diversification. That was its main policy in the form of new products, new technologies, new techniques, new markets and import replacements for western Canada.

They have also supported 16 systemic projects representing about $52 million. One that I would like to refer to is the Centre for Frontier Engineering Research,

CFER. It has just sent out a special issue with regard to the opening of its project. It was an $18 million project in Edmonton la st May 28.

This certainly shows co-operation where the federal government worked in co-operation with the provincial government and private enterprise to see this become a reality.

I feel not only has this been extremely beneficial but the other aspect about WD is that 80 per cent of the commitments are repayable. WD gives a helping hand. It gives people a kick-start. We do not have hand-out programs.

The other thing that was interesting in the Speech from the Throne in 1989 was the government's procurement policy. They were told to direct themselves toward regional considerations. In the last couple of years western Canada has received three or four major contracts. One had to do with the Department of Transport's CAATS contract for $380 million. It was awarded to Hughes Aircraft Canada which will open offices in Calgary and Vancouver. The contract was $380 million with spin-offs of over $500 million across Canada.

Also, there was a contract awarded to Computing Devices Canada for over $1 billion from the Department of National Defence. These people are going to open a head office in Calgary. Eighty per cent of that $1 billion will certainly go into the western part of Canada.

In conclusion, I have to say that the ACOA head office in Moncton with $1.05 billion, FEDNOR headquartered in Sault Ste. Marie with $60 million over five years and Western Diversification with the $1.2 billion, have certainly served to diversify. No longer do people sitting in Ottawa make the decisions. It is people in the regions making decisions for the regions and their needs. Diversification is very important.

• (1400 )

We are always open to amendments, to improvement, and to ways to do the job better. This is one area that has really been successful. The motion being discussed today is really a non-starter. We are in there. We are doing it. Regional diversification is a priority with this government and always will be.

**Mr. Speaker:** The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 86(1), this item is dropped from the Order Paper.

---

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*Translation*]

### HEALTH CARE

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Last October, in Gaspe, Mr. Speaker, Conservative members in the House of Commons who are the strength of Quebecers in Ottawa adopted a resolution asking the federal government to remove from the Canada Health Act all impediments preventing user's fees and other charges. Senator Roch Bolduc, who personally worked with a dozen Conservative Quebecers on a number of federal health system reform projects stated that these are leftovers from the 1950s put there by the very people who are responsible for our bankruptcy, meaning the officials who worked under the Liberal government.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Marc-Yvan Côté, who is a driving force, will certainly carry out the necessary reform of the Quebec health care and social services.

* * *

[*English*]

### FORESTRY

**Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Mr. Speaker, on Friday the B.C. Central Credit Union published a report outlining the foreign control of our forest industry. The report's results are of serious concern. Foreign corporations now control just over 43 per cent of industry assets according to this study.

This foreign control is aided and abetted by this government's free trade and softwood lumber tariff policies. This foreign control of our main industry raises serious questions about the future of our forest communities and our ability to have our forests managed in the best environmental manner.

The Minister of Forestry should launch an immediate investigation into the growing foreign control of our forest industry, and he should do it before this government allows all of our resources to be turned over and controlled by U.S. multinational corporations.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MGR. ALBERTUS MARTIN

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu):** With the passing of Monsignor Albertus Martin, Mr. Speaker, the people of the Nicolet diocese and the rest of Quebec certainly have lost one of the greatest builders and defenders of the Church in Quebec.

Monsignor Martin was a scholar and a world-class canon law specialist. He had been thoroughly involved in the reforms suggested by Vatican II. He was endowed with a remarkable intelligence and was recognized as a man of exceptional apostolic dedication. His administrative and leadership skills led him to found the Nicolet Seminary, rebuild the Nicolet cathedral following its destruction and give a sound financial basis to each of those parishes.

A very accessible man, he knew how to round up his flock following a disaster, whether a fire, a death, a sickness or the loss of a job. He left behind him apostolic accomplishments beyond compare. His simplicty, dedication, hard work, honesty, generosity, kindness and class made him really a man of God.

Monsignor Martin used to quote St. Paul often. Thinking of him, I wish to quote St. Paul. In his Epistle to the Galatians, he wrote: "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness and temperance". This certainly describes perfectly Monsignor Martin's heritage. Monsignor Martin, farewell and thank you!

* * *

[*English*]

## SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**Mr. David Berger (Saint-Henri—Westmount):** Mr. Speaker, in its report last week the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology of the House of Commons made the simple statement that the economic well-being of Canadians depended on science and technology.

If we want jobs in Canada we have to add value to products and services through science and technology and the skills of Canadians, not just scientists and technologists but the men and women who work on the shop floor across this country.

This is a simple message which to now has not been understood by the Conservative government. A newspaper headline on the weekend read: "PM Shatters Dreams of Top Canadian Scientists". The headline is wrong. It should read: "PM Shatters Dreams of all Canadians".

This government has damaged Canada's R and D capacity, cut support for industrial research and development, cut transfer payments for post-secondary education, and cut funds for training.

Can we hope for a death-bed conversion from this government, or is it too late to reverse a disastrous record?

* * *

## NATIVE HOUSING

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, it is now the holiday season and it is incumbent upon us to promote the spirit of giving and caring for our brothers and sisters. Yet it is a tragic fact that many of our nation's first peoples live in overcrowded homes, often without water and sewage facilities.

Can aboriginal children receive the education they need when they return each night to a crowded house? Can they return to school fresh and ready to learn after trying to sleep with many others in these same rooms? Can seniors expect to retain good health? Can expectant mothers hope to provide proper care in such conditions?

This is a good time for the government to make its New Year's resolution to the native peoples of Canada. This government must commit itself to alleviating the problem of substandard housing.

For many natives housing has improved, but not for all. I think it only fitting that we in this House do what we can to help the native people improve housing conditions in their communities.

*S. O. 31*

## SKI NORQUAY

**Mrs. Louise Feltham (Wild Rose):** Mr. Speaker, on December 15, I was pleased to be a part of the official opening of the extension of Ski Norquay, located in beautiful Banff National Park.

I am sure all colleagues will want to join with me in sending congratulations to the management and staff of this resort. The new ski runs on Wishbone and Skyline Ridge will provide good skiing and much challenge to people not only from the Banff area but from all of Canada and the world.

Tourism is such a major player in Canada's economy, we should take every opportunity to promote ventures like Ski Norquay and all tourist facilities throughout Canada.

* * *

## IMMIGRATION

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Mr. Speaker, on August 31 of this year, the Minister of Employment and Immigration eliminated the self-exile category for east Europeans wishing to immigrate to Canada.

At the same time the minister imposed a 40 per cent slowdown in the processing of these applications already in the system. The result has been a three to four-year delay for the outcome of these applications. The delay is causing a financial burden on government and undue hardship on applicants and Canadian sponsors.

I would like to urge the minister, first, to lift all the restrictions for the final disposition for Canadian consulates; second, remove the 40 per cent slowdown of processing; third, give high priority to all self-exile applications; and, fourth, allow work permit authorizations for those applicants already in Canada awaiting the final decision.

These proposed changes will not create a need for a change in regulations, only a change in policy, which is firmly in the minister's power.

In the spirit of Christmas, I ask the minister to implement these four recommendations before the House rises for the winter break.

## THE LATE CARL NICKLE

**Mr. Lee Richardson (Calgary Southeast):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a former member of this House, Mr. Carl Nickle, who passed away in Calgary last week at the age of 76.

Carl Nickle served as the member of Parliament for the ridings of Calgary West and Calgary South respectively from 1951 to 1957, using this place as a forum to promote the interests of western Canada passionately.

The son of oilman Sam Nickle, Carl was raised and educated in Calgary where he founded both the *Daily Oil Bulletin* and the *Canadian Oil Register* before going on to establish his own oil company, Conventures Ltd.

Nickle's achievements were certainly not confined to the oil industry. He served with the Canadian army from 1939 to 1948 where he achieved the rank of lieutenant. An avid coin collector, he became a prominent philanthropist, underwriting the Nickle Art Museum at the University of Calgary and playing a key role in the creation of the Nickle family foundation, which provides scholarships to students and cultural groups.

Carl Nickle was an exceptional parliamentarian, a distinguished Canadian, and a friend.

To his wife, Diana, and their family, I extend sincere condolences.

* * *

## CANADA POST

**Mrs. Diane Marleau (Sudbury):** Mr. Speaker, when Canada Post shut down public counter services at Postal Station A in Sudbury, it promised more accessible service and said that privatization would give us this.

• (1410 )

At 12.45 on Monday, December 10, one of its privatized outlets ran out of stamps. Can you imagine that, Mr. Speaker? In the middle of the Christmas rush, it ran out of stamps.

At other privatized postal outlets patrons were forced to wait in long lines because they just did not have the personnel to serve them more quickly. Yet one block down the street at the commercial outlet they could not serve these people because they are not important enough to Canada Post. We in Sudbury have had enough

of being sacrificed by this government for the bottom line at Air Canada, VIA Rail, CBC, and Canada Post.

* * *

## FORESTRY

**Mr. J. W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury):** Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House of Commons subcommittee on forestry, I was very pleased today to receive a positive response to our recent report from a large group of national organizations that both individually and collectively expressed their interest in and their support for both the economic and the environmental interests in our forests as expressed by that report.

These organizations included the Canadian Forestry Association, the Canadian Institute of Forestry, the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association, the Canadian Federation of Woodlot Owners, the Canadian Wildlife Federation, Wildlife Habitat Canada, the Canadian Nature Federation, Ducks Unlimited Canada, and the Canadian Federation of Professional Foresters.

It is particularly encouraging that these national institutions strongly support our recommendations for the implementation of sustainable development in Canada to begin in our forests and to be accomplished under federal and provincial leadership in a process of partnership with all stake holders in those forests.

The organizations which gathered here today represent a profound and comprehensive expression of the concept of partnership in the management of Canada's forest resources.

* * *

## CPR TRAINING

**Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester):** Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening a Canadian Airlines plane travelling from Ottawa to Vancouver was forced to make an emergency landing in Calgary. While on board, the 10-month old son of my constituents, Robert and Taunia Myrah, had stopped breathing. The flight attendants who were untrained in the procedures of cardio-pulmonary resuscitation administered this technique while reading from a manual.

Because emergency medical assistance is not readily available while planes are in the air, it is inconceivable that flight personnel are not required to possess these life saving techniques.

[*Translation*]

The airlines must assure their passengers that at least one of their flight attendants is trained in these techniques should an emergency come up.

[*English*]

I offer my sincere condolences to the family of Colton Myrah and recommend that as many Canadians as possible become familiar with the life saving techniques of CPR.

* * *

## CANADA'S GREEN PLAN

**Mr. Ross Belsher (Fraser Valley East):** Mr. Speaker, the residents of Fraser Valley East are very concerned with environmental issues. The beauty of the valley is often cloaked by ugly clouds of smog blown in from Vancouver. Air quality is not simply a cosmetic concern for the residents of Chilliwack, nor for that matter is the murkiness of the Fraser River a cosmetic concern. Every time we breathe the air or look at the water we are reminded of the pressing need for action.

The green plan for a healthy environment is a plan for action. I have made the minister aware of our concerns. The minister has listened, the minister has considered, and the minister has acted.

Targets are set for the establishment of comprehensive emission controls complete with a monitoring and advisory component. In 1991, the federal government will join with the Government of British Columbia to start development of a Fraser River action plan for the Fraser River and Burrard Inlet. The action plan will focus on restoring the river's fish population meaning clearer and cleaner water.

The green plan will ensure that the fresh is put back into fresh air and that the clean will be put back into clean water. This is definitely good news for residents of the Fraser Valley and indeed all Canadians.

*Oral Questions*

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, during the Liberal leadership campaign the hon. member for Hamilton East asked: "Where does Jean Chrétien stand on the GST?"

I believe we can still ask the question: Where do the Liberals stand on the GST? Why did the Liberal senators of the national Liberal caucus not oppose the GST legislation when leave was sought to introduce it in the Senate? Why did the Liberal senators and the Liberal caucus not oppose the GST when it was introduced at first reading in the Senate? Why did the Liberal senators and the Liberal caucus not oppose the GST at second reading in the Senate? Why did the Liberal senators and the Liberal caucus not defeat the GST when they had the majority in committee during April, May, June, July, August, September, and October?

For months and months, while the Liberals had the majority in the Senate, they chose not to defeat the GST. Could it be that the Liberal senators did not defeat the GST because they were following orders from their leader, Jean Chrétien?

* * *

### ILLITERACY

**Mr. Ken James (Sarnia—Lambton):** Mr. Speaker, let us consider the following: in May a Statistics Canada report revealed that the reading skills of 2.9 million Canadians were too limited to allow them to deal with most of the written material they encounter in everyday life. In 1987 the Southam survey found one in four Canadians to be functionally illiterate. These studies help reveal the magnitude of the illiteracy problem which challenges the future development of our country.

As we move to address this problem, our actions must be placed in a larger context. Illiteracy is just one part of the puzzle. Our actions on literacy therefore must be part of a much broader strategy to improve social mobilization and our social welfare system.

Our efforts must be accompanied by actions in areas like training, education, child care, employment equity, and initiatives to address the problem of poverty in this country.

I look forward to our government moving forward on this social policy agenda. Yet at the same time I urge that this be done in a consistent, comprehensive and co–ordinated manner.

---

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

### CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister.

Last week in Corner Brook and Calgary, last night in Rimouski and Windsor, tens and tens of thousands of Canadians rallied to call for the restoration of their CBC local television stations.

In Windsor, Ontario, for example, 10,000 people called for the bringing back of their station, the only Canadian station of any kind in the entire region. People say that without their stations they are less a part of Canada. They are tired of the unravelling of this country due to the decisions of this government.

If this government is truly interested in maintaining the unity of this country, will it restore local CBC television broadcasting right now?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity, just a few hours ago, to discuss these matters with representatives of the people from those areas, not Rimouski in particular, but the North Shore.

The CBC applies the principle of providing symmetrical programming services in all regions of the country. It was forced to close local stations as was Radio–Québec a few years back.

We must bear in mind that Radio–Québec decided in 1986 to close its nine production centers for financial reasons. In 1990, it closed down its Gaspé office. Neither Radio–Québec nor the CBC acted irresponsibly. Both were simply responding to economic pressures which force leaders to make decisions, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, what the minister calls symmetry is the

amputation of the regions of this country in a way that cuts it up and destroys its unity. That is not symmetry; that is not what the people of this country want.

This is a time when we should be thinking of the needs of those less fortunate than ourselves. Yet, because of the decisions of the CBC approved of by this government, next year there will be no Heart Fund telethon in Ottawa, no Easter Seals telethon in Windsor, no Children's Hospital telethon in Winnipeg.

My question is for the Minister of Communications. Why is the government so heartless, cruel, and insensitive that it supports the decisions of the CBC to eliminate these telethons? If the government has a heart, will the government take steps to ensure that these telethons are broadcast next year and for many years to come? Will the minister give this reassurance to the needy, the crippled, and the poor of the country right now?

• (1420)

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, the CBC has regularly received funding from the government to fulfil its mandate. If you analyse the percentages of government funding allocated to government programs, you will see that the CBC has been privileged in this respect in that its percentages were higher.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this government has a responsibility to provide for sound public administration, especially where the Budget is concerned. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to make sure we have social services across the country next year— One thing is certain, and that is that we will have those services thanks to the policies of this government, and no thanks to the policies of the previous government.

The best way to provide for this country's social, cultural and economic development is to act responsibly when dealing with public funds. That is what the previous government was incapable of doing, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, we have the previous government to thank for local television programming across the country, and the current government is cutting these programs. That is what is really happening, Mr. Speaker.

On the weekend, 5,000 people expressed their dissatisfaction in Rimouski, and another 10,000 in Windsor, following the shutdown of their CBC tv stations. My question is: Why is the minister depriving the regions of this vital resource? Why does he not he realize how important access to information is for these regions? Why is he isolating them even more from the rest of Canada?

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, the CBC must take into consideration the current economic situation in this country and the environment in which it has to work, bearing in mind the reports and analyses made over the years, from Applebaum–Hébert to Caplan–Sauvageau. The CBC and its administrators are trying to provide the country with a major programming centre and representation in the regions. However, the CBC has responsibilities like the rest of the government and like other broadcasters.

In Quebec, for instance, Radio–Québec had to stop its regional services in 1986, for economic reasons, and again in 1990, for the same reasons.

I think the CBC, like Radio–Québec, is responsible for the public money it spends, and that is the framework within which it operates, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Communications if he truly believes that the *maison–mère* on Rene Levesque Boulevard inQuebec City can reflect better the whole of eastern Quebec than they can themselves.

The minister has completely removed the face of eastern Quebec from the screen of Radio–Canada, our international and national voice.

Yesterday I joined 5,000 people in common voice in Rimouski when they asked the Prime Minister to re–order government priorities and provide the necessary funds to serve their distinctive voice.

My question is for the Acting Prime Minister. Will he make that choice? He has an option. Will he today restore the funding needed to put Radio–Canada back on the map across Canada?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, the present government has always acted responsibly in its dealings with the CBC. It has made sure that the percentage of assistance given to the corporation was greater than the amount granted all

government programs. When the hon. member for Mount Royal takes part in public meetings, she should not only be mindful of the economic problems of this government but should also remember that the present Prime Minister never threatened to shut down the CBC.

**Mr. Paul Martin (LaSalle—Émard):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State (Employment and Immigration). Yesterday in Rimouski, an entire region rose up to condemn the savage cuts at the CBC. The hon. member for Mount Royal was there to defend the region and the jobs that were lost. The Minister of Employment was not. Why did the minister support her government's decision? Will the minister now show her solidarity with her region and her people by defending their jobs? Does the minister have the courage to answer the question? Will she fight to bring the CBC back to eastern Quebec?

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows perfectly well it is most unfair to put a question of this type to a colleague whose responsibility does not lie in this area. My colleague, the hon. member for Remouski Temiscauata is not hiding behind the Minister of Communications, but her responsibilities lie elsewhere, Mr. Speaker. It is therefore my responsibility as the federal Minister of Communications to provide for the growth of the CBC, and growth means, first of all, programming. The best way to provide for programming is to put the CBC on a sound economic footing. That is how we can then provide a better service to the regions, including the Gaspé, Windsor, and other regions across Canada. The CBC will be there, in all 10 regions in this country, with two major bridgeheads that will provide programs that reflect our Canadian reality and identity. That is how the CBC will be able to serve Canadians, not with the kind of rhetoric we saw under former Liberal Prime Minister Trudeau, who had only one answer for the CBC-—

[*English*]

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair):** Mr. Speaker, my question is also addressed to the Minister of Communications. Last week his parliamentary secretary said that the minister is always available to consult with Canadians. Yet he refused to meet with the president of CBC. He refused to meet with the 2,500 Canadians who rallied in Saskatoon, the 500 who rallied in St. John's, the 5,000 who rallied in Rimouski. He also refused to make himself available to nearly 10,000 people who gathered in Windsor yesterday not just to protest the CBC cuts, but to express the fact that they have to fight to be a part of Canada because of the actions of this government.

If this minister can have a direct line to Lavalin Corporation, why can he not he listen to Canadians who want nothing more than to have a direct line to the rest of Canada?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, the Department of Communications made sure then as it does now that Canadians were consulted through various working groups and commissions of inquiry, from the Applebaum–Hébert Commission to the Caplan–Sauvageau Commission, and now the working group lead by Mr. Girard and Mr. Peters.

All those mechanisms are made available to the Canadian people so that the Canadian broadcasting system can be defined. But there is an economic reality the hon. member is not familiar with, that of an evolving market which ensures our economic as well as our cultural freedom, but also demands to be taken into account. That is precisely what the CBC leaders are doing, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Finestone:** Tell that to the artists and the journalists.

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair):** I guess this minister wants to go down in history as the minister of benign neglect. He has a responsibility. He talks about maintaining culture. Come on down to Windsor. Come down to Windsor where every single day in the week we are dominated and overcome by American culture. Your job is to defend Canada.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the economic situation is difficult. The way to deal with it, however, is

not by taking demagogic measures but responsible ones, and that is what this government is doing.

[*English*]

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question for the minister is this: has he listened to the voices coming from Rimouski, Saskatoon, Calgary, the French speaking population of Ontario? Has he listened and has he heard the anger? Has he heard the sense that they want to be able to speak to this country? Is he prepared to give them an answer that he will provide help, he will provide support and he will see that this country stays together in the future?

**An hon. member:** He has not listened to Orillia either, I can tell you.

• (1430)

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Marcel Masse (Minister of Communications):** Mr. Speaker, the CBC, Radio-Québec and TV-Ontario of Toronto, like all private or public broacasting companies, like all printed media, all periodicals, and all radio networks in Canada must, like in other countries, take into consideration both the technical evolution and the economic evolution.

We cannot assure the hon. member that one sector among others would be fully protected, Mr. Speaker, because that kind of protection exists only under a communist régime. And we can see now what happens—the total collapse of the entire economic structure.

We in Canada have to be mindful of the market, and it is with that consideration in mind that the CBC management face up to their responsibilities. The government helps to the tune of more than $1 billion, but there is also the advertising side of the issue. Since the CBC does not fully capitalize with respect to advertising, it now has to take that into account and restructure itself.

* * *

[*English*]

## INDUSTRY

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry. The afterglow of the free trade deal has resulted in a scorched earth policy for Canadian industry. The latest victims are 470 Stelco workers who are joining 4,500 other Stelco workers already on the unemployment insurance lines. Some estimate the job loss as being as high as 226,000 as a direct result of the Mulroney-Reagan trade deal, and yet the Minister for International Trade is in Washington today negotiating an extension to that deal with Mexico, because he says that there are "no fundamental obstacles".

I would like to ask the Minister of Industry whether he believes the loss of 226,000 jobs does not represent a fundamental obstacle to further negotiations and a further trade agreement.

**Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to say first of all that it is in the interest of the hon. member for Hamilton East to say that the FTA is responsible for all jobs lost in the country. However, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association has said very clearly that there is no way that we could put the difference between the recession and the FTA.

We believe that as much as the economic reality could be better, Canadians will be able to take advantage of the free trade agreement. Once again, I believe that we should do our best to recognize that the free trade agreement has been good for Canada; it is the global economy. I do not necessarily ask the member to understand that now but she will maybe understand in a little while.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry ought not to direct his remarks to me but to the 1,000 men and women who have worked in the furniture-making industry in the province of Quebec and to the 136,000 workers who can no longer find employment in that sector in Quebec because of his policies and that of his government.

I have a question for him because he and his government did promise all workers that there would be recycling programs, but there is none. Is he now prepared to assure the Canadian people that there will not be further negotiations until such time as programs have been implemented to find work for the men and women who have been laid off as a result of the free trade policy of this government.

**Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology):** Mr. Speaker, the answers in French are the same as in English. The free trade agreement

has nothing to do with current job losses in Canada. These references to the economic recession—

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that Quebec labour was in favour of the free trade agreement, and Quebec remains supportive of this deal. Mr. Speaker, after the Liberal Party's lengthy filibuster over Bill C–21, my colleague the Minister of Employment and Immigration finally has the mechanisms she needs to provide Quebec workers with the recycling programs they want.

But as usual my colleague speaks from both sides of her mouth. At the time she should have done everything to help the House adopt the bill designed to help Quebec employers and workers, and things would have been much easier all around, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

[*English*]

## FISHERIES

**Mrs. Coline Campbell (South West Nova):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. Last Friday the minister released a new Atlantic management plan that will apply for three years rather than the usual one. Part of that plan includes the introduction of individual boat quotas for the Scotia–Fundy inshore, a system which may cost many fishermen and communities their livelihood if it is put into place.

I ask the minister this. Why is he going to a three-year plan in the Scotia–Fundy area without first doing a comprehensive stock evaluation, as asked for by the fishing people in the area?

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, the question of the hon. member as to the reason why we have introduced a three-year TAC in Scotia–Fundy is the same reason that we have done it for other parts of the Atlantic region. We are trying to build some stability in that fishery. What the fishermen, what the producers and what the manufacturers have told us is if they could get a longer term view of the fishery, they can do better planning, they can do better marketing. That is the reason why we have gone for this three-year TAC, by putting in the window, that is not carved in stone. If we get biological evidence or scientific evidence that the stock is on the verge of collapse or that it is doing much better, then at that time we shall revise the TACs.

**Mrs. Coline Campbell (South West Nova):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his answer. I am sure if he spoke to the industry in the southern end of Nova Scotia, he would know that they would like to have a new evaluation.

My further question concerns the Minister of the Environment's green plan, which was introduced last week. I am sure the Minister of Fisheries is well aware that at page 76 it states:

> Accordingly, in consultation with the fishing industry and the provinces, the Government will put in place a system of Individual Transferable Quotas (ITQs) for various fisheries.

I ask the minister, is this now policy? If so, what fisheries does he plan to privatize further on the east coast?

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, I am struck by that question, privatize. I did not know that the governments of Canada or Nova Scotia, for that matter, or any other were fishing. This belongs to the private sector. I tell the member that these fishermen are entrepreneurs. They are the ones who are harvesting the fish in the Atlantic Ocean.

When she asks me whether this is the policy, she should be aware that the draggermen of her area are the ones to whom we have offered to introduce these Individual Transferable Quotas. They are being implemented right now. They have been asking for it. She should listen to those fishermen more.

* * *

## TRADE

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister. The Minister for International Trade is now in Washington talking to U.S. and Mexican representatives regarding trade talks on a U.S.–Canada trade deal with Mexico. From reports, the United States has given Canada until February 1, 1991 to decide whether we will participate. The last time the United States gave Canada an ultimatum we lost 226,000 jobs in just two years of the U.S. trade deal.

I want to ask the government this: what is the response of this government to the latest U.S. ultimatum, yes or no?

**Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)):** Mr. Speaker, as I think the hon. member knows, the trade minister is meeting with the United States trade representative and the Mexican representative today. They will be making a decision shortly. By the end of January or early February the three governments should be in a position to announce what the shape of those negotiations will be. I hope these negotiations will help to increase the creation of jobs in Canada just as we have had since December, 1988, with 207,000 jobs created in Canada since the free trade agreement.

• (1440)

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, trade deals for Canada based on hope have certainly not proven in the interest of Canadian workers. Two hundred and twenty-six thousand who have lost their jobs know that.

My supplementary is for the minister. This government, despite the job losses, despite the loss to Canadian sovereignty, continues on the same old way of dragging Canada into something and it cannot even prove that the Canada–U.S. trade agreement has been good for Canada. All other statistics say it has not. Yet this government is now considering a deal with Mexico.

Before even considering being a part of these talks, will the minister undertake on behalf of his government a full public assessment of the results of the Canada–U.S. trade deal before getting us into another one?

**Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)):** Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting when a spokesman from that side of the House and from the Liberal Party speak about the trade agreement. They always refer to one section of any country's trade balance and that is the manufacturing sector.

The manufacturing sector of Canada, the manufacturing sector of the United States, the manufacturing sector of Europe, the manufacturing sector of Japan have been declining in relationship to services for the past 20 years. There is nothing new about this. The manufacturing sector is declining.

What is not happening in other countries, and is happening in Canada, is that investment intentions in Canada, investment intentions in capital equipment, investment intentions in plant and equipment, hit record highs last year and they are up this year, 1990, 9.7 per cent over the previous year.

* * *

## FISHERIES

**Mr. Lawrence MacAulay (Cardigan):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of fisheries and concerns the dockside monitoring program.

Last Friday in the management plan announced by the minister he included references to the dockside monitoring program that fishermen want no part of. According to fisheries officials, the program is to be fishermen funded and run by a third party contractor.

Is the minister having this program contracted out to avoid the heat from annoyed fishermen in Prince Edward Island?

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** No, Mr. Speaker, that is not the reason why we are introducing the dockside monitoring program, and I really wonder whether the member would understand if I gave him the reason. With a question like that, you have to wonder.

The reason we are introducing a dockside monitoring program—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Valcourt:** Of course they like the question, but not the answer.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Well, give us an answer.

**Mr. Valcourt:** A good Liberal.

The reason is that the state of the fish stocks in Atlantic Canada is in bad shape. That is because of non-reporting of fish, discarding of fish, dumping of fish at sea—not by bureaucrats, but by fishermen. We want to control the stocks. I was asked earlier by one of the member's colleagues for a better assessment. Well, give us the tools and then we will have a better assessment.

**Mr. Lawrence MacAulay (Cardigan):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is for the same minister.

In the plan announced last Friday, the Minister of Fisheries announced that there would be a mesh size increase in the gulf fishery as well as a 20 per cent cut in groundfish quotas over three years.

When is the minister going to undertake a study of the Gulf fishery, like the Harris and Hâché commissions?

Also, will the minister set up an assistance plan specifically for the fishermen in the Gulf region now?

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, the best assistance we can give fishermen in Atlantic Canada is making sure that we have proper management measures to ensure the conservation of these stocks.

If the hon. member cares so much for the fishermen, he should endorse the groundfish management plan because it is one that will ensure the conservation of these stocks for present fishermen and the next generation of fishermen in all of Atlantic Canada.

I will thank him for his strong support.

* * *

## PERSIAN GULF

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Prime Minister. UN Resolution 678 authorizes member states to use force in the gulf after January 15. Talks before that date between Washington and Baghdad are currently non-existent.

Is Canada taking steps today to ensure that the UN Security Council is sponsoring its own peace negotiations before January 15?

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, I know that the Secretary of State for External Affairs is meeting with the NATO foreign ministers today and will be discussing the issue of the gulf.

Certainly it is our position that we would urge Saddam Hussein to quickly come to an agreement on a date to proceed with those meetings which would offer the best prospects for development of a peaceful resolution of this problem in the Middle East.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has certainly been using his good offices to encourage and urge that these meetings take place as quickly as possible so that there be a possibility of a peaceful resolution.

**Mrs. Christine Stewart (Northumberland):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the same minister. On Friday, President Bush referred to January 15 as the deadline for Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait.

I would like to repeat a question put to this House before but to which we have as yet an unsatisfactory response. Will the government assure us today that Canadian forces will not participate in any offensive action in the gulf before debate on the issue takes place in the House of Commons?

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, I think this issue was thoroughly debated during the last debate that we had with respect to the UN Resolution. Obviously, as the hon. member knows, the position of this government is that our forces are there to support the UN Resolution, to insist on the enforcement of that resolution, and to bring about a peaceful resolution of the dispute in the gulf.

If there is any change in the role of our forces, the government obviously would have to take that into consideration and would certainly advise the members of the opposition parties as quickly as possible.

* * *

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for External Relations. The minister knows that despite strong opposition from the African National Congress and despite very serious state violence in the black townships, the European Community yesterday lifted the ban on new investment in South Africa.

Will Canada maintain our ban on new investment in South Africa until there has been irreversible change in the policy of apartheid in South Africa as defined by the African National Congress and as defined by the South African Council of Churches?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Monique Landry (Minister for External Relations):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is well aware that these are multilateral sanctions which we approved within the framework of the Commonwealth. We are determined to maintain our present policy until the responsible ministers meet again in March of next year. My hon. friend is also well aware that the Government of Canada sincerely believes that the sanctions must be

maintained as long as there is no evidence of irreversible change in the policy of apartheid in South Africa. Such has always been and remains our position for the time being.

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the same minister also has to do with the issue of human rights in Africa.

In view of the serious violations of human rights in Zaire, including the killing of students, will the Government of Canada exert pressures so that the Francophone Summit be moved from Zaire, will cancel all assistance and credit to the government of that country and demand the immediate release of all the students currently in Zairian prisons, including Reverend Brother Victore Digekisa, President of the Student Union?

**Hon. Monique Landry (Minister for External Relations):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is certainly aware of this government's position concerning the human rights issue. Last week, I personally met the Zairian Minister of Foreign Affairs while on a visit to Canada and so did my colleague Marcel Masse. During our discussions, I conveyed to him the government's concern about the disregard for human rights and the democratic process which seems to be developing in Zaire.

My hon. friend referred to past events. Following the Lubumbashi massacres, I sent for the Zairian ambassador to express to him our very deep concern about these incidents. I had requested at the time that his government should authorize an international inquiry into the Lubumbashi events. We continue to give enornous significance to the human rights issue and the democratic process and we will take the every step necessary in this connection.

* * *

• (1450)

## REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Science and Technology. This question is further to the question on regional development in Quebec I asked him on November 7 as to whether three new programs would be announced for the resource regions of Quebec under the 1988 Canada-Quebec agreement.

Everyone in Quebec knows that the federal government is prepared to make such an announcement. Did he hear from the Quebec Minister of Regional Development since November 7?

**Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology):** Mr. Speaker, indeed, the programs concerning the business reception facilities, support for tourist attractions and infrastructure projects and support for major regional facilities were approved by the Treasury Board of Canada. As a matter of fact, we are now waiting for the required harmonization with the Quebec government to be completed and I expect to be able to make an official announcement in early January 1991.

* * *

[*English*]

## FORESTRY

**Mr. J. W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Forestry.

In its report entitled *Forests of Canada—The Federal Role*, the House of Commons subcommittee on forestry has recommended development of a national forest inventory and data base as a major priority in any strategy for sustainable forestry development in Canada. Such a system would entail not only perpetual statistical control of trees and timber, but also an integrated and constant analysis of wildlife, mineral deposits, ecological reserves, parklands and all other values of the forest, both economical and environmental.

My question to the minister is as follows: does he share the view of the report that such an integrated inventory system and data base is an essential priority for the future management of Canada's forestry resources and, if so, does he accept the recommendation that the federal government must provide the leadership to establish such a system in partnership with the provinces and other stakeholders?

**Hon. Frank Oberle (Minister of Forestry):** Mr. Speaker, not only can I tell my hon. friend that I support this kind of approach, but that we are well under way in co-operation with and under the control of the council of forest ministers in the country to update our data systems and put in place a national data system that would respect the principles that he has enunciated in

his report, namely, the need for integrated management and the management of the timber and non-timber assets in our forests. I am pleased to be able to say to my friend that early in the new year, when I am required to make my first report to Parliament, some of these new statistics will be reflected.

* * *

## AGRICULTURE

**Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex):** Mr. Speaker, the price discovery mechanisms for grains in the marketplace are not working. Due to concentration in the corporate sector and various United States subsidy programs, such as their target prices and deficiency payments and the Export Enhancement Program, will the Acting Prime Minister assure the House today, before Christmas, that Canadian grain farmers will not have to carry the burden of these misguided United States actions and will be compensated with reasonable prices for their highest quality grain in the world?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture)):** Mr. Speaker, the question raised by my colleague deals with the price of grains. You can see how right Canada is to defend, internationally and more particularly at the GATT, the position that the present grain war is nonsense. It is nonsense for Canada and for all countries closely interested.

We believe that if the Europeans could be convinced to water down their wine and display more flexibility, especially at this time—we did receive mildly optimistic reports from our representatives, as the members of this House did from the Standing Committees last week—it is likely that we could build on solid ground in the GATT negociations, starting in January. To support the Canadian farmers who produce high standard wheat, Mr. Speaker, we absolutely need to reach an agreement at the GATT negociations and I can assure you that Canada will not let this chance go by.

[*English*]

**Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex):** Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that some very prominent Canadian farm leaders marched with the European farmers in Brussels a couple of weeks ago showing support for the EEC position at GATT. Under the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement, the United States must take into account the impact that export subsidies have on Canada.

Will this government use the instruments provided for in this agreement to seek consultations and compensation for losses incurred by the Canadian Wheat Board and by the Canadian farmers for the 1990-91 crop year?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture)):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member ought to know that last year, the government had consultations with grain producers across Canada. We had a federal-provincial conference in November in Winnipeg, where we practically reached an agreement on a long-term program.

What Canadian grain producers need, in addition to a GATT agreement that will help them get a fair price on international markets, is a program that provides a safety net at the national level that will help them plan for the future. As far as consultation is concerned, Mr. Speaker, this Canadian government has consulted with farm producers more than any other government. We have nothing to be ashamed of in this respect.

* * *

[*English*]

## HEALTH

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Last week the minister informed the House he would seek clarification from his Quebec counterpart with respect to the $5 fee which would be imposed for some types of emergency room visits.

Has the minister received any clarification or reply? What does the minister think of the $5 fee? Is it or is it not a user fee?

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received a reply.

What we have done is write to the provincial ministry of health in Quebec to seek more information. It would be appropriate to await the results of a response to that letter before taking a decision as to whether or not it contravenes the provision of the Canada Health Act.

**Mr. Rey Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the same minister. Witnesses who have appeared before the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare for the past year have asked for adequate funding of community health care.

Will the minister commit to the House today that he will exercise more federal leadership and expand the mandate of the Canada Health Act to also include funding of community health care, as reflected in the report of the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare tabled in this House of Commons six months ago?

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada has shown considerable leadership in the whole field of health.

We transfer to the provinces each year some $14 billion to assist them in the provision of health services. In addition to that, we have shown leadership in fighting against AIDS, in terms of the fight against tobacco, drug abuse, and a whole range of other issues which affect the health of Canadians.

One thing that we also do, however, is respect the Constitution of Canada. We respect the fact that the delivery of health care services is given to the provinces within the confines of the Canada Health Act. We believe that is an appropriate division of responsibilities.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance.

Now that the Senate has passed the GST, Quebec has already exempted books from this tax and the Prime Minister of Canada promised to consider this a few weeks ago, is the minister prepared to make a formal commitment today that he will amend the goods and services tax legislation to provide an exemption for books? Is the minister prepared to accept the fact that taxing books means imposing ignorance?

[*English*]

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is wrong when he makes those comments.

We are not taxing educational services. We are not taxing public—If the hon. member says we are, he should read the legislation.

We are not taxing libraries. These are important elements in the whole battle against illiteracy in this country. My hon. friend realizes that we have not had Royal Assent. That, I expect, will come later today. We have said, with something as major as the goods and services tax legislation, that we will wait a period of time and review the impact that the GST has on various segments of the economy. After that, we will be in a better position to make some decisions.

* * *

• (1500 )

## FORESTRY

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister. Last week the Minister of the Environment promised to take steps to halt the clear cutting of timber in Canada's largest national park, Wood Buffalo in northern Alberta.

Since Canadian Forest Products is now cutting 24 hours a day and has given notice of its plans to double the cut, liquidating the largest white spruce forest in Alberta and destroying the trap lines and livelihood of the Little Red River Indian Band, will the Acting Prime Minister ask Canfor today to halt logging immediately? Or, is clear cutting of the national parks part of the green plan?

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I can indicate that there is a legal agreement between Canfor and the Government of Canada, which was initially entered into by our friends opposite in 1956 and which was renewed in 1982 for a 20-year period. Unfortunately, in that agreement as renewed in 1982, there was no provision for a buy-out opportunity.

This Government of Canada is opposed to the timber harvesting which is going on at the present time. We have indicated a willingness to negotiate with Canfor to secure such a buy-out if that company is willing to enter into negotiations.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### ORDER IN COUNCIL

TABLING AND REFERENCE OF APPOINTMENTS

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, a number of Order in Council appointments which were made by the government. Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 110(1), these are deemed referred to the appropriate standing committees, a list of which is attached.

* * *

### FEDERAL REGULATORY PLAN

TABLING OF DOCUMENT

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I am pleased to table, in both official languages, copies of the 1991 Federal Regulatory Plan.

* * *

### POINT OF ORDER

PRESENCE OF ASBESTOS IN WEST BLOCK

**Hon. Alan Redway (Minister of State (Housing)):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Last week the Minister of Public Works indicated in the House that he would be making available to all members of the House the report with respect to asbestos in the West Block.

Due to the fact that the report has not yet been translated into both official languages, it is not available for tabling in the House. However, it is available in both the opposition and government lobbies and is available to all members.

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, we understand the minister's predicament. We agreed that the document be made public outside the House, but it would be going against the Standing Order of this House and against the official languages law to table that today.

Although we requested this morning that it be done in the House, we certainly agree with the minister that it is better to dispose of that issue by tabling it outside the House.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I fully agree with the opposition House leader's comments. I may refer hon. members to Standing Order 32(4).

* * *

[*English*]

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

ENVIRONMENT—SIXTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

**Hon. David MacDonald (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the sixth report of the Standing Committee on the Environment, which has to do with the provision for publishing a report of the committee if the House happens not to be sitting when we expect to complete our third report on the atmosphere.

BILL C-91—REPORT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

**Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the report of the legislative committee on Bill C-91, an act to amend the Financial Administration Act and other acts, with amendment.

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

* * *

### QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 360 and 390.

[*Text*]

MEETINGS WITH BRITISH COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT RE. GST

Question No. 360—**Mr. Gardiner:**

Did representatives of the government of British Columbia attend meetings with the Ministers of Finance and National Revenue and their staff, where the principle, concept, and implementation of the Goods and Services Tax was discussed and, if so (a) on what dates (b) which representatives?

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** I am informed by the Departments of Finance and National Revenue as follows:

Representatives of the government of British Columbia attended meetings with the Minister of Finance where sales tax reform was discussed. At these meetings, the province of British Columbia was represented by the Hon. Mel Couvelier and/or senior officials. The dates these meetings took place are listed below.

December 12, 1986, Federal–Provincial Meeting of Finance Ministers and Treasurers.

March 12, 1987, Federal–Provincial Meeting of Finance Ministers and Treasurers.

June 15, 1987, Federal–Provincial Meeting of Finance Ministers and Treasurers.

November 5, 1987, Federal–Provincial Meeting of Finance Ministers and Treasurers.

December 10, 1987, Federal–Provincial Meeting of Finance Ministers and Treasurers.

March 9, 1989, Federal–Provincial Meeting of Finance Ministers and Treasurers.

April 7, 1989, Federal–Provincial Meeting of Finance Ministers and Treasurers.

December 7, 1989, Federal–Provincial Meeting of Finance Ministers and Treasurers.

The Minister of National Revenue and his staff did not attend meetings with representatives of the British Columbia government, where the principle, concept and implementation of the Goods and Services Tax was discussed.

DOWNSIZING IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE

Question No. 390—**Mr. Bellemare:**

Since February 1988, in the Public Service, how many people in the age 50 to 54 category have lost their employment due to downsizing?

*S. O. 52*

**Hon. Gerry Weiner (Secretary of State of Canada and Minister of State (Multiculturalism and Citizenship)):** I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows:

Since February 1, 1988, 149 employees in the age category 50 to 54 have been laid off from the Public Service. Of this number, 36 have been reappointed to the Public Service.

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The questions as enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered.

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

* * *

## MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S. O. 52

PERSIAN GULF

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I am in receipt of a notice of motion under Standing Order 52 from the hon. member for Victoria.

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could ask for leave, pursuant to Standing Order 52, for an emergency debate on the subject of the Persian Gulf and the situation there.

It arises out of the events of this past weekend. There had been planned meetings between the Secretary of State of the United States and the Foreign Minister of the Government of Iraq. Those meetings this past weekend have been cancelled, leading all observers of the grave situation in the Middle East to a new concern that war will break out in the Middle East shortly after January 15, the deadline established by the United Nations.

These events have added some urgency for this House because of the contemplated recess of the House in a few days. Given the deep concern of Canadians about the possible role of Canadian forces and the need for a commitment from the government before Canadian forces are committed to the situation in Iraq in any offensive capacity, this House must meet and must approve it. It is therefore, in my respectful submission, urgent that this House today deal with the situation as a

result of the weekend's events and have a debate on the issue of Canadian participation in offensive action in the gulf and a clear commitment from the government that there will be no such move by the government without clear parliamentary approval.

[*Translation*]

SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The hon. member for Victoria has once again raised an important question, but the Chair feels that the hon. member's request does not meet the criteria for an emergency debate at this time. Consequently, I will have to turn down this very legitimate request by the hon. member for Victoria, for the time being.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### PETRO-CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Thursday, December 6, consideration of Bill C-84, an act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada, as reported (without amendment) from the legislative committee; and the motion of Mr. Langdon (p. 16404).

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, I see that members on the government benches are all keyed up, but I suggest they calm down. I was busy with one of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, and I wonder whether you would perhaps refresh my memory and tell me where we are in the proceedings.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** We were considering motion No. 4A in the name of Mr. Langdon, concerning Bill C-84, the Petro-Canada legislation.

At the time the debate was adjourned, the hon. member for the New Democratic Party had the floor, and since he is absent, I wonder whether another speaker would like to be recognized.

**Some hon. members:** Question!

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The House is ready for the question.

Shall I dispense with the reading of motion No. 4A?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

• (1510 )

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The question is on Motion No. 4A. 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. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor)** moved:

Motion No. 6A

That Bill C-84 be amended in Clause 9 by adding immediately after line 26 at page 3 the following:

"(a) provisions insuring that the Governor in Council be entitled to appoint one director to the Board of Directors of Petro-Canada;"

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is yet another further attempt to see to it that there is some continuing public presence, some continuing reflection of the community and its concerns, as Petro-Canada makes its decisions.

After all, we have a company into which the Canadian people have put tremendous amounts of money. The total amount of taxpayers' money which has gone into this company is something like $4.3 billion in 1990

dollars. Taking inflation into account, that investment amounts to over $6.8 billion.

If we had a sense that this company would be sold for anything close to $6.8 billion and that money was going to come back to the people of Canada, then it might make some logical sense for the public authorities of this country to cut themselves off entirely from Petro-Canada. I still think it would be a serious mistake in terms of our national energy hopes for the future, but one could see the logic.

However, the minister indicated in testimony before committee that he simply did not know how much money would be received for the shares of this company. For instance, my colleague from Edmonton East asked him point blank: "What you are telling me is that the government does not really have a clue. The government simply does not know how much money it will get for the sale of Petro-Canada". I should congratulate the minister on his frankness when he responded by saying: "That is right. We do not know what we are going to get for the sale of Petro-Canada".

The minister was then asked by the hon. member for Edmonton East if there was a price below which the government would not go, but the minister would not name a price. He would not even say that it was the intention of the government to see to it that the taxpayers of this country would recoup the amount for which the company is valued on the books after some fairly slick accounting wizardry had recently reduced taxpayers' equity by $1.8 billion.

We have a company created by the taxpayers of Canada and expanded by the taxpayers of Canada. It was the recipient in present dollar terms of something like $6.8 billion in assistance and investment from the government, yet the government intends to cut its ties completely with this company.

What a total, absolute, abdication of responsibility to the taxpayers of the country, on the part of the future consumers of the country and on the part of the future people of the country who depend on this company for energy supplies.

We have suggested with this amendment that the government would be entitled to appoint one director to Petro-Canada's board, simply one director. We are not talking about government control of that board. We are not talking about a great mass of government bureaucrats. We are talking about a single director, so that there would be a chance for the public interest to be represented in the decision making that takes place in this company.

That director could of course be out-voted. It would be possible for that director to face a situation where he or she puts the public interest first, as cabinet saw it, before the Petro-Canada board and Petro-Canada says no, that it intends to follow the dictates of its bottom line and to seek to make decisions on the basis of what is most profitable for it, and that it is not going to listen.

This is not a suggestion that the director appointed by cabinet would have any extra power or authority, but that director would have the capacity to do two things: first, to convey to Petro-Canada, this company that we as taxpayers have put so much money into, the concerns of the public as reflected through the government of the day and, second, to be through participation on the Petro-Canada board, if not a window on the industry, at least a little peephole or a little chance for the government to have some direct insight into what is taking place with respect to this particular industry.

This is an industry which is crucial to the future of our country. It is crucial for the future of consumers and for the future of manufacturers. It is crucial for the future of resource producers in every part of the country that have to make use of gasoline or motor oil. Yet, if this amendment is not accepted, there will simply be a complete cut between the government which established this company and the company itself. This is not something remarkable or unusual. In many cases of privatization throughout the world, government has maintained the power to appoint at least one director. That director has proved an important communications link between the company and the government, subject of course to rules of confidentiality.

• (1520)

**Mr. McDermid:** Spy.

**Mr. Langdon:** The minister suggests that this director would somehow be a spy. That sort of ideological comment on the part of the government just reflects the lack of concern and understanding with respect to the

need for a closer relationship, a closer partnership between government and business in this country.

As far as this government is concerned, government is supposed to retire to the back room. People, the community, are supposed to forget about the $6.8 billion which they put into this company and of which they are almost bound to get, at most, half back. If the minister has been listening, he will realize that this is the 1990 value of the $4.3 billion which was originally invested in this company.

Anybody who looks at constant dollar terms as the government statistics do would realize that $6.8 billion in 1990 is the same as $4.3 billion in 1980.

My final point is to make the case as clear, and precise as possible that we are talking about one director. If this government will not accept even one director, I think this government just shows its lack of understanding of the future relationships between business and government.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I regret your time is over. The hon. member for Kamloops.

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, in order to facilitate the debate this afternoon, I wonder if you would not find that there is unanimous consent to consider the remaining two motions put forward by my hon. colleague from Essex—Windsor to be grouped for the purpose of debate and be voted on separately. This would simply facilitate the afternoon's proceedings. Motions 8A and 12A to—

**An hon. member:** What page?

**Mr. Riis:** Hey, a man who has found his place.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Does the House agree with the proposal of the hon. member for Kamloops?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor)** moved:

Motion No. 8A

That Bill C-84 be amended in Clause 9 by adding immediately after line 26 at page 3 the following:

"(a) provisions imposing a minimum price for the issuance and selling of shares so that the issuance and sale shall generate six billion seven hundred million dollars;".

Motion No. 12A

That Bill C-84 be amended in Clause 9 by striking out line 36 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"more than five per cent of the votes that".

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** Mr. Speaker, I will even try not to take my full 10 minutes, but I could not let this particular day and particular bill pass without commenting.

On December 3, 1977 at about one a.m. I became the candidate for the Conservative Party in the riding of Calgary West and ran for the first time in the election of 1979.

**An hon. member:** And won.

**Mr. Hawkes:** As a new candidate I felt it was my obligation in preparing to run for election and hopefully to be a member of this place, to spend some of that time in preparation, learning about pieces of public policy that I felt I was not comfortable with, that I did not know enough about.

Certainly in my case, as someone who was raised primarily in the city, agriculture was one of those areas and I spent many hours at it.

But the other was the oil industry. I was born in Calgary and grew up there. Many of my friends and acquaintances worked in one facet or another of the oil industry. Yet when facing the possibility of coming here as a member of Parliament I realized how little I really knew about it and how great the need was to learn more about it. I set about doing that. It would certainly have been easier for me in the city of Calgary than it might have been for members in other communities such as Windsor, to really be able to get people voluntarily to teach me about this industry because Calgary is the capital and Calgary is the centre.

One of the people who was my mentor was a man who was the president and the chairman of the board of a company called Voyageur Petroleum. When we became the government in 1979, he headed a committee on behalf of the government to look into the divestiture of Petro-Canada. They brought forward a report in December of that year which never became public policy because we subsequently lost the vote in the House of Commons and we lost an election.

Why did we, in 1979, and why did I, in the intervening time from December 3, 1977 until running for election in 1979, become so convinced and so persuaded that it was a piece of very bad public policy to create Petro-Canada in the first place, and that it was an even worse piece of

public policy to maintain it over all these intervening years.

I have read and listened to speeches that come from the other side. I say to members opposite, by and large, you do not know what you are talking about. You have no sense of reality about the funding and the financing of this corporation and what it did to our nation. It was an ideological decision to create this company in the first place. The cost of it was horrendous.

Prior to my running for office, Petro-Canada had acquired its first two smaller oil companies. The public treasury lost its income tax contribution because the minute they came into Petro-Canada's hands, they had no profit. In fact, the grants that the public, all of a sudden, had to give to those companies exceeded the income tax that it had been getting.

When I listen to the member opposite talk about all of the public money invested in this corporation. We had given up essentially, 15 years of income tax. We know how that compounds in the system and the contribution it would have made to deficit reduction over that entire 15-year period of time. We compounded the problem by giving them until 1984, until we became the government, annual grants of substantial size over and above those that were available to the industry generally, just for this corporation specifically.

In the entire period of time from the creation of this corporation until today, the government has had to borrow money to meet its operating expenses, that is, until the last three years when we have a little bit of money to apply the interest on the public debt.

We are talking about governments that went into the private sector, destroyed private companies by bringing them into Petro-Canada and paying for them with borrowed dollars. Canadians are stuck paying the interest on that public debt. My friend is worried about getting $4 billion back from Petro-Canada when it is worth over $7 billion. I heard him earlier in Question Period saying, "restore the money to the CBC. Give them the $108 million that they are asking for". Give, give, give. If we had even $4 billion, let alone $7.8 billion, would we not having to pay interest on it because it was a reduction of the public debt, $4 billion at 10 per cent, which is below market rates, is $400 million. We could give the CBC four times what it is asking for if that is his priority. But no, he would rather own corner service stations, asphalt, gas tank hoses and little numbers that run up and down. I am talking about the New Democrat who put these motions and just spoke, but it is a speech I have heard from the Liberals a thousand times.

I will tell you what it did to my city. When the government decided, for ideological reasons, that it had to move in this direction, it distorted, almost overnight, the entire labour market of an industry in the upward direction by about 35 per cent. It made all the costs for every oil company in this country on the staffing side at least 30 per cent to 35 per cent higher almost overnight and was a root cause of the runaway inflation in the early 1980s. This was the root cause of a whole lot of suicides and spousal batterings and this kind of stuff, because the government had blinders and said: "We must be involved in the oil industry at any cost and at any price". What advice did it give us? It did this under the rubric that it had this superlative advice that would put the Government of Canada in a position to do something, but what it was in a position to do was to inflate prices.

• (1530)

**An hon. member:** And the 18 cents went to two bucks.

**Mr. Hawkes:** Mr. Speaker, since Petro-Canada came on the scene the cost of producing gas and oil in this country has rocketed astronomically and the taxation has rocketed astronomically. That permeates the society, it increases the cost of clothing and food and everything else we use. That is the contribution that Petro-Canada has made.

The only salvation at the end of the line is to go out there and sell those shares, bring the money in, reduce the debt, reduce the costs and make things cheaper for Canadians. That is what it is all about.

* * *

## 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 his honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

• (1540)

[*Translation*]

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-87, an act to amend the statute law in relation to war veterans—Chapter 43;

Bill C-39, an act to apply federal laws and provincial laws to offshore areas and to amend certain acts in consequence thereof—Chapter 44;

Bill C-62, an act to amend the Excise Tax Act, the Criminal Code, the Customs Act, the Customs Tariff, the Excise Act, the Income Tax Act, the Statistics Act and the Tax Court of Canada Act—Chapter 45; and

Bill S-14, an Act respecting the laws prohibiting marriage between related persons—Chapter 46.

* * *

[*English*]

## PRIVILEGE

### ROYAL ASSENT

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt):** Mr. Speaker, I am looking to you for guidance. When the Gentleman Usher of the Back Rod was here, I rose on a point of privilege. Perhaps I was out of order, but being a rookie to this place, I possibly did not know any better.

I am asking the Speaker when it is proper for a member to rise on a point of privilege. When I was rising on a point of privilege, it was a matter very important to me. I am looking for your guidance, Mr. Speaker, as to whether it is proper to rise on a point of privilege, when it is proper and how far democracy can be overlooked.

[*Translation*]

### SPEAKER'S RULING

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** When the hon. member rose, the process had already started. He rose when the Chair was leaving the House to go to the other place. Unfortunately, it was impossible for the Chair to recognize the hon. member at that time, since the procedure for Royal Assent had already started. I felt I could not recognize anyone while we were engaged in this procedure.

[*English*]

**Mr. Karygiannis:** Mr. Speaker, I thank you. Perhaps I am trying to set a precedent, but I believe that democracy, and the way that we are elected here, should never be stopped or overlooked.

My point of privilege is that my rights were overlooked. I believe that this House should not have followed the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod to the other place as it would result in a breach of privilege of all members of this House.

I base this point on the fact that in neither House of Parliament did the government permit the full process to take place. I would urge that in accepting Bill C-62, as we did, without the—

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I believe I explained why I behaved the way I did. I see no need to discuss this decision, and with respect, I would appreciate the hon. member's co-operation. Perhaps we could resume debate from where we were before the Royal Assent. I want to thank the hon. member for his co-operation.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*English*]

**Mr. Karygiannis:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that I was trying to catch your eye and you did see me. Maybe you did not, but through my eyes I thought that you did see me. The privileges of the members in this democratically-elected House should not be overlooked. The rights of members should always be first and foremost.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I remind the hon. member of Standing Order 48:

48(2) Unless notice of motion has been given under Standing Orders 54 or 86(2), any Member proposing to raise a question of privilege—

I did not receive notice from the hon. member. I regret that I did not receive notice of your question of privilege. Resuming debate.

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

## PETRO-CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-84, an act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada, as reported (without amendment) from a legislative committee, and Motion No. 6A (Mr. Langdon).

**Hon. Roger C. Simmons (Burin—St. George's):** Mr. Speaker, I want to speak very briefly to Bill C-94 and in particular talk about the amendment moved by the gentleman from Essex—Windsor.

In doing so, let me make a preliminary comment. I am delighted to see the gentleman for Kamloops here in the Chamber because I not only listened with care to what he was saying, but I believe more to the point, watched what he was doing when he was making his final point just a few minutes ago. Indeed, those who were watching the monitors outside of the Chamber would have found the whole exercise very instructive as he went to his one pocket, then the other, to determine what his position ought to be on this particular amendment.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that a week or so ago I talked to this Chamber about what I call my NDP suit, which has a pocket on either side. The NDP in their respective pockets carry various positions on various subjects.

Well today, poor fellow, the hon. member for Kamloops got his pockets all mixed up but eventually got them sorted out. We now know that he is going to vote for the amendment put down by the gentleman for Essex—Windsor, a member of the same party. He is going to vote for the second one put down by the hon. member for Essex-Windsor. There were three in a row. My friend for Kamloops is going to vote for all three of those amendments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you think that is consistency, I say to you it is and we commend it. If you think it is an accident, I say to you, right again. It was an accident that he went to the left pocket instead of the right. I commend him for that particular accident. You see, he does sit next to me, the very next seat on my left. He stands to my left, and to my right, depending on the mood of the moment.

My friend is getting exercised now, but I mean this kindly. It is too near Christmas to get upset with my friends from British Columbia. We have too much in common to get upset with them.

**Mr. McDermid:** Name one thing.

**Mr. Simmons:** The Minister of State for Privatization says name one thing. We are the book-ends in Newfoundland and B.C. which help keep this country together, despite the minister's best efforts to tear it apart. That is one thing we have in common.

**An hon. member:** *Touché.*

**Mr. Simmons:** I say to my friend for Comox—Alberni that my sister-in-law is numbered among his constituents. He had better look after that particular constituent.

**Mr. McDermid:** Did she vote for him?

**Mr. Simmons:** I certainly could talk to her on that point. She had that choice or Social Credit, which is no choice at all. She is bright enough to know that having to decide between NDP and Social Credit is not much of a decision to have to make. I think he will agree on that point. Now we have them all excited in the NDP. Anybody who can get the NDP excited ought to get a medal.

I was saying to my friend from British Columbia that we in this party and particularly those who come from Newfoundland are still a bit upset about the jig that the crowd in the NDP danced on Hibernia. If ever anybody needed a suit with several pockets, it was that particular day. When they voted against the bill, they voted Hibernia. Then the member for Yukon went to Newfoundland and made that memorable statement to the press and to the university students. She said: "Because we voted against it does not mean we are against it". Oh no. If you are in the NDP, it does not mean that at all. It could mean you are for it or against it, or both, as the case may be. Do you understand that? It is all very clear. You are either for it, against it, or both. So I took great encouragement a few minutes ago when I found the hon. member for Kamloops actually closing ranks. He is going to vote for all three amendments put down by the hon. member for Essex—Windsor. Mr. Speaker, we are mak-

ing progress in this House. It is getting near Christmas. You can tell just by the mood of the House.

• (1550)

This brings me to the hon. member for Calgary West. That was not only his first speech, but his finest speech, absolutely his finest speech to date. He actually said—and you want to scream out "author"—listen to it: "They don't know what they are talking about". That is original. "They don't know what they are talking about", he said. Well, far be it from me to defend the NDP that I just came that close to maligning, but they do know what they are talking about and so do we, on this particular issue.

I say to my friend, the hon. member for Calgary West, that if he were a little more charitable today, he would recognize that we do know what we are talking about. I believe what he really means is that he does not agree with what we are talking about. He does not agree with what we are saying and that is his right because he has the right to be wrong, and he is dead wrong. He knows what he is talking about when he speaks on PetroCan but he is applying his facts, I submit, with less than real skill because he should read the title of this bill, "an act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada". That was what it was intended to be, our national policy instrument in the area of energy. That is what it is, that is what it was, and that is what the government is destroying. The government can put the nicest face on it and make as many accusations as it wants about that big, bad, Liberal regime in its day but it cannot skate around the fact that it is wiping out an important policy instrument at a time when we still need it.

Indeed, I heard the hon. member go on about all the sins that had been visited on the country by this big, bad, Liberal regime. The hon. member blamed Petro-Canada for suicides and for the pulverizing of Calgary. One would think that Calgary did not exist any more. I was in Calgary and it was existing and getting along fine, thank you, despite his gloom and doom scenario. If the hon. member is going to represent Calgary, let him represent it as having a future, not as if he is giving a funeral oration. A great city like Calgary is being maligned by one of its very own members. It is shameful, absolutely shameful. I have three sisters in Calgary. They deserve better representation than that. I am going to send them out with my cousin in Comox—Alberni because people are getting better representation out there than they are getting from that member. I do not agree with what he says but at least he does not misrepresent.

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Simmons:** At least he does not misrepresent. The minister is absolutely right, I should not suggest that the hon. member for Calgary West is misrepresenting. For that I apologize. I got carried away again, as I often do.

When I heard the hon. member talking about what terrible things Petro-Canada visited on this country, such as wiping out a city—which I understand still exists, despite his submission to the contrary—which has caused suicides, it occurred to me that about the only thing that he has not blamed PetroCan for is Noah's fame, as a result of the flood. That is about the only thing he did not cite as being the direct, adverse consequence of this animal, this monster called PetroCan.

It is getting much too near Christmas. These people ought to restrain themselves. If they are going to get up and say irresponsible things in the House, they ought to be required to have their notes read by somebody who knows what he is talking about, before they let loose people like the member for Calgary West who gets up and, with respect, I say to him, makes a complete fool of himself. He knows what he is talking about, yes, but he does not apply his knowledge terribly well in this circumstance.

I see from your signal, Sir, that my time is running out. Let me tell you that I think the hon. member for Essex—Windsor has a brilliant resolution on 6A, so I am going to vote for it. It does not look too brilliant on 8A, so I am going to vote against it. We support what he is saying in 12A. We are for a little more control in terms of foreign ownership, and I can support that particular amendment.

On a final word, let us put this thing in context. This has nothing to do with the minutia or the routine of changing bills. This has to do, however nicely it is couched, with dismantling a country. Whether you are talking about CBC, or post offices or unemployment insurance, this is another nail in the coffin of Canada. This privatization of PetroCan is part of the process that this government undertook back in 1984. It is part of a process of dismantling what was once a great country. There will not be enough left to govern if this crowd stays in office much longer. That is why I like the idea of the man out west, who was reported on the news this weekend. He is starting a campaign to have an election

now. I am going to subscribe to his advertising fund. The sooner the better for all concerned, especially Canada.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, the last time I stood regarding what we were doing, I think I garbled up a little bit. I would like to seek unanimous consent so that Motions Nos. 8A and 12A be deemed to be moved by the member from Essex—Windsor and grouped with 6A, currently under debate, with an understanding that the vote on 6A would apply to 8A and 12A.

I will simply say that 8A and 12A be deemed to be moved by the member for Essex—Windsor and grouped with 6A, currently under debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House agreed on the motion of the hon. member from Kamloops?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie):** Mr. Speaker, I believe I know which amendments I am supposed to be speaking to. I am probably in favour of all of them, including some of the Liberal ones that are vague, to say the least.

We have had the smugness of the member from Calgary West saying "We know it all and you know nothing," and that is part of the problem with the government. It tells Canadians "You know nothing, let us steer you in the right direction and everything will be fine." We go from smugness to Liberal flippancy. I enjoy the member's speeches but, on such a serious topic, you would not think that he would be just quite so flippant. The Christmas spirit I hope we will all catch, but the flippancy of the topic and of the Christmas spirit is not appropriate.

We New Democrats take this extremely seriously. I honestly thought that in my constituency there would not be a great to-do about the privatization of PetroCan. Nevertheless, we went ahead with the press conference at a PetroCan station in our community, along with 20 other New Democrats. I do not think the Liberals bothered, so this defence of Petro-Canada is a bit of a sham.

Afterward, we received 800 mail-backs of concern from my riding saying: "Please, government, don't sell off PetroCan". Here we are at Christmastime this year. Do you know what we were doing last year? I am sure the members opposite would want to forget. Last year we were talking about clawback, the end of universality in this country as we now know it. At that time it was lost in another debate and many Canadians were not aware of what was going on. Now, I think, they know. Here we are again at Christmastime and the government is doing something unto Canadians which they do not want to happen. In talking about my friend from Kamloops and his pockets and whatever he was trying to depict about my good friend, one has to talk about where the Liberals stand. I suspect that they do stand on the fence. They are getting hit from both sides, and that is very difficult. We understand where this group opposite is; it is on the far right. We understand we are on the left, but the Liberals maintain that middle road. As I say, they get hit from both sides when they do that.

• (1600)

**Mr. Gauthier:** The Liberals set it up.

**Mr. Butland:** The Liberals set it up at the behest of the New Democratic Party, absolutely. That is the truth, and the Liberals know it full well. I can tell by their reaction that we have touched a nerve. It was set up at the behest of the New Democratic Party.

The energy critic at that time was the member for Sault Ste. Marie, Cyril Symes, a good man. It was his initiative, along with that of Tommy Douglas. I hope to have a chance to give some education, as opposed to this smugness from the member for Calgary West that they know it all. I suggest he read about Tommy Douglas, and he might know a heck of a lot more than he does now.

With regard to privatization, we are talking Petro-Canada, Air Canada, Canada Post, and VIA Rail. I am wondering if we are talking about CBC. The CBC says it will not be able to fund the viewing of Parliament in the rest of Canada. I am wondering if this is the foot in the door which we brought to the government's attention. Everyone should know that there was an agreement between CBC and the cable companies of this country to get into a partnership where they would share the viewing—

**Mr. McDermid:** What has this got to do with these amendments?

**Mr. Butland:** It is related to this privatization. It seems strange that the CBC would make such a sensitive cut and say: "Canadians, you are not going to be able to view Parliament". However, there is an agreement between Cableco and CBC somewhere that may go to the CRTC, and eventually this agreement may come about. I suspect, since CBC cannot afford it, we will be able to privatize it completely. You will be able to avoid the lobby groups, go right into the House and buy yourself an MP, the ones perhaps who are not already bought.

**Some hon. members:** Order, order.

**Mr. Butland:** Mr. Speaker, you do not have to stand. If necessary, I retract that statement.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please! I may remind hon. members that the debate is still on the three motions in the name of the hon. member for Essex—Windsor, Motions Nos. 6A, 8A and 12A. I am sure the hon. member knows better than to digress from the subject before the House today which deals with the legislation to privatize Petro-Canada.

I thank the hon. member for his co-operation.

[*English*]

**Mr. Butland:** Mr. Speaker, I thank you for reminding me of the excellent amendments as proposed by the New Democratic Party and my lukewarm support for most of the vague amendments from the Liberal Party.

I thought what the member for Burin—St. George's touched upon had no relationship whatsoever. He talked about my friend from Comox—Alberni and people all across the country. I too have friends, but I am not going to recite their names. I suspect that mine was more in line with the amendments than that of my colleague from Burin—St. George's.

**Mr. Milliken:** You are getting into trouble. Maybe you should sit down.

**Mr. Butland:** No, I am going to continue. These amendments are very appropriate because at least they are offering that last bit of hope to Canadians that there will be a line of communication with Petro-Canada as we once knew it, not as it has developed over the past several years.

They are suggesting: "Let's sell it off. Let's operate it like a private enterprise". Canadian taxpayers have asked me: "If you sell off a private company, don't you get some money back. Where is my dividend? If I have invested $7 billion", or whatever the price tag is "am I not entitled to something back?" I am sure if a corporation divests itself of its ownership the directors say: "Where is my proceeds from the sale?" This is not going to happen.

Petro-Canada had the opportunity to be a leader, to be a public servant. It was in the beginning but gradually it phased out. It was not allowed to show any leadership in areas in which it certainly could have, given the appropriate funding. The director of Petro-Canada said: "If the timing is not right to sell, we won't sell". Let us say that the timing could not be worse. I know the minister would agree with me that the timing could not be worse. Petro-Canada was begun because of the mid-east crisis, and there may be an oil crisis. The timing is inappropriate. It is the wrong time, the wrong price, the wrong decision. If Petro-Canada had taken any kind of public leadership, Canadians would have said: "My goodness, it is different from the other corporations". However it was not allowed to.

I have cited before what is perhaps a very small environmental issue that becomes a major one. In my community I receive calls from constituents and gasoline retailers saying: "What about our waste oil? What do we do with it?" Nobody wants it. Some people say: "I am forced to go out into the forest and dump my waste oil when I change my oil in my vehicle". Why could not Petro-Canada, if it were operating for public benefit and public good, show leadership in that area? It will never be allowed to because profit will now be the sole motivation for the corporation. It will be no different from any other oil multinational. It will be the very same.

The amendments are excellent. They stand on their own merit. Once again I have to say that whoever crafted the Liberal amendments—

**Mr. McDermid:** We are not on them yet.

**Mr. Butland:** I think I have to make a point of them. Petro-Canada has to work for the general advantage of

Canada, how vague can they be? Ours are very specific and exemplary. I think the House should support them.

**Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex):** Mr. Speaker, I rise at report stage on this bill because I believe, as I pointed out at the second reading stage, that the mandate of Petro-Canada should be expanded.

Motion No. 6A would provide that the Governor in Council be entitled to appoint one director to the board of Petro-Canada. It is one of the ways that we could achieve some of the things I spoke about at second reading.

I asked the government at that time to expand the mandate of Petro-Canada, not only to reinstate its status as a vehicle for frontier development and exploration which has been virtually at a standstill over the last two years. The number of oil wells drilled and brought into production in Canada last year was the lowest since the 1970s. This year it is only slightly better in spite of increased crude oil prices. The other area I suggested to this government to expand the role of Petro-Canada was the inclusion of alternative and renewable fuels. I suggested that the government should immediately implement a program to ensure that all automotive fuels contain 3.2 per cent oxygen, and that MMT be banned for use in Canada immediately.

This octane enhancer, MMT, has been banned in the United States since 1978. In the words of one our leading neurotoxic scientists, "it is an insidious neurotoxic substance that is taken in through the respiratory system and destroys the cells in the base of the brain". Children whose immune systems are not yet fully developed are particularly susceptible. Canadian children will accumulate the substance in their bodies over a period of years, and the results may not be visible for several years.

This is a case of gross negligence by this government. I submit the government should not privatize this oil company but rather direct it to take the lead by cleaning up its product and developing the plants required to produce the ethanol and provide a blended gasoline which is one part ethanol to nine parts gasoline.

• (1610)

This requirement would utilize five million to eight million bushels of Canadian grains and would be a tremendous boost to the farmers of this nation. This new market would take about 20 per cent of our total grain production. The by-products created could be used by the cattle industry, the dairy industry, fish farms, and as a dried food product for Third World countries for human consumption.

I should point out that the net energy balance of ethanol contains two to four times the energy invested in its manufacture. In fact fuel ethanol is renewable. Its positive net energy balance of up to 80,000 B.t.u. per U.S. gallon is extremely favourable in comparison to gasoline, a fossilized energy source. The net energy content of gasoline is calculated at 110,000 B.t.u. per U.S. gallon, after accounting for a 12 per cent energy subsidy consumed in energy production and refining.

This government has brought in closure on this bill. We do not have a great deal of time or opportunity to debate all the possibilities and opportunities that should be pursued by this Crown corporation.

The so-called green plan tabled last week in this House shows the areas of smog concentration across Canada. These are all concentrated in major urban centres where the congestion of traffic is greatest. The report points out that this smog is the worst in the summer months. Therefore we know that most of it has to come from automotive emissions rather than home or office furnaces or other heating systems.

The report also states that these concentrations are known to have adverse effects on health. Yet the report carefully avoids any identification of one of the worst toxic substances being used. It ignores the fact that there are environmentally friendly alternatives that would cut these carbon dioxide emissions by 10 per cent or more. This is not just a 10 per cent cut in carbon dioxide emissions, but carbon dioxide emissions are also absorbed through the process of photosynthesis or the growing of the plant because as it is growing to produce the grains the plant absorbs carbon dioxide from the air. We have a double-barrelled impact on the reduction of carbon dioxide emissions.

We have the lowering of the carbon dioxide emissions on the one hand. Then, if we were to ban the MMT or methylcyclopentadienyl manganese tricarbonate in Canada as they have in the United States, it would also take away that insidious near toxic substance that comes from the exhaust systems of cars, commonly known to che-

mists as Mn3, and accumulates not only in the atmosphere but in the bodies of the people who breathe it in.

I should point out that this is not the normal type of manganese accumulation that takes place through the digestive system. Our bodies, soil and most growing plants contain manganese, but this Mn3 is taken in through the respiratory system and attacks the cells at the base of the brain. As I mentioned earlier, young children whose immune systems are not yet in place are particularly susceptible.

I am appalled that in the last month and a half five individuals from Newfoundland through to southern Ontario have come to me with health problems they feel may be linked to gasoline additives. I am not convinced at this point that all of it may not be linked to the Mn3 but to other substances including benzene, which is used as an octane enhancer and is carcinogenic in nature. The people who have come to me with these problems pointed out that they worked either in a gas station, at a distribution centre or in the service bay of an automotive dealership and consequently over the years have come down with these ailments. They must be linked somehow to the fuels and to the environment they work in.

I wish to point out one quote from page 44 of the green plan.

> Over the last 20 years, scientists have learned much about the detrimental effects of toxic chemicals. We know that barely detectable amounts of some chemicals have the ability to remain and build up in the tissue of the animals we rely on for food. These "persistent" toxic substances accumulate to a point where they represent a danger to our health.

I see that I am running out of time, but I want to suggest that it is a case of gross negligence to suggest that we should be concerned about the build-up in animals and completely ignore the build-up in citizens of this country. Certainly both go hand in hand. If we are going to be concerned about the build-up in animals we rely on for food, we should also be concerned about the build-up in human bodies, because we have far more humans in the urban concentration around the cities where the smog is worse than we do animals, which are usually out in the countryside grazing in the pastures or eating in barns or feed lots.

I call on the government now to withdraw this bill and give Petro-Canada a new mandate, one that places first and foremost the health of our people including that of our children and grandchildren.

**Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the member who just spoke on his speech and his suggestion about the kind of leadership that Petro-Canada could take under appropriate management and direction from the government, if we had a government that was capable of giving the corporation appropriate direction.

Basically what we are doing here is following the dictates of an ideologically right wing party that believes the government should not be involved in anything. For that reason, it wants to dump Petro-Canada and virtually every other Crown corporation that it is involved in.

I was surprised at the member for Calgary West who was talking about the amount of income tax we could get from Petro-Canada. He was talking about the fact that once Petro-Canada was nationalized we were no longer able to receive income tax from it. I challenge the member for Calgary West to tell me about the 100,000 other corporations in this country that are profitable corporations and pay absolutely no income tax at all.

Among those corporations are some of the most profitable oil companies that operate in Canada, basically foreign owned oil companies such as Shell Oil of Canada which in many years has paid absolutely no income tax at all.

I suspect that once Petro-Canada is privatized, given the tax policy of this government, we are not going to see a nickel of income tax coming from Petro-Canada because of the taxation policy of this government that has allowed the rich and powerful to get away with paying absolutely no taxes in this country. There are 100,000 profitable corporations paying absolutely no income tax at all. Petro-Canada is going to be numbered among those, as have Shell Oil and other major oil companies over the years because of Conservative and Liberal tax policies.

The suggestion that once they privatize Petro-Canada we are going to see the income tax flowing from that organization is false and misleading. I am sure the

member did not mean to mislead the House. This may have been a belief of his, but it certainly is not borne out by the taxation statistics.

The member for Calgary West also complained about the number of grants that the Government of Canada and the taxpayers of Canada have had to pay to Petro-Canada over the last few years. I can tell the hon. member that grants have gone from this government to oil companies that are not in the public sector. Petro-Canada received very few of those grants. As the hon. member for Burin—St. George's just pointed out, we gave something like $1.8 billion or it might have been $2.1 billion to the Hibernia project. We have given money to projects for getting oil out of the tar sands of northern Alberta. We have given money for heavy oil upgraders on the border between Alberta and Saskatchewan.

• (1620)

This government has been very generous in the grants that it has given to private oil companies. In many cases, those grants have not substantially increased the amount of permanent employment in this country and in many cases those grants have not resulted in any permanent, long-term employment at all in this country. The grants have simply gone to foreign-controlled oil companies and, in many cases, there is a connection between the amount of money flowing outside of our borders, along with the oil that flows outside of our borders to the United States, and the grants made by this government and this Parliament generally end up flowing outside our borders and leaving Canadians with no net benefit from the grants made to those corporations.

That information has been backed up by a number of studies, including studies done by the Auditor General. So the suggestion that grants have been made to Petro-Canada and not to other oil companies is completely false. The vast majority of grants made by this country and this Parliament to oil companies have gone to the private oil companies and in most cases they have delivered no real net benefit, no long lasting benefit. In addition, many of the companies receiving those grants are among the companies listed in the taxation statistics as paying no income tax at all. So it is not a good deal for Canadians.

The oil companies derive other benefits from this government as well. I noticed over the last weekend the Minister of Transport announced that the oil companies are going to receive the generous benefit of not having to double-hull the tankers that they use in Canadian waters. It may be a generous benefit to the oil companies, but to people in my constituency who have seen oil spills on their beaches time after time, and have, in many cases, seen those oil spills cleaned up through the efforts of government tax money and through the volunteer efforts of constituents in my riding, the grant of the relief from the double-hulling of the tankers is not of much benefit to Canadian citizens and certainly not of much benefit to the people of my riding who are going to experience more oil spills, as a result of that decision by the Minister of Transport. Again, this is a decision made by this government that receives a substantial amount of its campaign donations from oil companies. This is a decision made to benefit the oil companies. In spite of the risk of oil spills, in spite of the green plan, and in spite of what this government says about its concern for the environment, this government is not going to require the oil companies to assume the costs of the risks of transporting oil. In fact, this government has said that those oil companies can pass that risk on.

**Mr. McDermid:** What has this got to do with this amendment. Absolutely nothing.

**Mr. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** It has a substantial amount to do with it. For the member who constantly speaks from his seat, who never stands up in the House to justify his positions, and who is constantly harassing other members in the House, this human wrecking-ball who is responsible for privatization in the cabinet, if he wants to stand up and speak, let him do so, but when other members are on their feet speaking in this House, as is their right, I would appreciate it, Mr. Speaker, if you would tell that member to shut up.

**Mr. McDermid:** Start telling the truth.

**Mr. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, this member was speaking from his seat a few minutes ago when my colleague, the hon. member for Essex—Windsor was talking about putting a director on the board of PetroCan who would be appointed by Governor in Council. We are not asking that the NDP appoint this director, we are not asking that the Liberals appoint this director. However, if the opposition did it, it would probably be more

responsible to the people of Canada. We are saying that the Governor in Council should appoint a director to the board of Petro-Canada once it is privatized.

There is a precedent for this. The member from his seat said, "All you want to do is control the private sector". We are all subject to a certain element of control in this country. We all have to drive our car on the appropriate side of the road and stop at stop signs. Oil companies themselves should be subject to some control, whether it is pollution control or whether it is control relating to labour relations and occupational health and safety.

In Europe, the government and trade unions put representatives on the board of directors so that the policies of companies, the labour policies and government policies can be integrated and can be consistent. We are not saying that the oil companies should not be making a profit. We are saying that oil companies' policies should be consistent with the other policies of the country so that we can develop an integrated approach to the management and the exploration for energy. That is all we are asking.

For this member to crab from his seat and say, "All you want to do is control the private sector", that is absolutely right. We believe that the private sector should be subjected to the same kind of controls that individuals in our society are subjected to, so that we all obey the laws and so that we all operate in a direction that is consistent with what is best for Canada.

I definitely support the idea of the government having a single director on the board of Petro-Canada. I think it is an excellent amendment and I certainly commend it to the House for its support.

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to say a few words concerning the three amendments now before the House, the three amendments having been put forward by colleagues in the New Democratic Party. I could not help but listen carefully to the remarks of my colleague in the Liberal opposition, the member for Lambton—Middlesex, in relation to the ethanol issue, an alternative fuel and the hope that Petro-Canada might have had an expanded mandate in this area of alternative fuels.

In my view it is unfortunate that over the long haul we may have, in divesting ourselves of Petro-Canada, given away, sold or privatized a tool that might have addressed the issue of alternative fuels in a manner that is more prompt and more effective than that which the private sector by itself would generate.

Motion No. 6A proposes that the Governor in Council has the right to appoint one director to the board of Petro-Canada. We feel that is not a bad amendment at all. We feel we can support that.

As long as the government controls the shares of Petro-Canada, it is going to be appointing directors. For that phase of the privatization of Petro-Canada, there really is not great difficulty relative to the appointment of directors. As the sale goes on, as we piece off more and more of Petro-Canada, we approach what we could call the grey line—it is not a red line, it is a grey line-where we are not sure whether the big block shareholder has control or not. In some widely-held corporations the control block can involve as little as 10 or 15 per cent of the shares outstanding. So what do we do, the people of Canada, when our government holds, something in the vicinity of 10 or 15 per cent, let us say, of the outstanding shares of Petro-Canada? We have one foot on the dock and one foot on the boat and we may find we no longer have control. We have an interest but we no longer have any representation on the board. This amendment would ensure that the Governor in Council had that right to appoint at least one person to the board.

The amendment, as it is structured, would run past the total divestiture date. It would go on forever. It would be in perpetuity, I suppose, as long as Petro-Canada was around. Given the origins of Petro-Canada I cannot say that would be a bad thing for us or for Petro-Canada.

• (1630)

The other amendment, 12A, proposes that the individual control limit that would be the 10 per cent limit of shareholdings would be reduced to 5 per cent. I would not want to try to guess what the reason for that would be, but I think the reason is that, as I mentioned earlier, the control blocks in some widely held corporations can be constituted by as little as—and I am talking theory here—10 per cent. I think the thrust of the amendment is that the threshold be 5 per cent so that we are very sure that we can catch control blocks and prevent them from maturing.

I was disappointed actually in the remarks of the member for Calgary West when he referred to the fact that Petro-Canada did not earn a profit in its early years. It was not profitable for the taxpayers of the country. I have to point out for the record that we are not in the business of making profits, of running things for profits.

We are in the business of running a country, not for profit, and the acquisition of Petro-Canada was not ideologically driven any more than a divestiture of Petro-Canada is ideologically driven.

There are a lot of countries in this world that have state oil companies and are proud of it. They continue in operation and some of them are thriving. It happens to be the position of this government, whether it is ideologically driven or not—and we can certainly debate that here if we want to—that Petro-Canada should be discarded. We, of course, do not agree with that and it is not easy to stand and try to propose constructive amendments to a bill that you fundamentally disagree with.

Is your heart in it? I suppose your heart is in it, trying to make a bad bill better, but if you agree with divestiture and privatization, this is not a bad bill. It does exactly what the doctor ordered. It sends the thing back out into the private sector. A lot of people expect that those in opposition have an obligation to lie down in front of the freight train and do a Hollywood production. The debate is opposition. It is not grandstanding, it is not a Darryl F. Zanuck Hollywood production that some people in the media would like it to be. It is what is going on right here in debate.

The last amendment proposed is No. 8A, requiring that the sale yield $6.7 billion bottom line. I am afraid that we cannot support that. The idea is fine and it would be nice if we could dictate what the sale would yield, admitting all along that we do not agree with the sale in the first place, but we have to keep in mind that we are selling Petro-Canada—if it is to be sold—in fractions and pieces. You cannot at the beginning create what looks like a master reserve bid. You cannot dictate in the beginning that the sale is going to yield a minimum of *x* billion dollars all the way through.

That would make the sale, the privatization, rather problematic. Maybe that is part of the thrust of the amendment. Maybe I kind of agree with that too. But if it is going to be sold and if we do not like the deal, let us get on and not destabilize the process and let us not back ourselves into a corner that would impair the process that we adopt in the House here.

Having addressed the three amendments in that way I will defer to the next speaker.

**Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Mr. Speaker, in the brief time we have this afternoon to speak to Bill C-84 I would like to put some comments on the record about this bill, what its intentions are, and of course on some of the amendments that are actually being proposed this afternoon.

Before I start I would like to give credit to two colleagues from our caucus who have done a great deal of work on this bill, the hon. member for Essex—Windsor and the hon. member for Edmonton East, my seatmate, who as our energy critic has really led the way with his staff to prepare a lot of the material and information on this bill at a very important time.

If we look at the world Conservative agenda or world-wide conspiracy in their own respective jurisdictions to destroy the country and the institutions many of us have come to believe in and to recognize, I do not think we should forget what this government is doing. As the member from Scarborough mentioned, how do you move good amendments to bad legislation? I want to echo his comments on where that fits in with the agenda that this government is following. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, on a Monday afternoon for a couple of hours, we get to do our best to convince government members opposite of some of the amendments we propose to their plan to get rid of PetroCan will make it a very difficult thing. It fits with the agenda this government has, be it post offices, VIA Rail and, of course, more recently their attempts to destroy the CBC, some of the institutions that have come to help define what we are in Canada.

I hope when the vote takes place that maybe enough Tories will stay away and some of these amendments will actually pass. These are good amendments and they are trying to improve bad legislation. When you look at the amendments you can actually see that they are very reasonable.

For example, the motion from the New Democrats is asking the cabinet to appoint a member to the board of this newly privatized PetroCan so it may provide a window, or a messenger if you like, to have the opportunity that the Government of Canada would still

have in terms of directing the activities of PetroCan, to provide some advice from government and from the public. I think that is very important. I do not know how long the Minister of State for Privatization's political career has been, but I will tell you one thing, we will not appoint him to the board after the next election. I can guarantee that. It is having that window on the operation of PetroCan that will be critical and this is an entirely reasonable amendment.

In fact, the very good notes prepared for our members took a look at what the guru of privatization for most of the members opposite, the former Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Margaret Thatcher, who went on this privatization splurge, did. Even Margaret Thatcher had an appointee from her cabinet on the boards of directors of some of the businesses, the former Crown corporations as we know them here; British Aerospace, Britoil, British Gas, Cable and Wireless and British Telecom. One would think that government would want to do this because once this is done and this bill passes—and we will vote on a lot of these amendments today and there will be another day's debate—what will we get just before Christmas? We will get rid of PetroCan probably once and for all.

During the break, I had a chance to ask some people out on the Sparks Street Mall what they thought, that if we sell PetroCan, can we get it back? I am afraid to report to you that a lot of people just do not think that we could do that again. How will we get control of our oil company again? It will be very difficult to do, if not a costly thing to do.

One other very reasonable provision that we suggested earlier, and unfortunately the Liberals and Conservatives joined to defeat this particular motion, was to call on the government to submit an annual report to Parliament to show exactly where the industrial benefits were happening, where the jobs were being created, what kinds of jobs they were and where the oil was going.

• (1640 )

That would give a chance for the government to say that we were wrong. We were going to give the government the opportunity to come back in a year with an annual report to Parliament saying: "You guys were wrong. Look at all the wonderful things that have happened to this company since we sold it off".

It is a reasonable amendment. This time, unfortunately, the Liberals and Conservatives defeated this amendment. It was good enough for legislation that we dealt with last week, Bill C–74, the Fisheries Act, where we asked that a separate annual report to Parliament be given. In that case it was habitat protection. The government accepted that amendment. So I see no reason in my mind why it should not be able to accept the very straightforward amendment in Bill C–84, the one we are debating today.

I see the other amendment that we brought in as a challenge to the government. If it is going to sell off Petro–Canada, then maybe it should do its best to get a fair return for the taxpayers of Canada. That is why we think it should be asking for a minimum of $6.7 billion. That is the amount of money that the taxpayers of Canada have put into this corporation. That is only a fair return.

I suggest that the government should take us up on our challenge, see if it can do it and then agree to our provisions for an annual report so it can come back to Parliament and tell us that it was successful. The problem, though, is I am not sure we would expect that of this government.

For many communities across the country Petro–Canada has become more than just a gas station. It has become a community store and in many cases it is the only place where you can buy gas. The Tories are just selling off bits and pieces of the country and it's institutions. We have come, as I said earlier, to try and define ourselves.

In wrapping up, Mr. Speaker, if anything has got ten through to Canadians and to the media who have been covering this debate, it has been the work by my colleague for Edmonton East in saying to Parliament and to Canadians: "Why don't we use Petro–Canada as the vehicle to ensure that we have energy conservation in Canada, and use its locations throughout in Canada as a way to promote energy conservation".

Think of all those locations where there would be a store–front opportunity for Canadians from across the country to get easy and handy information and advice on proper car maintenance, running of their vehicles and homes. I could not think of a better thing to do.

At the same time, instead of what we are likely to expect from the Tories in turning the red and white of Petro-Canada to a blue and white, why do we not paint it green and white?

**Mr. Butland:** Don't tell them.

**Mr. Gardiner:** If you give the minister an idea like that, you know what he is going to do with it. Why do we not paint the colours green and white; use Petro-Canada as our environmental leading edge in energy conservation. Let us not go about destroying the country like this government is doing. Let us not sell off the valuable assets that we have gained. Let us keep Petro-Canada. I hope the government will come to its senses, withdraw the bill, or at the very least, support some of the very reasonable amendments moved by my colleagues from the New Democratic Party.

**Mr. Ron Fisher (Saskatoon—Dundurn):** Mr. Speaker, it does not very often happen but I am going to be standing for the first part of my comments in opposition to something my colleague for Sault Ste. Marie said.

**Mr. Butland:** Shame.

**Mr. Fisher:** The New Democrat disagrees. The member for Sault Ste. Marie said that the timing was perfect. What he was referring to was that with the economy in the kind of trouble it is, although it could be argued I think that capital is doing very well, thank you—it is the economy that is in bad shape—nevertheless, in the state of the country in which we find ourselves, the *d* word has now been used. We are now in a depression, it has been admitted to by the government—recession, the *r*, he has not got to the *d* word yet. In any event, the inference of the member for Sault Ste. Marie was that it was an inopportune time to sell, that the timing was really bad.

I would submit that that is not the case. From the government's point of view and from the ideological and philosophical point of view and the reasons for which it is actually getting rid of Petro-Canada, the timing is most opportune. When we realize that really what is happening here is the transference of wealth from the people of Canada to the rich friends of the government, then the very best thing that we could possibly do is sell Petro-Canada when it is at its least economically desirable state of affairs.

That is perfectly consistent with the whole philosophical constitution of the Progressive Conservative Party. I would remind my colleague from Sault Ste. Marie, other members of the House and the Canadian public who are listening that I once heard Ted Kennedy say that conservatives get elected by promising the poor they will look after them; the smoke and mirrors where they have to get rid of Petro-Canada, for example, in order to be able to balance the budget or to reduce the national debt or whatever the case may be.

Mr. Speaker, if you are to believe that, with all the things they have privatized up to this point, they would not have to privatize Petro-Canada in order to balance the budget, in order to eradicate the national debt, they would already have done it. The fact of the matter is of course that nothing they have so far privatized has gone, even the slightest iota, toward reducing the deficit or the national debt.

The second part of the quotation is that they get elected by promising the poor they will look after them and by assuring the rich that they will not. That fits in so well with the whole idea that it is an opportune time to be selling Petro-Canada now because they are certainly looking after the rich, as they sell Petro-Canada at a time when the market would indicate that it really is not all that desirable a commodity. If I had money to buy shares in Petro-Canada, which I do not, I assure you that it is just at this time in the economic cycle that I would be doing my very best to get as many shares out of them as I could.

This brings up one of the references to the amendments where we are proposing that the maximum amount of ownership be not 10 per cent as the legislation proposes but rather that it should be 5 per cent. I would suggest that 5 per cent, even in a Canadian context, is rather generous when we understand that in the United States of America they consider 5 per cent ownership of a company to be tantamount to control of a company. They realize that for someone to be able to amass enough capital to be able to own 5 per cent of the shares of a company is very close to being able to control it.

That of course makes no reference at all to the whole idea of privatizing it in the first place or foreign control. We were talking earlier on one of the other amendments where the legislation talks in terms of 25 per cent and we were proposing that it be 1 per cent. In the United States as well, as was alluded to the other day, the same

idea prevails where they consider that 5 per cent ownership of the economy in any sense is getting to be dangerous in so far as the sovereignty of the United States is concerned.

We have the double-edged whammy of great amounts of foreign ownership being allowed in Canada and also great amounts, which 10 per cent certainly is, of private ownership as well. The control simply dissolves away from any kind of public participation at all. Amendment 6A refers to the fact that the government ought to have some kind of public control, governmental control and involvement and ought to have some kind of window into the operation of Petro-Canada even after it has been privatized to the extent that a good portion of the assets which are being disposed of will really not accrue to the Canadian public.

• (1650)

As was pointed out earlier, there seems to be some controversy about whether or not you speak and evaluate in terms of the original investment or in terms of the present inflated value of the Canadian dollar. I would suggest that it makes a great deal of sense to speak of it in terms of the $6.7 billion or $8 billion which it ought to be valued at, rather than at the somewhat less value of $1.5 or $2 billion less, that the government seems to think is a fair amount of money to evaluate the company at.

The member for Calgary West made reference to the National Energy Program. I come from the west, Saskatchewan, and we produce a little bit of oil there. We do not produce anywhere near as much as they do in the province of Alberta, but enough to give a resident of Saskatchewan an interest in what is happening within the oil industry. I can remember the uproar that was caused, particularly in Alberta, not so much in Saskatchewan, over the National Energy Program. I can remember the pictures on the news in the evenings of the drilling rigs from Alberta heading south of the border and how all this was described and depicted as being such a tremendously negative thing for the country, and how the National Energy Program had destroyed the province of Alberta. While it is certainly unfortunate that the oil activity in the province of Alberta declined as much as it did, it seems to me that a good portion of the blame attributed to the National Energy Program was really not deserved at all.

If the journalists and the news media in Canada had followed those oil rigs into the United States, they would have seen that they found no work there either. Rather than going down there and continuing drilling, finding all kinds of oil and making billions of dollars—as in the mythology of the oil industry—what in fact happened was that they were parked. I would suggest that the member from Calgary was certainly a long way off base on that.

As far as the lost taxes from Petro-Canada being a Crown corporation over the years, I do not know how much Petro-Canada paid in taxes. I would like to think that the Government of Canada ran Petro-Canada as a responsible corporate citizen. We saw, particularly during the Olympics, with the carrying of the Olympic flame and so on, a great deal of involvement by Petro-Canada in the national community. That is the kind of thing it should have done. Through the years, I would hope that Petro-Canada, as a reliable and desirable corporate citizen, would also have paid the taxes which it ought to have paid.

I would like to take exception to the member for Calgary West's reference to the loss of tax revenue from Petro-Canada. There are a few oil companies in this country. I would hope that Petro-Canada was an exception which made a tremendous amount of profit and paid no taxes at all. The Prairie Oil Royalties Company had a profit of $5.1 million in 1989. It got a bonus of $1.6 million and paid no taxes.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Unless the House agrees, the hon. member's time has expired.

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened patiently, and maybe sometimes not so patiently, to the debate this afternoon on amendments 6A, 8A and 12A, which the House Leader of the New Democratic Party finally got right. I thank him for doing that because it does expedite the business of the House.

I have listened for quite some time. The NDP are back on their old kick about corporations. One figure that was thrown out this afternoon was that of 100,000 profitable companies not paying taxes in a given year. One thing the New Democratic Party never does is to go back to see how these corporations did the year before or the year before that, whether or not they lost money. That would be terrible if the NDP went back to check to see if they

had some legitimate write-offs. Of course, they have legitimate write-offs. Corporations do not avoid tax without having losses or donations to some very good charities.

The hon. member just talked about Petro-Canada dealing with sharing the Olympic Flame and all that that involved. Many private corporations in the energy industry do a tremendous amount for the arts in this country. They do a tremendous amount for artists, writers and so on in this country. The NDP members fail to mention that when they stand up here and rhyme off all these silly statistics that do not mean a hill of beans because they do not give the whole story.

I think the energy industry as a whole has done a tremendous job on the environment and the record speaks for itself. As a matter of fact, it has received national and international awards for the work it has done on the environment.

The members of the New Democratic Party suggest that we should maintain Petro-Canada and use it as a centre for collecting old oil and doing all these other things. What I say to the New Democratic Party is that if that is what it wants to do with stations around the country—and there are many people who have set up businesses to collect old oil and recycle it and are doing a fine job at it—you cannot just take one corporation in a competitive environment, as the hon. member mentioned, one that is competing with other companies and place the onus on that company which places it at a disadvantage to other competitors. If you do that, and place an environmental stipulation on an industry, then do it as a whole so it is competitive for all of them. But do not place one corporation in an uncompetitive position. That is exactly what the New Democratic Party is suggesting.

It is unfair to the corporation, whether it is a Crown corporation competing in the private sector or whether it is one that becomes privatized and therefore has to compete in that same environment; it is a very unfair idea of the New Democratic Party. It would be better to promote an over-all environmental program. That would be more important, and that is exactly what our government is doing with the green plan. The green plan is an environmental program that affects all industries on a fair and equitable basis and speaks to the environment as a whole and does not place the onus on one or two Canadian companies.

The other interesting thing about this is that they are asking us to place the onus on a Canadian company when they are not placing it on foreign companies. That is exactly what the NDP wants to do. It wants to place a Canadian company in unfair competition with foreign interests in this country. That is hogwash.

• (1700 )

The other interesting thing about this is that they are asking us to place an onus on a Canadian company when they are not placing it on the foreign companies. That is exactly what they want to do. They want to place a Canadian company in unfair competition with foreign interests in this country. That is hogwash.

I must admit that I digressed a little, but so did they. They agree that in all fairness I had a chance to rebut what they had to say. The first amendment from the New Democratic Party talks to appointing a director on the board of Petro-Canada in perpetuity, forever and ever. Again I ask: why do you not bring forward a proposal that we appoint one board member to Imperial Oil, to Shell and to the other 2,500 energy companies we have in this country? Why does the NDP not suggest that the government appoint a board member to each and every one of them; Canadian, foreign, it does not matter what. Why do you not do that?

I am surprised members of the New Democratic Party did not come forward with that suggestion. That sounds very much like what they would do. That sounds exactly like what they would do. They would like to stick their tentacles into every private corporation board room to see what goes on there. Because they have suspicions about all these board rooms across this country, how terrible they are, we should have an appointee on each and every one of them.

I can tell the House and the people that we as a government will have representatives on the board of directors of Petro-Canada as long as we have shares in Petro-Canada. There will be a mechanism established to appoint members to the board of directors from the Government of Canada as long as we hold shares. I can assure the House and the public of that.

Once we completely divest ourselves of the corporation, however, it will be electing its own board of directors by shareholders, by those Canadians who exercise their rights to vote as shareholders in Petro–Canada. It would be really inappropriate for us to legislate a seat in perpetuity on the board of directors of a privatized Petro–Canada, so we will be voting against that motion.

The next amendment is the NDP accounting procedure. A dollar is not a dollar. A dollar is $1.50 to its members. If in fact we did accounting procedures like members of the New Democratic Party are bringing forward on Petro–Canada, there is not an accountant in Canada agree with their accounting. Even the NDP accountants in this country do not agree with this type of accounting. They do not agree with it whatsoever.

We will be defeating this motion. We are committed to receiving a fair value for the company, a fair value for the taxpayers' dollar that has been spent and which is on our books at $4.3 billion. Even the New Democratic Party can understand—at least I hope it can—that a share is sold when a willing seller is prepared to sell it and a willing buyer is prepared to buy it.

**An hon. member:** It is called capitalism.

**Mr. McDermid:** Isn't that awful? It is called capitalism. Can you believe that?

**An hon. member:** What about profits?

**McDermid:** I heard them talking about profits. It is terrible. The New Democratic Party does not like either of those things. Isn't that awful? Isn't that terrible?

It is profits that get reinvested and make our economy grow. That is what it is all about. Once the New Democratic Party understands that, maybe it will get somewhere in governing this country. Maybe, sometime.

Turning to the final amendment they have put forward, they are proposing to reduce the percentage of voting shares an individual is permitted to own from 10 per cent to 5 per cent. The current individual ownership provisions are intended to encourage a broad base of ownership in Petro–Canada much like we saw in Air Canada wherein 130,000 Canadians participated in the initial issue and to prevent a single investor or group from obtaining control of the company.

The strength of these provisions lies not only in the 10 per cent limit itself but in the definition of associates, since the limit applies to any one person together with the associates of that person. In this way two or more shareholders are prevented from acting in a way that would circumvent the 10 per cent individual ownership requirements. The argument that they put up that two people would be able to control Petro–Canada is entirely false. We feel that the level of 10 per cent strikes a reasonable balance.

Those are the three amendments that the New Democratic Party has proposed in this particular area, Motions Nos. 6A, 8A, and 12A. We will be voting against these motions.

**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. 6A standing in the name of Mr. Langdon. 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), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 8A standing in the name of Mr. Langdon. 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 yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 12A standing in the name of Mr. Langdon. 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), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River)** moved:

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-84 be amended in clause 9 by striking out line 29 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"(e) financing of Petro-Canada or for so long as the Minister holds any voting shares of Petro-Canada, from disposing of any asset of Petro-Canada which the Minister has designated in writing as a strategic asset, where the Minister has published notice of same in *The Canada Gazette* prior to the completion of any such disposition."

He said: Mr. Speaker, this proposed amendment respecting the bill privatizing Petro-Canada deals with an issue that arose during the debate, the discussions and the hearing of witnesses at committee. It derives from a projection into the future of certain fact sequences which might prove to be a problem for Petro-Canada, for the government, and for the shareholders.

The proposed amendment sets out that the minister—and that would be the minister designated under this particular bill—would have the opportunity to prevent a sale by Petro-Canada of an asset described as a strategic asset.

• (1710)

Why is that important to us? If we look at the reason for having a state oil company in the first place, we see we can define certain national interests that require us to act or take steps as a country and as a nation. In this case the state oil company would take steps on behalf of all of us to protect our vital interests in areas deemed to be of strategic importance.

When I talk about strategic importance or strategic assets or vital interests, I am talking about economic areas of activity engaged in now by Petro-Canada, areas where Canadians and the government have wanted Petro-Canada to be active from the beginning, exploration for domestic oil reserves and distribution of energy commodities in this country.

The difficulty we see arising is one in a future that would not be quite so orderly and planned as what we like to think would mature in the ordinary course. I am talking about a situation that would evolve in the economy and politically around the world. I suppose the current gulf crisis is an example. Although that particular crisis is quite a way offshore, it has affected us here in Canada. It has affected our oil price.

However, in this unseen future I think what I am looking at is a change in circumstances whereupon the people of Canada, from all across the country or from a particular region, would say to this government that in acting for all of us it must take a step in our interest to protect us or to foster the national interest in a particular field of the economy.

I am talking about, for example, maintaining in business a refinery that is strategically located in our national interest in a particular region, in a particular area. I am talking about the sale of particular reserves of crude, and even of a particular type of crude, in a particular area of the country where it would be seen to be in our national interest for that crude not to fall into foreign hands or offshore control. I am also talking about the sale, conveyance or even abandonment of transportation infrastructure by Petro-Canada, which by that point in time will be our former state oil company. We will either still have a percentage interest or even a large interest, but because of the process of divestiture and privatiza-

tion we will have given up administrative or, practically speaking any role in the running of the company and the decisions it would be making.

As well I am talking about the sale of a pipeline, the abandonment of a pipeline. I noted last week or two weeks ago a projection that the pipeline which runs from southern Ontario to Montreal could be shut down by 1991. Petro-Canada does not have anything to do with that pipeline. However, I am talking about a situation wherein the government is called upon by the electorate to intervene, protect, and stabilize an enterprise like a pipeline to ensure that the people of Montreal, for example, have access to western Canadian crude. I have referred to the refinery, the reserves, the transportation. the infrastructure, and the pipeline. There are perhaps other unforeseen areas where Canadians will demand that their government intervene, protect and stabilize a particular strategic asset.

By placing this amendment in this bill, it will provide notice to Petro-Canada, to its competitors, and to its new shareholders that Canadians still retain the right to intervene if they feel it is in their national interest to do so.

I know that does not sit well in the private sector. I know that a provision like this one will affect to some degree the price of shares, but in the phase of moving from no privately held shares to all privately held shares we have to go through the process where the potential purchaser of shares knows very well that the people of Canada still have an interest in Petro-Canada. Whether that process takes five years or ten years, it is still going to be there for us.

There is no need in this amendment to define what is a strategic asset. Some people may ask: "How can you provide for a right for the minister to force Petro-Canada to retain a strategic asset when you have not defined what it is?" I would maintain that when the minister is called upon to act, he or she would know exactly what that asset was. As long as the government felt that it was an asset disposition which required its intervention, that would be a sufficient reason for intervening. I am sure that that intervention would not be taken lightly.

The amendment provides that notice of same would be published in *The Canada Gazette*. I am sure as well that there might be offers to the government: "If you are going to prevent us from disposing of it, then perhaps you ought to expropriate it". I do not know whether or not we will get into that kind of situation. It would place us right back to where we were when Petro-Canada was created in the first place, where there was a perceived need for a national oil company that had the means of participating in the marketplace and in the upstream and downstream side. When Petro-Canada was created of course it was the upstream side that was targeted, but it is that national interest the people will wish us to pursue.

That is the reason for the amendment. I believe it fairly describes the situation wherein such intervention would have to be involved, at least in terms of process. I hope the House will support my amendment.

**Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for a short time on the amendment being presented by the Official Opposition. We can certainly support this particular amendment. It is a particularly good policy approach, if this government is going to go ahead and get rid of Petro-Canada, sell it off once and for all. It would appear that is what is to happen. It should do an entire review of its assets, equipment, refineries, and pipelines. In particular they should all be surveyed. As the hon. member who just spoke suggested very reasonably, a determination would obviously be made by the Governor in Council, by cabinet, as to which particular parts of the company are strategic. We all know what strategic really means. We know when it comes to oil crises and problems with our national energy supply that we could be faced with that situation now, given the crisis in the gulf. Reference was made to that earlier today in our speeches.

• (1720)

Here we are, turning over an entire infrastructure that the public has paid for, and that we built up to provide an opportunity for a window on the industry and a chance for the Government of Canada to make some money

from the oil industry. It has a chance to use Petro-Canada in some innovative leading-edge ways when it comes to the environment.

It is a very reasonable amendment to suggest that the government would take a look at the strategic assets of PetroCan and publish them for comment in *the Canada Gazette*. This would give people a chance to see what are the strategic assets so that they would then be able to comment on them.

In the Peace district of northern British Columbia, I believe the refinery in Taylor is owned by PetroCan. Who knows what is going to happen to that refinery after this bill is passed? If that refinery was to close it would do damage to the economy of that area and the whole infrastructure of the industry in that particular part of British Columbia.

It is without any hesitation that we can support this amendment. It is only a logical approach to take. I hope that the Government of Canada has some logic and will support this amendment.

**Hon. William C. Winegard (Minister for Science):** Mr. Speaker, I have heard both my colleagues on this amendment. I am somewhat confused about it because they seem to not understand that the Government of Canada has sufficient power in any kind of emergency situation to do whatever it wants.

For the kind of emergency that this amendment is meant to compensate for, this amendment is unnecessary. It is also unnecessary to put obstacles in the way of people buying Petro-Canada. It is unnecessary to make policy decisions for some unforeseen happening down the road. If there is a true emergency, the Government of Canada has all the power to intercede that it can possibly need under any of the emergency measures orders.

This is just one more way in which the opposition parties want to put hedges against what happens with respect to Petro-Canada. There is no real reason for it. It is one more amendment that our party is certainly going to vote against.

**Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie):** Mr. Speaker, this time I will try to deal directly with the amendments or assets which the minister deems to be strategic. There is a problem with that unless we would change the minister. The strategies of this minister and this government would certainly not be in line with what the Canadian public wants.

For the general advantage of Canada, I am going back to this business of very vague amendments. They are so far-reaching that I think they are very innocuous. The New Democrats can see their way to support them nevertheless. Loath as I am to read, I would like to read just one paragraph where I hope one can get the relationship to the amendments. It is entitled "Loss of Autonomy":

> Selling state economic assets to a foreign MNC may yield real benefits, but it has the necessary result of the nation state losing control of some of its resources. For example, Chile has sold its ownership of vast forest holdings to two New Zealand companies, Carter Holt Holdings and Fletcher Challenge Limited. These firms may have very different approaches to the use of these forests than the Chilean government. When the forests are held by a foreign multinational, harvesting schedules may be tied to the world price for paper or timber. Whereas the Chilean government may have made forestry decisions based on the objectives of maintaining an active presence in the world market, continuing employment levels or managing forest lands for orderly future harvests.

It is an intriguing paper from which I read. It is entitled "Privatization in Developing Countries". I would ask the minister to make note of what is in this document. We certainly are not a developing country. The minister should take note of the safeguards and the concerns that the author puts forward, even if he is speaking of the underdeveloped countries of the world.

**Mr. John E. Cole (York—Simcoe):** Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this rather enlightening debate this afternoon. It is really strange to try to figure out the balances on the opposite side of the House.

We are looking at legislation that is really talking about disposing of assets and not disposing of assets. We are talking about whether they are strategic or not strategic. I have heard many people say that the Government of Canada should not be making these decisions and should not be involved in making these decisions. I think that kind of makes sense.

We should privatize Petro-Canada and give it the opportunity to compete on a level playing field. We hear that term often enough and yet we are trying to say that we should keep some hold-backs within it and keep the government involved in the process. I do not think that is what we are here for. I have heard talk about disposing of assets that might be strategic. We can carry this so far and be so silly in this argument that we can be talking about which corner gas station we are going to close at a main intersection, when four of them happen to be owned by PetroCan. That is how ridiculous this whole thing could be.

I do think we have to be fair in this whole situation. We have to put it into the hands of the people who are willing to invest in PetroCan and give them an opportunity to have a fair return from their investment. I think that is exactly what we want to do. We want to be able to sell those shares in a free and open market. That is going to bring revenue to the Government of Canada to replace some of the money that has been spent and continues to siphon into this corporation, over the last number of years. It is very critical that we give investors the opportunity to get some of the dollars back and provide some of those dollars back to the Government of Canada.

Clause 9(1)(d) is intended to reinforce the individual and foreign ownership limit. That does not make it weaker and it does not take away from it, but it is not there to prevent the normal sale of properties, assets or small divisions of the company. It will give Canadians who purchase those shares and get involved in the system the opportunity to get money back, to show a profit. The dirty word, profit, again comes in. But that is what makes this system go. It makes capitalism go. It makes our country go. It makes us profitable. And I think that is very important for everyone. We all want to make a profit, in various ways, whether it is in our own business endeavour, in investment, or in whatever we happen to do. It would make it very difficult for any business to operate properly and to continue to be competitive if it was limited in its ability to buy and sell its assets. Often times, corporations will make strategic plans which will be beneficial to that particular company but will also be beneficial to the company that purchases, so I think that is a very positive step.

It is not the intention of Petro-Canada to stop being an integrated oil company; that is one of its big assets. It is there at the retail level and it is there at the processing level. I think that should be very profitable. It will encourage more people to invest in Petro-Canada. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting Motion No. 15.

**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. 15, standing in the name of the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River. 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:*

• (1730 )

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76, the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)** moved Motion No. 23.

That Bill C-84 be amended by adding immediatly after line 44 at page 12 the following new clause:

"18. All undertakings and works constructed by Petro-Canada are, and each of them is declared to be, works or a work for the general advantage of Canada."

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is too bad I have only 10 minutes to speak to this very important amendment. In fact, it concerns a provision in our Constitution, Section 92, which deals with the right of the Parliament of Canada, or rather says that the Parliament of Canada may, on occasion—it has done so many times—declare, before or after their execution, that works, although wholly situate within a province and under its jurisdiction, shall be for the general advantage of Canada or for the advantage of two or more provinces.

Mr. Speaker, the effect of this amendment would be to declare that once privatized, Petro-Canada would have to recognize that what makes us distinct, what brings us together and what keeps us together in this country is that we have declared ourselves to be a people with two official languages.

My purpose in amending Bill C–84 is to confirm that in the future, Petro–Canada will have to comply with the rules that customarily apply to federal institutions with respect to service to the public, language of work and participation of French—and English—speaking Canadians in the administration of the institution.

Mr. Speaker, it has happened many times before that Parliament, on the basis of its declaratory power, declared that it could modify, without the consent of a province or provinces, an area customarily and exclusively under provincial jurisdiction.

I would like to refer to a document by a respected constitutional expert, Senator Gérald Beaudoin, who said the following in a collection of essays for the University of Ottawa Law School, in Part IV on page 279, and I quote: "Declaratory power is exceptional. Nevertheless, Parliament has often used that power, as explained by Ms. André Lajoie in her remarkable book on the subject. She writes: "Parliament has specifically declared to be for the general advantage of Canada: dams, canals, battlefields, railways, companies, grain elevators, jetties, gas pipelines, slides, a piece of legislation, a subway, oil pipelines, bridges, including several international bridges, ditches and tunnels".

Mr. Speaker, declaratory power is nothing new. It has been applied to a number of works and institutions.

In the same text, Ms. Lajoie goes on to say, and I quote: "Declaratory power is applied to the following: company shares, harbour improvements, aqueducts, aircrafts, buses, ferries, basins, drydocks—" and there is quite an extensive list, Mr. Speaker. I will not list them all for lack of time.

That being said, it is my humble opinion that once privatized, PetroCan, our window on the industry, should be bound to the obligation to serve the Canadian people, its shareholders and customers, in the official language of their choice, whether French or English, as long as it is the customer's language.

However, all we find in Bill C–84 is a flawed and weak section, in my opinion, namely section 9(1) which states that the articles of amendment for PetroCan shall contain—these are, word for word, the obligations flowing from this amendment and I will quote the English text, because it is slighty different in French. So, section 9(1) reads as follows:

[*English*]

> 9.(1) The articles of amendment particularly shall contain
>
> (e) provisions requiring Petro–Canada to ensure that any member of the public can, in either official language, communicate with and obtain available services from
>
> (i) its head office, and
>
> (ii) any of its other offices and facilities, and the head office of any other office or facility of any of its wholly–owned subsidiaries, where Petro–Canada determines that there is significant demand for communications with and services from that office or facility in that language having regard to the public served and the location of the office or facility;

Mr. Speaker, I say it is a weak clause because only the shareholders of a privatized Petro–Canada will have a right to demand and to ask the company to follow those—

**Mr. McDermid:** No.

**Mr. Gauthier:** I hear the minister say no. Did I hear the minister say no? If that is so I think he should stand and explain to me how he interprets this clause and how that clause will have the effect of obligating Petro–Canada to serve the Canadian public in both official languages.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the company answers to its shareholders. Therefore only the shareholders of that company will have the right to demand from the directors the answers to their questions.

I deplore the fact that the government has not seen fit to do with Petro–Canada what it did with other Crown corporations, in particular Air Canada when it was privatized.

**Mr. McDermid:** It's entirely different.

**Mr. Gauthier:** Oh, I understand the minister saying to me that Air Canada falls under the federal jurisdiction of transport and therefore is subjected to the general rules of safety and security, that language must be used in giving notices to the public and therefore Air Canada is obligated to follow those rules. I say to the minister that that is why I put this amendment which would declare a privatized Petro–Canada, and I would like to read it again:

> 18. All undertakings and works constructed by Petro–Canada are, and each of them is declared to be, works or a work for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, there is no magic to this amendment. Strictly it makes Petro–Canada a company which will respond in our view, which will act in an active manner toward its clientele and give Canadians in French or English, the services they deserve from this company whenever it is privatized.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a reasonable amendment and should be adopted by the House.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands on a point of order.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions and I think you would find there is unanimous consent for applying the vote on Motion No. 2A to Motions Nos. 6A, 12A, 15, 19, 20, 23 and 32A later on, when we proceed with the votes at the report stage of Bill C–84. The same vote will apply inversely to the adoption motion.

• (1740)

The vote on Motion No. 15A will apply to the vote on Motions Nos. 4A and 8A. After the vote I believe the hon. member for Beaver River will rise on a point of order concerning her vote on only one of the motions. I hope this proposition will have the unanimous agreement of the House.

[*English*]

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, as much as I followed the point made by my hon. friend, I believe we support it. I will reflect on it for a moment or two, but as far as I can understand, yes, we support the suggestion.

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, if I understood the hon. member's fluent French, I am sure I will have no trouble supporting that. As I understood it, it is a vote on each of the amendments and then the government, of course, would be voting for the concurrence motion. We certainly do not have any problem with the proposal as proposed by the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The House has heard the proposition of the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands. Is that agreed.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Agreed and so ordered.

[*English*]

**Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I think the timing of this initiative from the government is one of the more curious aspects of this whole debate. We saw that the last oil shocks devastated our national economy in the late 1970s and early 1980s, and here we are again in another situation where the oil companies are using the world situation to their advantage.

This Liberal amendment is worthy of speaking about. The whole privatization of Petro–Canada is an initiative that is one of those more curious aspects of the leadership role of this government.

Petro–Canada had such potential to be used as a national instrument for the betterment of Canadians, for the benefit of environmental policy and for the benefit of taking control of our economy and that potential has never been fulfilled. Now, if the government gets its way, it will never be fulfilled. It will be lost.

The hon. members on the other side of the House talk about we, as social democrats, putting a Canadian company at a disadvantage *vis–à–vis* foreign controlled companies. Another way of looking at it is that what Petro–Canada could be doing and is not doing, but should be doing, is using its role in the marketplace to the benefit of consumers. I know a number of my constituents who are hurting because of the price of gas going up and up and up, and they are hurting because there are no alternative transportation policies initiated by the government.

We need Petro–Canada to keep those foreign companies honest because we know in our guts that the reason those prices are going up is not necessarily because of decreased supply. We have supply in Canada. It is because they are using the timing of the current crisis regarding the gulf to their own financial advantage. Canadians know this and are going to criticize this government for not using Petro–Canada and not urging Petro–Canada to be used as an instrument of national policy.

It is ironic that we are now debating the privatization or selling off of a national instrument, just another one in a whole string of national instruments to bring Canada together.

We hear a lot of rhetoric about Canadian unity, but when the government has the tools for the job, it sells them off to foreign companies. Once Petro–Canada has been sold off at bargain basement prices, we can never

get it back because no succeeding government could afford to get it back. It is one of those ironies as well where this government is selling off not only what we have now, but the potential for leadership.

I read through many of the speeches on Petro–Canada by government members when they were in opposition. They talked about the need for Canada to maintain control over its resources. Petro–Canada is one of those means of maintaining control over its resources. So one wonders whether or not sitting on the other side of the House does something to your head. It sort of swivels it around and makes you see things backward. I hope not because I hope to be sitting on the other side—

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I regret to interrupt the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands, but I am still waiting for her to speak to the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier. I am sure she will co–operate and stick to the subject of the motion. The hon. member has the floor.

[*English*]

**Ms. Hunter:** Perhaps I should have been more explicit. The amendment is regarding the general advantage of Canada. That is precisely what I am talking about.

I would also like to refer to something the current House leader said. He was the Conservative energy critic when he was in opposition. This is what I am talking about when I say members see things differently when they get to the other side of the House. On February 20, 1979, he said: "I agree with the Leader of the NDP. The corporate purposes of Exxon may not be synonymous with the best interests of Canada".

Well, that is quite an admission, Mr. Speaker. I think that that also states that there are some government members who understand that the best interests of Canada are not going to be served by the privatization of Petro–Canada.

As a member of the parliamentary committee on the environment, I am most concerned about this initiative of the government because nothing is clearer to me than the fact that energy policy is crucial for Canada's role in the future. Energy policy is crucial to the economic development of our country.

When we are talking about a global economy, as the government members are wont to do, they consider that we do not understand that. I instruct them to look at Japan and the kind of growth it has enjoyed. One of the reasons that it has enjoyed the growth that it has is that it has reduced the energy content of a unit of gross domestic product by about 40 per cent. It is estimated that that has given Japan a 5 per cent comparative advantage, just on energy savings alone, against U.S. made products.

This is the kind of potential that this government is selling off in its privatization move. We are not going to be able to have the flexibility to have those kinds of initiatives. I would remind the government members as well that the much touted and very disappointing green plan released last week talked rather circuitously about energy policy. It is crucial for the economic advantage of Canada. This government is losing that vision. It has no sense of vision. It is very short–sighted.

Petro–Canada should be used for the development of alternative energy sources; alternate fuels such as ethanol. Sitting on the environment committee, we have heard a lot of testimony about the dangers of global warming. The danger of this is confronting our world. We know that we have to reduce our dependency on fossil fuels. We know that the dangers of fossil fuel consumption are enormous. The danger of fossil fuel transportation, especially for me coming from a coastal riding where tankers and the dangers of tanker traffic in Saanich and the Gulf Islands area, is only too apparent especially for those of us who had oil wash up on beaches.

• (1750)

A kind of alternate energy such as ethanol could be used, but no, the government members do not want to hear about that. Ethanol comes from plants. Why could we not use Petro–Canada to develop that kind of energy source?

The lack of vision that this government has demonstrated time and time again is tragic. The vision is lacking because what we are talking about here is a selling off of Canadian potential. I am not overstating it. It it is a

selling off of a national instrument for the development of policy and it fits in—I see the Minister of State for Privatization across the way—with one of his initiatives; everything has got to be going through the market.

The market has gone beyond him. The market for the future is the eco-business. The kind of initiatives for the future are not the old views of the Minister of State for Privatization, but the new vision where environmentally friendly products are the ones that are going to be the money-makers. They are going to be the growth products for Canada.

But this government says no, "We have got to put our heads in the sand. We have got to get that deficit down. We have got to sell off our assets just like we have done in Canada Post and other initiatives. We have got to get that deficit down and we have got to see the bottom line". Focusing on that bottom line prevents the government from looking forward. It prevents it from having a vision for the future which will lead Canada to a better economy and an environmentally sustainable future.

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, I listened to that last speech by the hon. member of the socialist party. I notice that she did not touch once on the amendment presented by my friend from Ottawa—Vanier on official languages. I think the NDP is afraid to discuss this subject. Obviously it is. The hon. member did not mention it once, which was rather interesting.

We are debating a well-intentioned amendment that was presented by my friend from Ottawa—Vanier. I want to give the government's side on this because I think it is very important.

Once Petro-Canada ceases to be wholly owned by the Crown, it's business activities fall under provincial jurisdiction. That is the difference between an oil company and an airline company.

When Air Canada was privatized, it still was under federal jurisdiction. When Petro-Canada is privatized, it will come under provincial jurisdiction, just like its competitors.

Parliament has really no constitutional basis to legislate a privatized Petro-Canada directly in respect of language. Application of even a part of the Official Languages Act to a privatized Petro-Canada would put the federal government in the untenable position of regulating an activity over which it has no jurisdiction. That causes us some problems.

The only way it could do this is to specifically override provincial jurisdiction in the manner suggested by Motion No. 23. I am not sure that my hon. friend wants that. I know what he wants. He wants to assure that Petro-Canada maintains its bilingual policies, and so on. That is fair enough. Mr. D'Iberville Fortier made it very clear that Petro-Canada has done extremely well in the use of both official languages. He was very pleased with its performance. There is no reason why it would not carry that on.

However, the government does not believe it is desirable to infringe on provincial territory, nor does it believe that it is necessary to do so in order to ensure Petro-Canada continues to serve the public in both official languages. We have assured that through the section in the bill referring to official languages and through the articles which will be approved for Petro-Canada to ensure that both official languages are used in an appropriate way by Petro-Canada.

The hon. member asked me how the public can complain with regard to the official languages if it was found to be necessary. He is not listening to me right now, but I am trying to explain to him how the ordinary citizen, how he or I, can make a complaint against Petro-Canada if in fact it is felt that it is not doing what it said it would do. It is laid out very clearly in its articles as to what it will do and if a citizen feels it is not following what it said it will do, under the Canada Business Corporations Act the complainant can make a complaint that the company is not abiding by what it said it would do. So, there is an avenue for the public to complain if Petro-Canada is not following the articles laid out as to what it said it would do.

To be quite honest, we wrestled with this. It is something to which we gave a tremendous amount of consideration. I think the hon. member will agree that we all in this House are concerned about official languages and their application. The articles will spell out very clearly what Petro-Canada will do with regard to official languages, and I think the hon. member will be pleased as will the Canadian public.

I also think the member understands that we should not override the constitutional jurisdiction of the provin-

cial governments in this regard. Therefore, we feel that the bill as it stands covers the area of official languages.

We have spoken with Mr. D'Iberville Fortier on this subject. I have had correspondence with him. I explained the situation. He would like to see us override provincial jurisdiction. We do not feel it is proper to do that. Therefore we will vote against this well-intentioned amendment.

**Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment that has been alluded to by the Minister of State for Privatization.

I find it rather ironic that the minister has acknowledged that the concept presented by the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier is a valid one. He considers it an enlightened one. I certainly support it and it is a very well-intentioned one, as is the normal course of events for the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier. I would suggest that the hon. member for Brampton ought to listen because I assure him that the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier thought of all the questions that he asked, but also he is well aware of what is in the provisions of the Official Languages Act and the ability of that act to be effective in this regard. The hon. member went to great lengths to find the way to ensure what the minister has just said, that he wants to see official languages within the context of the privatized Petro-Canada. If he wants it, why does he not listen to my hon. colleague? If he looks at clause 9 (1)(e), he will recognize that the amendment being suggested by my hon. colleague will enable exactly what the minister indicated he wanted to have happen.

• (1800)

I refer the minister to *la quatrieme partie du pouvoir déclaratoire fédéral*, because exactly what is called for by this amendment is a declaratory power. As long as Petro-Canada is a Crown corporation there is no question of its obligation to comply with the Official Languages Act. Mr. D'Iberville Fortier, the Commissioner of Official Languages, indicated that it was working very well in the interests of all Canadians. All of us can drive anywhere across this country with a great sense of pride. When we look at the identification and the signage that is outside Petro-Canada stations, we see the Canadian flag. We have a sense of participation and belonging all across Canada. Whenever there is correspondence or a logo that identifies Canada, it is a very vital matter.

As we are busy destroying all the national infrastructure across this land, whether it be VIA Rail, Air Canada or Radio-Canada, it is a serious matter. It is not just the signage; it is also the language in which one can be served. The minister indicated good will and good intent, but he did not seem to find the avenue to apply that intent. My hon. colleague has found that for him.

If the way it is written in the statutes is changed, will Petro-Canada be subject to the same obligations? If so, why has the government—and he seems to indicate that it will be—elected to include 9 (1) (e) since the Official Languages Act already covers language of service. Therefore there must be something there. If it will not, why can we not ensure it? It was put in there. Why was it put it in there? Was it to cover the fact that it was no longer under the Official Languages Act? He as much as said that. He does not want to trample on provincial relations. That is what you said.

It is not a matter of trampling. It is a matter of having a priority. It is a matter of having a vision for Canada. It is a matter of understanding that there are certain issues one makes a choice on which say that we belong to Canada.

**Mr. McDermid:** What about the Constitution?

**Mrs. Finestone:** It has nothing to do with the Constitution. If the minister will listen to the translation, I will read to him what it has to say about *le pouvoir déclaratoire fédéral.*

[*Translation*]

Knowing that the hon. member does not speak French, I can only hope that he will understand what I am about to say in that language.

The declaratory power is what enables the Parliament of Canada, under section 92(10(*c*), to change *proprio moto*, without consent and at the expense of the provincial legislative powers, the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces over the local works it has declared to be for the general advantage of Canada or for the advantage of two or more of the provinces.

Incidentally, paragraphs (*b*) and (*d*) deal with the nature of this power. It is a special power.

[*English*]

If one believes in Canada, there are certain areas where one makes priorities, choices, and options.

[*Translation*]

Although this a special power, Parliament used it extensively, as Mrs. Andrée Lajoie explained in her remarkable book on the subject. She wrote: "Parliament specifically declared to be for the general advantage the dams, canals, battlefields, railways, companies, grain elevators, landings stages, gas pipelines, slides, a piece of legislation, a subway, an oil pipeline, bridges—including several international bridges—trenches and tunnels."

Is is often argued that, and I quote: "The business or company is declared to be for the general advantage of Canada". We will examine the validity of this line in a moment. This line was used to exercice declaratory power regarding the following works, and I quote: "Company shares, harbour improvements, aqueducts, aircraft, buses, benches, basins, drydocks, water falls, docks, motor power, electricity, warehouses, companies involved in lumber, home building, railways, breeding, messengers, transport, terminals, garages, harbours, hotels, mines, mills, ships, works and undertakings—and on and on—of the federal district and later of the region of the national capital, oil refineries, restaurants, saw mills, telegraphs, underwater cables, telephones, theaters, tramways—of Montreal, Quebec, Ottawa and elsewhere—steel mills, brick factories, steel plants, pulp and paper mills, chemical plants, precious metal and gold refineries. This declaratory power enables the federal authority to redistribute unilaterally the legislative powers in a given field.

A distinction has to be made between, and I quote: "declaratory power", "emergency power" and "national reduction". These are three different concepts. We have already examined the first two.

In terms of exercise, that power can only be exercised through legislation. You must pay attention when I say through legislation, for you do not want to include it in legislation because you act as if you did not want to exercise your power in the field of activity at the provincial level. I have just read a list, exhaustive perhaps but it shows that you have taken the wrong road. You had an option, you had a choice but you did not make the right choice.

[*English*]

This is a government that does not know how to exercise options and choices or how to make an enlightened decision in the interest of all Canadians. Is that not just too bad. Another stubborn minister.

**Mr. McDermid:** Thank you, mother.

**Mrs. Finestone:** You are welcome. I would not even acknowledge you as my son.

In the interest of national unity, in the interest of national identity, and in the interest of Canadians, I would suggest that this minister, if he would put his ego in his pocket and go and think about it, might see that there is an enlightenment behind the suggestions made by my hon. colleague from Ottawa—Vanier. It falls right now at a very nervous and sensitive time in the history of Canada. It would exercise for all of us an enlarged thinking and attitude toward the official languages of Canada and ensure whether one is in Moose Jaw or in Saguenay–Lac–Saint–Jean—

[*Translation*]

—or in Gaspé, or on the North Shore you can be served in the two official languages of Canada, and it is in that respect that I speak of—

[*English*]

—national interest of Canada. One should be able to be served in both those languages and it should be within the law, not within the mind and heart of what is in the House.

**Mr. McDermid:** Every gas station, is that what you are saying?

**Mrs. Finestone:** I would not mind that at all. That is the way it should be. But the minister would not like that. It might hurt him like the cereal box hurt him with French and English on both sides. He should not be ridiculous.

We do have a few people who have not evolved in their mentality, it is sad to say, on the other side of this House. I wish you, Mr. Speaker, as one of the hon. representatives from the other official languages, and a few of your ministers and backbenchers, would speak to this member and make him see the light of day.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Manicouagan):** Mr. Speaker, I would like for a few minutes to take the time of the House to comment on amendment no. 23 moved by the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier. I would also like to

give some clarification, which I am convinced will reassure the hon. member for Mount Royal, concerning the provision with regard to official languages which is found in Bill C–84.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege to sit on the legislative committee on Bill C–84 and I must say that I paid special attention to clause 9(1)(e), which deals particularly with the issue of bilingualism. The information that I received is to the effect that the provisions of that clause in Bill C–84 apply exclusively to Petro–Canada and not to other oil companies in Canada.

• (1810)

So, I got a very clear answer to the questions I asked to find out whether this clause only applies to Petro–Canada. Only this company must comply, under specific sections of this bill, to certain provisions concerning the two official languages.

Mr. Speaker, would it be possible to have a little decorum, please?

**Mr. Gauthier:** It is your minister!

**Mr. Langlois:** My minister and members of the Opposition.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, Petro–Canada is the only oil company in Canada where, when it is privatized and in the hands of Canadian shareholders, there are provisions which compel that corporation to give services in both official languages at its main office and at all its other places of operation where the public asks for services in both official languages.

The hon. member for Mount Royal certainly does not want this House to move amendments to Bill C–84 which will encroach on the rights of the provinces, particularly those of the province of Quebec. The province of Quebec already has a code and a legislation on both official languages. I do not think the hon. member for Mount Royal really wants that an amendment to or an article of Bill C–84, respecting the privatization of a Crown corporation, putting it into the hands of Canadian stockholders, to encroach upon the provincial jurisdiction. The minister has been very clear about that a little while ago. To include in Bill C–84 a provision that forces PetroCan to provide services in both official languages is already exceptional.

So, I think the concerns of the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier and those of the hon. member for Mount Royal have been taken into account since they are already included in the provisions of Bill C–84.

Mr. Speaker, while we recognize, on this side of the House, that the amendment presented by the member for Ottawa—Vanier is well–intentioned, I will presonally vote against it, convinced as I am that the clauses of Bill C–84 are quite reassuring concerning the prospect that, contrary to its competitors who will not be required to implement such measures, Petro–Canada will, once privatized, continue to provide services to Canadian citizens and consumers in both official languages.

[*English*]

**Mr. Robert E. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that we were dealing with Motion No. 23, that the undertakings and works of Petro–Canada will be considered for the general good of Canada.

I am sorry the minister for privatization got to his feet so quickly to say that no, the government was not going to support this amendment. He referred almost exclusively to the requirement for Canadian works to offer their offices in both official languages. He also indicated that there was concern about interfering in provincial jurisdiction.

I think the government takes a bit of a hypocritical approach to this matter. There are a number of operations in the province of British Columbia, for example, designated as works for the general good of Canada. One of those operations, as the Minister of Transport is aware, is the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway. It is a railway that starts in Victoria, in the suburb of Esquimalt on Vancouver Island, and terminates at Courtenay in my riding.

The reason the Minister of Transport is aware of it is that he has an action in court trying to shut down this railway service. One things the Government of British Columbia is proposing is that it take over jurisdiction of this railway and operate it because it begins and ends in British Columbia. It is a British Columbian railway service, especially because of the way it is being treated by the federal government.

**An hon. member:** Then why are we paying for it?

**Mr Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Because you declared it a work for the general good of Canada. It was not done at the insistence of British Columbia. Many times over the last several years the Government of British Columbia has attempted to regain jurisdiction over this railway.

I am not saying that by passing this legislation when there is a crummy government in office one is going to get a well managed operation or responsible regulation of an operation. In fact, the Minister of Transport and his cronies are attempting to drive this railway into the ground.

It is a little hypocritical for the government to say on the one hand that it does not want to declare Petro-Canada a work for the general good of Canada. It interferes with provincial jurisdiction. Then, on the other hand, like a dog in the manger it wants to destroy that railway on Vancouver Island, that little railway that we want to make successful. It wants to retain jurisdiction so it can shut that railway down and drive it into the ground. This is a kind of dog-in-the-manger approach that this government is taking.

**Mr. Lewis:** Your brother never looked so good.

**Mr. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** And Harvie Andre is looking at a much better House leader.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Harvie Andre is a much better House leader is what I am saying.

**An hon. member:** Harvie will be surprised.

**Mr. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** There is not really too much to compare between them.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please. I would ask the member to confine himself to the matter at hand.

[*English*]

**Mr. Skelly (Comox—Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, if those members will stop interrupting and allow debate to proceed in an orderly fashion in this House, I want to say that it does not necessarily help for an institution or a company such as PetroCan to be declared a work for the general good of Canada because of the way the Minister of Transport has been treating the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway in British Columbia.

If he would let the Province of British Columbia assume jurisdiction over that railway then, when the NDP takes over in a very few months, we are going to operate that railway as if it were something of value to the people on Vancouver Island. We are going to promote it. We are going to expand its operations. Really, we have a vision to make sure that railway operates.

On the other hand, there is some justification for having Petro-Canada declared a work for the general good of Canada. This, after all, is a company that trades interprovincially. It has retail outlets in virtually every province in Canada. It trades into the international market by purchasing goods and services from international offshore suppliers. It also sells Canadian products on the international market. There is some justification for this nation-wide company, represented in every province and doing business interprovincially and internationally, to be a declared a work for the general good of Canadians and, for that reason, to be regulated by the Government of Canada and to be within the jurisdiction of this Parliament so that this Parliament can oversee and regulate its operations. There is some justification for that.

Obviously there is no justification for the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway. I would encourage the Minister of Transport to listen to people in British Columbia who want to tell him to get his hands off it because he is doing nothing but destroying that railway and undermining the transportation network on Vancouver Island. If only we had a competent Minister of Transport federally, we would be looking forward to a better operation there. Unfortunately that is not the case.

I would hope members of the House would be persuaded by the arguments made by the hon. member from Montreal, that PetroCan should be declared a work for the general good of Canadians.

**Hon. William C. Winegard (Minister for Science):** Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word on this particular amendment.

**Mr. Fisher:** Time is up.

**Mr. Winegard:** I know you would like that. It seems to me that the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier really has a choice. If we are going to have one oil company with one set of rules and 2,500 energy companies with

different kinds of rules, I think it is unfair to the corporation.

• (1820)

I do not believe the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier wants this because my experience with him since I have come into this House is that he really is a remarkably reasonable person. In fact, when I first came to this House as a new member in 1984, I sat just down on the other side and he was very helpful to me.

But what my colleagues in the NDP would like is to have all of the oil companies nationalized and operating in their so-called "good for the government of Canada". They would end up with a lot of people losing money like all the other things they want for the betterment or the good of Canada.

**An hon. member:** Very good point.

**Mr. Winegard:** Their operation is if we own it as a government it is bound to lose money and that will be good for Canada. That is what they say: lose money and if you are losing money it will be grand for Canada.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the motion of the member for Ottawa—Vanier, while I have tremendous sympathy for what he is trying to do, I think it would be unfair to have one corporation operating under a different set of rules than all of the other energy companies in the country.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly to this motion as well. When we look at the words "for the general advantage of Canada", when we look at the privatization of Petro-Canada, I think what we see is that the base underlying the problems that we have in this country is that we need to get our financial house in order. Probably more than anything else that will speak to the general advantage of Canada.

To many Canadians in western Canada the privatization of Petro-Canada signals the dismantling of the last vestiges of the National Energy Program. Many Canadians have waited six years for this government to privatize Petro-Canada. I believe that the legislative actions of the government demonstrate the much-needed requirement for this reform.

It has taken six years to announce Petro-Canada's privatization, years which included Petro-Canada's buy-out of even more of its competition. It has taken six months to table the bill after the announcement and, of course, now only six days allowed for debate on it.

I support the complete privatization of Petro-Canada. It is one of the policies which the Reform Party of Canada has advocated since our inception. I am pleased to see the initial steps at selling the 15 per cent Treasury shares, but I and the market would be happier if and when the government had taken this opportunity to decide on a definite time frame in which remaining government holdings in Petro-Canada would be disposed of.

Unfortunately the fact that the previous government paid far too much for the assets and shares which were rolled into Petro-Canada means it is unlikely that taxpayers will ever get back their full investment in Petro-Canada. However, the fact that one government made a bad decision does not mean that every government should have to be bound by that bad decision. Again I speak to the motion that we are looking at "the general advantage of Canada", and I think nothing could be more simple and more fair than that.

I believe, as Reform Party members do, that business should be involved in business and that government should be involved in government. Government should be involved in regulating and making priorities for the long-term benefit of society. Today, unfortunately, instead we see government doing what it does best, trying to do everything else. Where has that gotten us, Mr. Speaker? Unfortunately we are $350 billion in debt and the public is unhappy with practically everything that the government does.

When we are looking at the whole idea of this motion about what is best for Canada, what would be for our advantage, unfortunately what we have seen is that instead of the government ensuring that Canada's future is economically sound, many in Canada are concerned with maintaining the institutions of the past whether or not they have been contributors to the Canadian economy and society.

For many people it is unclear exactly what the government was trying to accomplish by starting Petro-Canada. Was it to ensure there was long-term exploration and development of Canadian energy resources? Was it to ensure that the industry was more competitive by buying

out its competitors? Should it be to promote energy conservation, as some have suggested here today?

The public can rightly be confused. The politicians are confused over this issue as well. However, despite the confusion, the public can very well look at the size of our debt, the levels of interest payments and ask whether there were, and are, more effective ways perhaps to spend taxpayers' dollars to achieve the government's objective than for the government to spend billions of dollars to purchase a place in the oil and gas industry. This despite the fact that the government may find its private sector industry generally profitable and willing to compete without the government being one of the participants.

The taxpaying public may well ask whether there is a cheaper way to regulate an industry than by owning a company, which invariably becomes a political toy, a place to put old supporters as well paid directors and encouraging policy decisions that are politically expedient but perhaps not economically sound.

Finally, before concluding my thoughts on this particular motion on this bill, I would like to deal with two related issues, one of which is the claim first of all that Canadians already own Petro–Canada, and second, that Canadians will be surrendering control of their industry and economy by selling Petro–Canada, or what is generally called reversing Canadianization of the oil and gas industry which is in the national interest.

To deal with the claim that Canadians already own Petro–Canada, first many will point to the price tag which is in the billions of dollars that the government paid. However, if we look at the debt and interest payments it is very obvious that the Canadian government may have bought Petro–Canada, but it has yet to pay for it. As I have already said, there are cheaper ways to have achieved this objective.

Nevertheless, even though it has yet to be paid for, there are still the claims that Canadians do own Petro–Canada. To this, I ask what do Canadians own exactly? If a taxpayer owns shares in a private oil company such as Imperial Oil, that person owns the right to receive dividends, the right to sell his shares, the right to participate in capital growth. They own the residual value of all the assets and they have the right to elect directors in proportion to the value of their holdings.

When we speak of Canadians owning Petro–Canada, we know they do not own the traditional rights which I have just referred to, at least not directly.

Taxpayers have the obligation to pay for the purchase of Petro–Canada but does Parliament even indirectly exercise stewardship in the operations of Petro–Canada? Today with the government increasingly distant and aloof, most Canadians do not feel as though they in fact do own Petro–Canada. The government might, but Canadians doubt that they own it.

Let me turn to the issue of Canadianization. It is perfectly laudable and understandable that Canadians should wish to be masters in their own home and to have control over their resources and their economic destiny. However, many of these Canadianization policies in tandem with the fiscal priorities which governments have had over the past 20 years have actually had the opposite effect.

The most effective means the government has of ensuring that Canadians are masters in their own home is ensuring that the government's policies, fiscal and monetary, as well as political, aid in ensuring the fundamental strength and vitality of the Canadian economy.

Again speaking to the motion, that is what will be of general advantage to all of Canada. Unfortunately, too much attention has been focused on politically short–run decisions which have added to our deficit and debt and which have hindered Canada's long–run capacity to compete and to be economically the masters in our own house.

I point out the increasing reliance that the federal government's own fiscal shortcomings are met by foreign source financing of our domestic deficit mess. Our reliance at the federal level has increased from 10 per cent to 20 per cent in the last six years, during which time the actual debt has doubled, meaning that at the federal level it has recently increased four times in the past six years.

However, this may be alarming since the facts are that this parallels the early growth that has already occurred in foreign source borrowing at the provincial and municipal levels, and in the private sector because the federal

government took advantage of domestic borrowing first, so that our other borrowers have had no choice but to borrow from foreign sources, if they were to borrow at all.

Now the effects on the Canadian economy have been a high and unstable dollar, as well as high interest rates, and on historic spread between Canadian and U.S. interest rates. It is perfectly naive to suggest that Canada should arbitrarily set its own interest rate and a little bit misleading to suggest that those high interest rates are merely at such high levels to combat inflation with our heavy reliance on foreign-source borrowing.

As I have said, if those who are truly interested in ensuring that Canada's economic well-being is secure, that Canadians are masters in their own house, they should make sure government policy is consistent with achieving these ends.

The large deficit which the government has been running for years now, and increasing foreign borrowing, has been working opposite to the goal of ensuring that Canadians have control over their own economy.

As to the claim that owning Petro-Canada and the Canadianization of the oil industry is in the national interest, to many western Canadians that phrase, "the national interest', has become almost cynically associated with a particular phrase that we hear also and that is, "Trust me". To many Canadians in the less populated regions of the country, or what has become recently called "outer Canada", it has become increasingly questionable about why it is in the national interest to Canadianize the resource industries of outer Canada, but it is apparently not in the national interest to Canadianize some of the industries of the more populated regions of southern Ontario and southern Quebec or what is called "inner Canada".

• (1830)

I would like to conclude my remarks by saying that at this particular time of Christmas and when we are looking forward with good will and hope for a new year, I would recommend that our politicians make a commitment to reforming certainly the Senate, where legislation on Petro-Canada will have to pass through, and our political institution here in this House so that there is more fairness. I would recommend that we let Parliament support the privatization of Petro-Canada and concentrate on ensuring that Canadians have a strong economy which benefits all Canadians, rather than institutions here and in the other place which provide questionable benefits and incur unaffordable costs.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House ready for the question?

[*Translation*]

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Motion No. 23?

**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), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

[*English*]

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River)** moved:

Motion No. 20

That Bill C-84 be amended in Clause 12 by adding immediately after line 30 at page 9 the following:

"(2) The Minister shall not refuse to promptly disclose all materially relevant financial information within his control, in connection with any transaction authorized by this Act, to and at the written request of the Auditor General of Canada, on such reasonable conditions as to commercial confidentiality as Petro-Canada shall impose in consultation with the Minister."

**Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (for Mr. Langdon)** moved:

That Bill C-84 be amended by adding immediately after line 44 at page 12 the following new clause:

"18.(1) Each time that Petro-Canada sells or otherwise disposes of ten per cent or more of its shares, it shall submit to Parliament a report indicating the proceeds received by

(1) Petro-Canada

(ii) Her Majesty in Right of Canada, and

(iii) the underwriters of the sale or disposal, pursuant to the sale or disposal.

(2) Every report to Parliament made by Petro-Canada under subsection (1) shall be made by being transmitted to the Speaker of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Commons for tabling in those Houses.

(3) Every report laid before Parliament under subsection (2) stands referred to the Standing Committee on Energy, Mines and Resources of the House of Commons."

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, as we have very few minutes left to complete debate on these amendments, I am going to keep my remarks very short because other members, I am sure, will want to speak to this very important amendment.

As I pointed out earlier, it is sometimes difficult to propose an amendment trying to make a bill better when one disagrees with the principle of the bill or fundamentally opposes it. That is what is happening here.

This particular amendment I happen to take quite a bit of pride in. If we think back five or 10 years, we will recall the number of times that the Auditor General has had to go public, raise his voice and even in one period of time he went to court. He actually went to the courts in an effort to obtain information relative, in this particular case, to the Petro-Canada acquisition. The Auditor General is out there providing constructive comment and guidance as to how we show our public accounts. I think we in the House of Commons have to support the Auditor General in that effort.

Recalling the Auditor General's difficulties in getting information about the Petro-Canada acquisition, there were real reasons and real obstacles to his getting that information. They involved the principle of cabinet confidentiality.

I sit in opposition now, but I know that the events that gave rise to the Auditor General's initiative in this were events that occurred during a period of time that my party was in government. Yet I believe when the Auditor General went to court was when the Conservative government was in power. Both governments held to the same principle that you do not release matters that involve cabinet confidentiality. The reason is that we expect our cabinet ministers to be able to deal honestly and frankly with their advisers in cabinet without fear of having their discussions made public. The fear of that would impair the process of governing. I accept that even though I am in opposition. I would love to know what goes on inside the cabinet room, but I accept the principle.

This amendment does not attack the principle of cabinet confidentiality. What it does is provide a ruling in advance. I will just read the relevant portion that the designated minister who would preside over the privatization shall not refuse to disclose promptly all materially relevant financial information within his control in connection with the privatization transactions. That would be at the written request of the Auditor General—and this is very important—on such reasonable conditions as to commercial confidentiality as Petro-Canada shall impose. As well, that permits Petro-Canada to impose conditions relative to commercial confidentiality which is important to it, I am sure. In this way, both the minister and Petro-Canada are obligated to provide that information to the Auditor General.

I believe that process of providing information is important. I think it provides some sunshine on an area of financial transaction that is not provided for in the act. The Auditor General may have a general mandate, but I know that we in this House have to provide the tools that the Auditor General needs to supervise, even if it is *ex post facto*, the accounting transactions of the government. I hope that members on both sides of the House will subscribe to this amendment.

**Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley):** Mr. Speaker, I checked my very extensive briefing notes, and rise to make a few comments on the amendments proposed, one by the Official Opposition and one by the hon. member for Essex—Windsor. I appreciate the opportunity to allow us to bring that motion forward on the hon. member's behalf.

I have some very extensive notes here and it is a very interesting question. This particular amendment is part of the reasonable package of amendments being proposed to this legislation. We know that if the government is reasonable it will likely support, or we hope it will support, this one.

This amendment simply requires the minister responsible to disclose to the Auditor General information when it is needed or requested by the Auditor General, and as it says in the amendment that reasonable condi-

tions are attached as to the confidentiality of that information.

It is interesting that both the Liberals and the Conservatives in the past, from what I understand of the history of PetroCan and Petrofina, failed to live up to this amendment that they are now proposing. It is interesting to see the little twist perhaps of turning a little bit of Liberal history upside down given their failure to respond in the past.

The second amendment being debated, Motion No. 32A, goes back to previous and similar motions that we moved earlier during debate on the bill, which unfortunately, both the Liberals and the Conservatives voted against. It was a very simple motion at that time that would require an annual report to Parliament to talk about what happened with PetroCan, where it is going, the proceeds, and what have you. It is unfortunate that the Liberals again supported the Conservatives on this proposal. We hope they will support our proposal this time.

• (1840)

The proposal here is a very interesting and unique one, I think, and certainly bears some consideration from the House. I will read it into the record:

> 18.(1) Each time that Petro–Canada sells or otherwise disposes of ten per cent or more of its shares, it shall submit to Parliament a report indicating the proceeds received by
>
> (i) Petro–Canada,
>
> (ii) Her Majesty in Right of Canada, and
>
> (iii) the underwriters of the sale or disposal, pursuant to the sale or disposal.

I think that is very reasonable. It goes on, as you know Mr. Speaker, to report through you to the Speaker of the Senate and to yourself, the Speaker of the House of Commons, and also to refer each report that does come to Parliament to the energy, mines and resources standing committee of the House to review.

Again it gives this Parliament a chance to see exactly what has happened as a result of Bill C–84 and gives yet another challenge that I think the government, certainly this afternoon, has failed to take up, and that is to show exactly what it has done with Petro–Canada, to prove that it is right or we are wrong. This is their chance, and they are passing that chance up. For that we will all be worse off because we will not really know exactly what has happened with these proceeds.

Let us hope it will be the usual news release that we get. At best I suppose that might happen. We have had some experience with this in British Columbia when the then Premier Bill Bennett brought in something called the British Columbia Resources Investment Corporation. Whatever it is called now, and whoever owns it now is sometimes hard to keep track of.

I think that given the debate, given what members in this House have had to say, and given some of the assurances, whatever they may be, from the government members of "Oh, don't worry; everything is going to be fine. Petro–Canada is not going to be bought up by anybody. Everything is going to go along fine", let us give the government a chance to tell this House exactly what the point is. Let us see if it is true to its word and prove its point on that.

I think in that sense it is an excellent amendment worth voting on tonight. As you know we will be moving on to more debate tomorrow, third reading I think it is, on Petro–Canada. Again it is giving us and the people of Canada through this House a chance to see exactly what this government is doing with one of the institutions of Canada. It is only something we hope to expect from this government. Certainly when the New Democrats form the next Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker, you can be assured we will account to Parliament and to Canadians when we run their Crown corporations for them.

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs)):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my hon. friend for giving me a couple of minutes before we vote on these amendments.

We will have covered all the amendments that were brought forward by the opposition party.

First of all let me comment for a moment on the disclosure of information motion. Securities legislation across this country requires a company to issue a prospectus whenever it issues shares to the public. The regulations governing the contents of a prospectus require it to disclose the proceeds and the cost of the issue. It must all be there before it is permitted to go forward.

Funds received by the sale of Petro–Canada, the shares, will be reported in the public accounts which are tabled in Parliament. As we know, we have a debt of $4.3 billion on our books that has to be written off.

Of course the minister will continue to disclose to the Auditor General information that he is required by law to disclose in connection with the Public Accounts of Canada. Those are all covered. So this amendment No. 20 is not necessary.

As far as amendment No. 32 is concerned, the information to be tabled in this proposed report that they are talking about is available from other sources that are required under other existing laws, so inclusion of this provision is redundant and unnecessary.

Security legislation requires a company to issue a prospectus whenever it issues shares to the public. That is well known. When privatization takes place, Petro-Canada will become a widely-held public company subject to all the requirements of a public company. We, of course, will report where the income goes from Petro-Canada as these shares are sold off. Both these motions are totally unnecessary and we will be voting against them.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** It being 6.45 p.m., pursuant to order made in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78(3) on Tuesday, December 11, 1990, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill.

Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The question is on Motion No. 20 standing in the name of the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**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), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 32A standing in the name of the hon. member for Essex-Windsor. 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 Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on the motion is deferred.

The House will now proceed to the recorded divisions deferred at report stage of the bill now before the House.

Call in the members.

• (1900)

*And the division bells having rung:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please. The first question is on Motion No. 2A. The result of this vote will apply to Motions Nos. 6A, 12A, 15, 19, 20, 23, and 32A, according to an order made earlier today.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 371*)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Althouse |
| Anawak | Angus |
| Baker | Benjamin |
| Black | Blaikie |
| Boudria | Brewin |
| Butland | Campbell (South West Nova) |
| Copps | Crawford |
| de Jong | Dionne |
| Ferguson | Finestone |
| Fisher | Fulton |
| Gardiner | Gauthier |

Hunter
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacAulay
Marleau
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nault
Parker
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Taylor
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—51

Jordan
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Lee
MacLellan
McCurdy
Milliken
Murphy
Pagtakhan
Prud'homme
Robinson
Samson
Stupich
Vanclief
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)

## NAYS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Belsher
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bourgault
Browes
Cardiff
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Clifford
Collins
Corbett
Couture
Danis
Dobbie
Duplessis
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Greene
Gustafson
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Layton
Lewis
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Marin
McCreath
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Monteith
Oberle
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Shields
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Vincent

Andre
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Brightwell
Cadieux
Chadwick
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Côté
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Dorin
Edwards
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Larrivée
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Littlechild
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Masse
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Rocheleau
Saint-Julien
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Weiner
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard

Wilbee
Worthy—123

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

• (1910 )

[*English*]

**Mr. Flis:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I walked in halfway through your reading of the amendment. Had I been here on time I would have voted with my party.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Flis:** I hear a lot of booing, but we do have on our TV monitors whether it is a 30-minute vote or a 15-minute vote. The 15-minute mark should have been on our screens.

However, I am here in time for the other amendments, so I hope that you will count me as voting with my party on the other amendments.

**Miss Grey:** Mr. Speaker, in the interest of saving time, I would like to say that my no vote applies to all motions except Motion No. 20. I would vote yea for Motion No. 20.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The next question is on Motion No. 6A standing in the name of Mr. Langdon.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 373*)

## YEAS

Members

Allmand
Anawak
Baker
Black
Boudria
Butland
Copps
de Jong
Ferguson
Fisher
Fulton
Gauthier
Jordan
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Lee
MacLellan
McCurdy
Milliken
Murphy
Pagtakhan
Prud'homme
Robinson
Samson
Stupich

Althouse
Angus
Benjamin
Blaikie
Brewin
Campbell (South West Nova)
Crawford
Dionne
Finestone
Flis
Gardiner
Hunter
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacAulay
Marleau
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nault
Parker
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Taylor

Vanclief
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—52

## NAYS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Belsher
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bourgault
Browes
Cardiff
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Clifford
Collins
Corbett
Couture
Danis
Dobbie
Duplessis
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Greene
Gustafson
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Layton
Lewis
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Marin
McCreath
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Monteith
Oberle
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Shields
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Vincent
White
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard
Andre
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Brightwell
Cadieux
Chadwick
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Côté
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Dorin
Edwards
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Larrivée
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Littlechild
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Masse
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Rocheleau
Saint-Julien
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Weiner
Wilbee
Worthy—123

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 12A standing in the name of Mr. Langdon.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 375)*

## YEAS

Members

Allmand
Anawak
Baker
Black
Boudria
Butland
Copps
de Jong
Ferguson
Fisher
Fulton
Gauthier
Jordan
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Lee
MacLellan
McCurdy
Milliken
Murphy
Pagtakhan
Prud'homme
Robinson
Samson
Stupich
Vanclief
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)
Althouse
Angus
Benjamin
Blaikie
Brewin
Campbell (South West Nova)
Crawford
Dionne
Finestone
Flis
Gardiner
Hunter
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacAulay
Marleau
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nault
Parker
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Taylor
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—52

## NAYS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Belsher
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bourgault
Browes
Cardiff
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Clifford
Collins
Corbett
Couture
Danis
Dobbie
Duplessis
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Greene
Gustafson
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Layton
Lewis
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Marin
Andre
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Brightwell
Cadieux
Chadwick
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Côté
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Dorin
Edwards
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Larrivée
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Littlechild
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Masse

| | |
|---|---|
| McCreath | McDermid |
| McDougall (St. Paul's) | McKnight |
| McLean | Merrithew |
| Monteith | Nicholson |
| Oberle | O'Kurley |
| Plamondon | Plourde |
| Porter | Pronovost |
| Redway | Reid |
| Reimer | Ricard |
| Richardson | Rocheleau |
| Roy-Arcelin | Saint-Julien |
| Scott (Victoria—Haliburton) | Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) |
| Shields | Siddon |
| Sobeski | Soetens |
| Sparrow | Stevenson |
| Tardif | Tétreault |
| Thompson | Thorkelson |
| Tremblay (Rosemont) | Tremblay (Lotbinière) |
| Turner (Halton—Peel) | Valcourt |
| Van de Walle | Vankoughnet |
| Venne | Vien |
| Vincent | Weiner |
| White | Wilbee |
| Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia) | |
| Winegard | Worthy—123 |

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 15 in the name of Mr. Lee.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Lee) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 377*)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Althouse |
| Anawak | Angus |
| Baker | Benjamin |
| Black | Blaikie |
| Boudria | Brewin |
| Butland | Campbell (South West Nova) |
| Copps | Crawford |
| de Jong | Dionne |
| Ferguson | Finestone |
| Fisher | Flis |
| Fulton | Gardiner |
| Gauthier | Hunter |
| Jordan | Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | MacAulay |
| MacLellan | Marleau |
| McCurdy | Mifflin |
| Milliken | Mitchell |
| Murphy | Nault |
| Pagtakhan | Parker |
| Prud'homme | Riis |
| Robinson | Rodriguez |
| Samson | Skelly (Comox—Alberni) |
| Stupich | Taylor |
| Vanclief | Whittaker |
| Young (Acadie—Bathurst) | Young (Beache—Woodbine)—52 |

NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Atkinson | Beatty |
| Belsher | Bertrand |
| Bird | Bjornson |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blais |
| Blenkarn | Bosley |
| Bourgault | Brightwell |
| Browes | Cadieux |
| Cardiff | Chadwick |
| Champagne (Champlain) | Charest |
| Chartrand | Clark (Brandon—Souris) |
| Clifford | Cole |
| Collins | Cooper |
| Corbett | Côté |
| Couture | Crosby (Halifax West) |
| Danis | Darling |
| Dobbie | Dorin |
| Duplessis | Edwards |
| Epp | Fee |
| Feltham | Ferland |
| Fontaine | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) |
| Greene | Grey (Beaver River) |
| Gustafson | Harvey (Chicoutimi) |
| Hawkes | Hicks |
| Hockin | Holtmann |
| Horner | Hughes |
| James | Jelinek |
| Johnson | Joncas |
| Jourdenais | Kempling |
| Koury | Landry |
| Langlois | Larrivée |
| Layton | Leblanc (Longueuil) |
| Lewis | Littlechild |
| Lopez | MacDonald (Rosedale) |
| MacDougall (Timiskaming) | Malone |
| Marin | Masse |
| McCreath | McDermid |
| McDougall (St. Paul's) | McKnight |
| McLean | Merrithew |
| Monteith | Nicholson |
| Oberle | O'Kurley |
| Plamondon | Plourde |
| Porter | Pronovost |
| Redway | Reid |
| Reimer | Ricard |
| Richardson | Rocheleau |
| Roy-Arcelin | Saint-Julien |
| Scott (Victoria—Haliburton) | Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) |
| Shields | Siddon |
| Sobeski | Soetens |
| Sparrow | Stevenson |
| Tardif | Tétreault |
| Thompson | Thorkelson |
| Tremblay (Rosemont) | Tremblay (Lotbinière) |
| Turner (Halton—Peel) | Valcourt |
| Van de Walle | Vankoughnet |
| Venne | Vien |
| Vincent | Weiner |
| White | Wilbee |
| Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia) | |
| Winegard | Worthy—123 |

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 19 in the name of Mr. Lee.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Lee) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 378*)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Althouse |
| Anawak | Angus |
| Baker | Benjamin |
| Black | Blaikie |
| Boudria | Brewin |

Butland
Copps
de Jong
Ferguson
Fisher
Fulton
Gauthier
Jordan
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Lee
MacLellan
McCurdy
Milliken
Murphy
Pagtakhan
Prud'homme
Robinson
Samson
Stupich
Vanclief
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)
Campbell (South West Nova)
Crawford
Dionne
Finestone
Flis
Gardiner
Hunter
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacAulay
Marleau
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nault
Parker
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Taylor
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—52

## NAYS

Members

Allmand
Anderson
Atkinson
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Bourgault
Browes
Cardiff
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Clifford
Collins
Copps
Côté
Crawford
Danis
Dionne
Dorin
Edwards
Fee
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Gauthier
Greene
Gustafson
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
James
Johnson
Jordan
Kempling
Koury
Langlois
Layton
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacLellan
Marin
Masse
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Milliken
Nault
Oberle
Pagtakhan
Anawak
Andre
Baker
Belsher
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boudria
Brightwell
Cadieux
Chadwick
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Dobbie
Duplessis
Epp
Feltham
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Landry
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Littlechild
MacAulay
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Marleau
McCreath
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Mifflin
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plamondon
Plourde
Pronovost
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Shields
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Vanclief
Vankoughnet
Vien
Weiner
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—147
Porter
Prud'homme
Reid
Ricard
Rocheleau
Saint-Julien
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Valcourt
Van de Walle
Venne
Vincent
White
Worthy

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 20 in the name of Mr. Lee.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Lee) which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 379)*

## YEAS

Members

Allmand
Anawak
Baker
Black
Boudria
Butland
Copps
de Jong
Ferguson
Fisher
Fulton
Gauthier
Hunter
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacAulay
Marleau
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nault
Parker
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Taylor
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—53
Althouse
Angus
Benjamin
Blaikie
Brewin
Campbell (South West Nova)
Crawford
Dionne
Finestone
Flis
Gardiner
Grey (Beaver River)
Jordan
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Lee
MacLellan
McCurdy
Milliken
Murphy
Pagtakhan
Prud'homme
Robinson
Samson
Stupich
Vanclief
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)

## NAYS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Belsher
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bourgault
Andre
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Brightwell

Browes
Cardiff
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Clifford
Collins
Corbett
Couture
Danis
Dobbie
Duplessis
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Greene
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Larrivée
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Littlechild
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Masse
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Rocheleau
Saint-Julien
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vien
Weiner
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard
Cadieux
Chadwick
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Côté
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Dorin
Edwards
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gustafson
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Layton
Lewis
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Marin
McCreath
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Monteith
Oberle
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Shields
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Venne
Vincent
White
Worthy—122

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question will be on Motion No. 23 standing in the name of Mr. Gauthier.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Gauthier), which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 380)*

## YEAS

Members

Allmand
Anawak
Baker
Black
Boudria
Butland
Copps
de Jong
Ferguson
Fisher
Fulton
Gauthier
Jordan
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Lee
MacLellan
McCurdy
Milliken
Murphy
Pagtakhan
Prud'homme
Robinson
Samson
Stupich
Vanclief
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)
Althouse
Angus
Benjamin
Blaikie
Brewin
Campbell (South West Nova)
Crawford
Dionne
Finestone
Flis
Gardiner
Hunter
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
MacAulay
Marleau
Mifflin
Mitchell
Nault
Parker
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Taylor
Whittaker
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—52

## NAYS

Members

Anderson
Atkinson
Belsher
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Bourgault
Browes
Cardiff
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Clifford
Collins
Corbett
Couture
Danis
Dobbie
Duplessis
Epp
Feltham
Fontaine
Friesen
Greene
Gustafson
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
James
Johnson
Jourdenais
Koury
Langlois
Layton
Lewis
Lopez
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Marin
McCreath
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Monteith
Oberle
Plamondon
Porter
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Shields
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Turner (Halton—eel)
Andre
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Brightwell
Cadieux
Chadwick
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Côté
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Dorin
Edwards
Fee
Ferland
Fretz
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Kempling
Landry
Larrivée
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Littlechild
MacDonald (Rosedale)
Malone
Masse
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Reid
Ricard
Rocheleau
Saint-Julien
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Valcourt

Van de Walle — Vankoughnet
Venne — Vien
Vincent — Weiner
White — Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard — Worthy—123

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question will be on Motion No. 12A standing in the name of Mr. Langdon.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Langdon), which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 381)*

YEAS

Members

Allmand — Althouse
Anawak — Angus
Baker — Benjamin
Black — Blaikie
Boudria — Brewin
Butland — Campbell (South West Nova)
Copps — Crawford
de Jong — Dionne
Ferguson — Finestone
Fisher — Flis
Fulton — Gardiner
Gauthier — Hunter
Jordan — Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Langdon (Essex—Windsor) — LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee — MacAulay
MacLellan — Marleau
McCurdy — Mifflin
Milliken — Mitchell
Murphy — Nault
Pagtakhan — Parker
Prud'homme — Riis
Robinson — Rodriguez
Samson — Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Stupich — Taylor
Vanclief — Whittaker
Young (Acadie—Bathurst) — Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—52

NAYS

Members

Anderson — Andre
Atkinson — Beatty
Belsher — Bertrand
Bird — Bjornson
Blackburn (Jonquière) — Blais
Blenkarn — Bosley
Bourgault — Brightwell
Browes — Cadieux
Cardiff — Chadwick
Champagne (Champlain) — Charest
Chartrand — Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Clifford — Cole
Collins — Cooper
Corbett — Côté
Couture — Crosby (Halifax West)
Danis — Darling
Dobbie — Dorin
Duplessis — Edwards
Epp — Fee
Feltham — Ferland
Fontaine — Fretz
Friesen — Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Greene — Grey (Beaver River)
Gustafson — Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hawkes — Hicks
Hockin — Holtmann
Horner — Hughes
James — Jelinek
Johnson — Joncas
Jourdenais — Kempling
Koury — Landry
Langlois — Larrivée
Layton — Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lewis — Littlechild
Lopez — MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacDougall (Timiskaming) — Malone
Marin — Masse
McCreath — McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's) — McKnight
McLean — Merrithew
Monteith — Nicholson
Oberle — O'Kurley
Plamondon — Plourde
Porter — Pronovost
Redway — Reid
Reimer — Ricard
Richardson — Rocheleau
Roy-Arcelin — Saint-Julien
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton) — Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Shields — Siddon
Sobeski — Soetens
Sparrow — Stevenson
Tardif — Tétreault
Thompson — Thorkelson
Tremblay (Rosemont) — Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Turner (Halton—Peel) — Valcourt
Van de Walle — Vankoughnet
Venne — Vien
Vincent — Weiner
White — Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard — Worthy—123

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question will be on Motion No. 14A standing in the name of Mr. Langdon.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Langdon), which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 376)*

YEAS

Members

Althouse — Angus
Benjamin — Black
Blaikie — Brewin
Butland — de Jong
Fisher — Fulton
Gardiner — Hunter
Langdon (Essex—Windsor) — McCurdy
Mitchell — Murphy
Parker — Riis
Robinson — Rodriguez
Samson — Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Stupich — Taylor
Whittaker — Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—26

NAYS

Members

Allmand — Anawak
Anderson — Andre
Atkinson — Baker

Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Bourgault
Browes
Cardiff
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Clifford
Collins
Copps
Côté
Crawford
Danis
Dionne
Dorin
Edwards
Fee
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Gauthier
Greene
Gustafson
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
James
Johnson
Jordan
Kempling
Koury
Langlois
Layton
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacLellan
Marin
Masse
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Milliken
Nault
Oberle
Pagtakhan
Plourde
Pronovost
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy-Arcelin
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Shields
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Vanclief
Vankoughnet
Vien
Weiner
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—147

Belsher
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boudria
Brightwell
Cadieux
Chadwick
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Dobbie
Duplessis
Epp
Feltham
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Landry
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Littlechild
MacAulay
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Marleau
McCreath
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Mifflin
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plamondon
Porter
Prud'homme
Reid
Ricard
Rocheleau
Saint-Julien
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Valcourt
Van de Walle
Venne
Vincent
White
Worthy

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

*Government Orders*

The next question will be on Motion No. 4A, standing in the name of Mr. Langdon.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Langdon), which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 372)*

## YEAS

Members

Althouse
Benjamin
Blaikie
Butland
Fisher
Gardiner
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Mitchell
Parker
Robinson
Samson
Stupich
Whittaker

Angus
Black
Brewin
de Jong
Fulton
Hunter
McCurdy
Murphy
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Taylor
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—26

## NAYS

Members

Allmand
Anderson
Atkinson
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Bourgault
Browes
Cardiff
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Clifford
Collins
Copps
Côté
Crawford
Danis
Dionne
Dorin
Edwards
Fee
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Gauthier
Greene
Gustafson
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
James
Johnson
Jordan
Kempling
Koury
Langlois
Layton
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacLellan
Marin
Masse

Anawak
Andre
Baker
Belsher
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boudria
Brightwell
Cadieux
Chadwick
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole
Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Dobbie
Duplessis
Epp
Feltham
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Landry
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Littlechild
MacAulay
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Marleau
McCreath

McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Milliken
Nault
Oberle
Pagtakhan
Plourde
Pronovost
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy–Arcelin
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Shields
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Vanclief
Vankoughnet
Vien
Weiner
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—147

McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Mifflin
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plamondon
Porter
Prud'homme
Reid
Ricard
Rocheleau
Saint–Julien
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Valcourt
Van de Walle
Venne
Vincent
White
Worthy

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

The next question will be on Motion No. 8A, standing in the name of Mr. Langdon.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Langdon), which was negatived on the following division:

*(Division No. 374)*

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Benjamin
Blaikie
Butland
Fisher
Gardiner
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Mitchell
Parker
Robinson
Samson
Stupich
Whittaker

Angus
Black
Brewin
de Jong
Fulton
Hunter
McCurdy
Murphy
Riis
Rodriguez
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Taylor
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—26

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Anderson
Atkinson
Beatty
Bertrand
Bjornson
Blais
Bosley
Bourgault
Browes
Cardiff
Champagne (Champlain)
Chartrand
Clifford

Anawak
Andre
Baker
Belsher
Bird
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blenkarn
Boudria
Brightwell
Cadieux
Chadwick
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cole

Collins
Copps
Côté
Crawford
Danis
Dionne
Dorin
Edwards
Fee
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Gauthier
Greene
Gustafson
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
James
Johnson
Jordan
Kempling
Koury
Langlois
Layton
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacLellan
Marin
Masse
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Milliken
Nault
Oberle
Pagtakhan
Plourde
Pronovost
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Roy–Arcelin
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Shields
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Vanclief
Vankoughnet
Vien
Weiner
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—147

Cooper
Corbett
Couture
Crosby (Halifax West)
Darling
Dobbie
Duplessis
Epp
Feltham
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles–de–la–Madeleine)
Grey (Beaver River)
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Landry
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Littlechild
MacAulay
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Marleau
McCreath
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Mifflin
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plamondon
Porter
Prud'homme
Reid
Ricard
Rocheleau
Saint–Julien
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Valcourt
Van de Walle
Venne
Vincent
White
Worthy

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion lost.

[*English*]

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs))** moved that the bill be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 382*)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson | Andre |
| Atkinson | Beatty |
| Belsher | Bertrand |
| Bird | Bjornson |
| Blackburn (Jonquière) | Blais |
| Blenkarn | Bosley |
| Bourgault | Brightwell |
| Browes | Cadieux |
| Cardiff | Chadwick |
| Champagne (Champlain) | Charest |
| Chartrand | Clark (Brandon—Souris) |
| Clifford | Cole |
| Collins | Cooper |
| Corbett | Côté |
| Couture | Crosby (Halifax West) |
| Danis | Darling |
| Dobbie | Dorin |
| Duplessis | Edwards |
| Epp | Fee |
| Feltham | Ferland |
| Fontaine | Fretz |
| Friesen | Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) |
| Greene | Grey (Beaver River) |
| Gustafson | Harvey (Chicoutimi) |
| Hawkes | Hicks |
| Hockin | Holtmann |
| Horner | Hughes |
| James | Jelinek |
| Johnson | Joncas |
| Jourdenais | Kempling |
| Koury | Landry |
| Langlois | Larrivée |
| Layton | Leblanc (Longueuil) |
| Lewis | Littlechild |
| Lopez | MacDonald (Rosedale) |
| MacDougall (Timiskaming) | Malone |
| Marin | Masse |
| McCreath | McDermid |
| McDougall (St. Paul's) | McKnight |
| McLean | Merrithew |
| Monteith | Nicholson |
| Oberle | O'Kurley |
| Plamondon | Plourde |
| Porter | Pronovost |
| Redway | Reid |
| Reimer | Ricard |
| Richardson | Rocheleau |
| Roy-Arcelin | Saint-Julien |
| Scott (Victoria—Haliburton) | Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth) |
| Shields | Siddon |
| Sobeski | Soetens |
| Sparrow | Stevenson |
| Tardif | Têtreault |
| Thompson | Thorkelson |
| Tremblay (Rosemont) | Tremblay (Lotbinière) |
| Turner (Halton—Peel) | Valcourt |
| Van de Walle | Vankoughnet |
| Venne | Vien |
| Vincent | Weiner |
| White | Wilbee |
| Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia) | |
| Winegard | Worthy—123 |

NAYS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Althouse |
| Anawak | Angus |
| Baker | Benjamin |
| Black | Blaikie |
| Boudria | Brewin |
| Butland | Campbell (South West Nova) |
| Copps | Crawford |
| de Jong | Dionne |
| Ferguson | Finestone |
| Fisher | Flis |
| Fulton | Gardiner |
| Gauthier | Hunter |
| Jordan | Kilger (Stormont—Dundas) |
| Langdon (Essex—Windsor) | LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) |
| Lee | MacAulay |
| MacLellan | Marleau |
| McCurdy | Mifflin |
| Milliken | Mitchell |
| Murphy | Nault |
| Pagtakhan | Parker |
| Prud'homme | Riis |
| Robinson | Rodriguez |
| Samson | Skelly (Comox—Alberni) |
| Stupich | Taylor |
| Vanclief | Whittaker |
| Young (Acadie—Bathurst) | Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—52 |

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion carried.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## THE CONSTITUTION

### ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

The House resumed from Thursday, December 13, consideration of the motion of Mr. Andre (p. 16670).

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** It being 7.23 p.m., pursuant to order made on Wednesday, December 12, 1990, the House will now proceed to the recorded division on the motion calling for the establishment of a Special Joint Committee to inquire into and report upon the process for amending the Constitution of Canada. Can we dispense with the ringing of the bell?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 383*)

YEAS

Members

| | |
|---|---|
| Allmand | Anawak |
| Anderson | Andre |
| Atkinson | Baker |
| Beatty | Belsher |
| Bertrand | Bird |
| Bjornson | Blackburn (Jonquière) |
| Blais | Blenkarn |
| Bosley | Boudria |
| Bourgault | Brightwell |
| Browes | Cadieux |
| Campbell (South West Nova) | Cardiff |
| Chadwick | Charest |
| Clark (Brandon—Souris) | Clifford |
| Cole | Collins |
| Cooper | Copps |
| Corbett | Côté |
| Couture | Crawford |
| Crosby (Halifax West) | Danis |

Darling
Dobbie
Duplessis
Epp
Feltham
Ferland
Flis
Fretz
Gauthier
Greene
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hicks
Holtmann
Hughes
Jelinek
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Landry
Larrivée
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lewis
Lopez
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacLellan
Marin
Martin (Lasalle—Émard)
McCreath
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McLean
Mifflin
Monteith
Nicholson
O'Kurley
Plourde
Pronovost
Redway
Reimer
Richardson
Saint-Julien
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Siddon
Soetens
Stevenson
Tétreault
Thorkelson
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Vanclief
Vankoughnet
Vien
Weiner
Dionne
Dorin
Edwards
Fee
Ferguson
Finestone
Fontaine
Friesen
Gray (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gustafson
Hawkes
Hockin
Horner
James
Johnson
Jordan
Kempling
Koury
Langlois
Layton
Lee
Littlechild
MacAulay
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Marleau
Masse
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Milliken
Nault
Oberle
Pagtakhan
Porter
Prud'homme
Reid
Ricard
Roy-Arcelin
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Shields
Sobeski
Sparrow
Tardif
Thompson
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Valcourt
Van de Walle
Venne
Vincent
White
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Winegard
Worthy
Young (Acadie—Bathurst)—143

## NAYS

Members

Althouse
Benjamin
Blaikie
Butland
de Jong
Fisher
Gardiner
Hunter
Lapierre
McCurdy
Murphy
Plamondon
Robinson
Samson
Stupich
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Young (Beaches—Woodbine)—33
Angus
Black
Brewin
Chartrand
Duceppe
Fulton
Grey (Beaver River)
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Mitchell
Parker
Riis
Rocheleau
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Taylor
Whittaker

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis):** Mr. Speaker, at the end of the vote, I heard some totally unacceptable words from some colleagues. I would like to give you notice that I may rise on a question of privilege about some comments made by members about other members concerning communism and so on. If this is reported in *Hansard*, I will rise at the appropriate time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** It being 7.34 p.m., this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

The House adjourned at 7.34 p.m.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Tuesday, December 18, 1990**

The House met at 11 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

### SMALL BUSINESSES

TABLING OF SECOND REPORT

**Hon. Tom Hockin (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the second report to Parliament on the state of small business in Canada.

This document provides a reference source on the latest statistics on small business. It provides profiles of outstanding growth oriented firms, discussion of the factors which contributed to their success, and an indication of the wide range of government programs and services which support small business growth.

[*Translation*]

The title of this document, "Small Business in Canada—Competing Through Growth", reflects our economic situation and indicates how small businesses can respond to new economic challenges. The document shows what is being done by businesses that have satisfactorily adjusted to a new situation. It also contains a list of the many federal services and programs that can help small businesses while they make these adjustments.

[*English*]

These enterprises have grown in this country.

* * *

### PETITIONS

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to six petitions.

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

* * *

### INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION

PRESENTATION OF REPORT ON OFFICIAL VISIT TO LONDON, JERSEY AND GUERNSEY

**Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to the House the report, in both English and in French, on the official visit to London, Jersey, and Guernsey.

* * *

[*Translation*]

### REVIEW OF THE PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT

PRESENTATION OF SIXTH AND SEVENTH REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

**Hon. Marcel Danis (Minister of State (Youth), Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the Sixth and Seventh Report of the Special Committee on the Review of the Parliament of Canada Act.

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

* * *

[*English*]

### PETITIONS

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I am tabling today the first of tens of thousands of petitions from the people of Windsor and Essex county who are calling upon Parliament to take all necessary measures to preserve local CBC television broadcasting in Windsor and in other areas deprived of such service by federal government cutbacks and by the decisions of CBC management.

I want to inform the House that we already have over 45,000 names on these petitions, calling for the restoration of local TV broadcasting by the CBC in Windsor.

These petitions will be presented by all the members from Essex county, and I sincerely hope that before too long we will get a favourable response from the government.

VIA RAIL

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to present a petition, pursuant to Standing Order 36, on behalf of people from Hamilton, Thunder Bay, Vancouver, Winnipeg, Calgary, West Germany, Montreal, Cayman Islands, London, Ontario, Saskatoon, and Sioux Lookout.

• (1110 )

**An hon. member:** It is out of order.

**Mr. Riis:** Anyway, there are lots of names on this petition. It just shows the interest of people in VIA Rail.

They are joining their Canadian friends where perhaps they have lived at one time or another. They are all pointing out their concerns with the government decision to cut back on VIA Rail service. As we speak new lines are being curtailed in Gaspe, the Smiths Falls area, and other places in Canada.

They are asking the government to reconsider this particular step, pointing out also that passenger rail service is the most environmentally friendly way to move large numbers of people.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, although the next petition is in a sense after the fact, these petitioners were not aware of it when they signed the petition. I suppose the case can still be made that they oppose the goods and services tax.

In spite of the fact that the government has now introduced the tax or is about to on January 1, they still point out a whole set of concerns as to why they oppose the tax. They are asking the government to recognize what this is going to do to the economy of Canada.

**Mr. Boudria:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I know that the whole House is aware or that at least Mr. Speaker is very much aware of the fact that under our Standing Orders petitions must only be signed by residents of Canada.

The difficulty is that I am sure that most members of the House, including myself of course, approve of the signature of everyone trying to oppose cutbacks in VIA Rail.

I wonder how it is that the certificate was issued by the clerk's office or by representatives of the clerk's office as to the possible tabling of a petition that was signed by non-residents. I did notice that the petition was properly certified. I saw the certificate attached to the petition. Nevertheless one has to ask the question how it is that it was certified, given that it does not meet the rules of the House.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The Chair has taken note of the hon. member's comments, and if necessary, it will check the allegations and report back to the House.

[*English*]

GASOLINE ADDITIVES

**Hon. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton—Middlesex):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to table several hundred more names of residents of my particular riding. They are all residents of Canada and citizens of Canada.

They are requesting this government to make a minimum 3.2 per cent oxygen content in gasoline fuel mandatory and to ban methylcyclopentadlenyl manganese tricarbonyl from use in Canada in the gasoline as an octane enhancer.

Ethanol can be produced from corn, wheat, and barley and is a renewable resource. Plants remove carbon dioxides from the atmosphere. There is a very positive energy balance in the fact that up to four times as much energy can be taken from the crop in the way of ethanol than what is used in the manufacture of the product.

Ethanol blended gasoline represents a renewable and secure source of fuel energy and reduces our dependence on declining reserves of fossil fuels.

CANADIAN TRAVEL VISAS

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to present a petition under Standing Order 36.

Many Canadians have family members in many countries where they are now being denied Canadian travel visas for good faith family visits.

These petitioners call upon the government to introduce measures immediately which will facilitate travel visa issuance to relatives living abroad who, together with their Canadian hosts, wish to arrange good faith family visits to Canada.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair):** Mr. Speaker, I too have a set of signatures on petitions from Windsor and Essex county. Let me assure you that every signature on these petitions is not only Canadian but desperately Canadian in circumstances in which the people very deeply feel that they are being alienated from the rest of Canada by the decisions being taken by government and by the CBC.

The petitioners state that the Canadian Broadcasting television station in Windsor is the only one located in the Windsor–Essex area, an area dominated by U.S. television. The lack of a local newscast deprives Windsor of a view of itself as a part of Canada.

It relies on national and regional broadcasting emanating from Toronto. Even if they carry some Windsor area items from time to time from a Windsor bureau, it not only distorts the character of our region, but of Canada generally.

Therefore, the undersigned, your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take all necessary measures to preserve local CBC television broadcasting in Windsor and in all other areas deprived of such service by federal government cutbacks and by the decisions of CBC management.

There are 2,500 signatures on this petition. There are 45,000 more already in the process of certification. This indicates the depth and the dimensions of the feelings of the people of Windsor that they not be denied their participation in Canada—

**An hon. member:** Louder, louder.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please! According to the Standing Orders, petitions must be presented in concise form, while the reasons must be very brief. I thank the hon. member for his co–operation.

[*English*]

**Mr. Jerry Pickard (Essex—Kent):** Mr. Speaker, I too rise with petitions with regard to the CBC and the definite negative effect the closing of the Windsor station will have on Essex county and Windsor.

I have 1,200 petitions but as the previous speaker mentioned, there are tens of thousands of people very concerned about the loss of local broadcasting in our area.

They are also concerned about the loss of Canadianism in our area. Through the petition they humbly ask this Parliament to do everything it can in order to restore this local broadcasting, this local system, to the Windsor–Essex county area.

FOOD AND DRUGS

**Mrs. Pauline Browes (Scarborough Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present this petition today from petitioners who live in Scarborough, Oshawa, Ajax, Markham and Richmond Hill. These petitioners were motivated to sign this petition because they are concerned about the packaging of foods. The content of food is not being disclosed. The protection of the health of the citizens of Canada is affected.

The petitioners are calling upon the Government of Canada to enact legislation amending the food and drug regulations in order to require manufacturers to list specific food ingredients and additives used in the pre–packaged foods.

As well, they are calling on the restaurateurs and food retailers to provide to the customers a list of all the food ingredients and additives to prepared foods.

I might add, since these petitions have been put forth, that a number of restaurateurs across Canada are displaying their entire food additives in their restaurant menus. I am very pleased about that.

* * *

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 399 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

[*Text*]

DFO—THINK TANK SESSION

Question No. 399—**Mr. Gardiner:**

Did the Department of Fisheries and Oceans hold a "think tank" session on November 1 and 2, 1990 and, if so (a) what was the name and organization of (i) each person invited (ii) each person who participated (b) what was the cost of (i) travel (ii) accommodation (iii) other expenses (c) which federal officials attended the meetings and what were their departmental affiliations (d) what was the established criteria upon which the invitations were extended?

Return tabled.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

### PETRO-CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

**Hon. John McDermid (Minister of State (Privatization and Regulatory Affairs))** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure today, a long-awaited pleasure I might say, to lead off the third reading debate of Bill C-84 which will authorize the sale of Petro-Canada shares to the public. Allow me first, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to take this opportunity to thank members from all sides of the House who have taken part in the various stages of debate on this bill. In particular, let me thank the members from both sides of the House who were part of the legislative committee on Bill C-84 who I believe carefully and thoughtfully studied the various clauses of the bill.

• (1120)

I appeared twice before the committee and many witnesses appeared and gave testimony. The evidence is overwhelming that the government is on the right track and is doing the right thing in privatizing Petro-Canada.

Opponents of this bill have expressed concerns about Canada's energy security in the context of Bill C-84. These concerns are quite natural and understandable given the recent volatility of world energy markets. I believe that we have been able to demonstrate that Canada's energy security does not depend on continued government ownership of Petro-Canada. The security of supply can be reached in many other ways. The government has the ability to do that. Through all stages of debate on this legislation, the government has been able to give Canadians the assurance that Canadian energy security is not at risk as a result of public participation in the ownership of Petro-Canada.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, in addressing the legislative committee, outlined the government's energy policy in words that bear repeating. He said, and I quote:

> —current policy emphasizes primary reliance upon the operation of competitive markets for decisions regarding energy supply, demand, pricing and trade. The government considers that competitive prices provide the most appropriate and effective signals to both investors and consumers. We know, from the experience of the early 1980s, that such a market-oriented approach is far better, both in economic terms and in terms of federal-provincial relations, than policies which emphasize heavy reliance upon regulation and government intervention.

The privatization of Petro-Canada is perfectly consistent with the government's energy policy as stated by the Minister of Energy. I might say that I just returned from the west after pre-budget consultations with a number of interested groups and organizations, two of which were involved dramatically in the energy business. They all have said that the energy industry over the last four years has done a tremendous amount of work in streamlining its operations, getting themselves in shape without the vagaries, if I can use that terminology, of subsidies and offering them this here and that there. They have told me that their capital expenditures for next year are going to increase rather dramatically in exploration and capital costs. That is very good news not only for the west, I might say, although the west would benefit from it the most, but also from ridings such as mine, where I have 52 companies that I have identified within the riding of Brampton that supply the oil patch with needed goods and services. When the energy industry is doing well, all of Canada benefits. I can assure you of that.

A privatized Petro-Canada, strengthened by a new equity infusion, will be able to contribute to Canada's long-term energy security by continuing its ongoing exploration and development activities, thereby increasing the strength of the Canadian oil and gas industry. That is what Bill C-84 is all about; strengthening Petro-Canada so it can get on with the job of doing what it does best and that is exploring for and developing Canada's energy reserves and contributing in a positive way to Canada's future energy security.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quickly reiterate for all members of the House the two main reasons why the government is moving forward with this initiative. First, government ownership of Petro-Canada is no longer required to fill a public policy role.

Second, the company needs an infusion of capital in order to allow it to participate in the exploration and development of Canada's oil and gas reserves. For this reason, the initial public offering will be comprised of treasury shares enabling the company to raise much needed equity.

As I have said on numerous occasions, the privatization of Petro-Canada will be good for the company and good for Canadians. We recognize the important role that Petro-Canada has played in Canadian oil and gas development and the special relationship that the company enjoys with Canadians across this country.

The bill in no way diminishes these two important roles. Neither does it diminish the government's ability to carry out its energy policy, to ensure energy security and to promote environmentally sound practices within the Canadian oil and gas industry.

I must say that the Canadian oil and gas industry has been very understanding and very co-operative and has worked extremely hard in the field of environment and, as a matter of fact, has been recognized by environmental groups for the work that it has done. This, in no way, is going to change that in the importance of environment to all 2,500 to 3,000 energy companies we have in this country. The rules, the regulations, the goals and the aspirations all remain the same and privatizing Petro-Canada is not going to have a negative effect on the environment whatsoever.

As a matter of fact, by privatizing Petro-Canada, by allowing the company to raise equity from individual Canadians rather than relying on taxpayers, we are providing the company with the means to become an even stronger presence in the Canadian oil and gas industry, and we are strengthening the Canadian identity of the company by inviting individuals to buy shares.

I hear the opposition saying that we own it now. Well, I submit that the taxpayers have had all the liabilities and none of the benefits from the company. It is on our books now for $4.3 billion. Therefore, who really does own it? The government lays claim to it but there is a tremendous debt attached to that.

The legislation opens new opportunities for Petro-Canada. With the ability to raise new equity it can get on with that job that it does best, exploring and developing our gas reserves. I think most important, as we saw in the Air Canada privatization, a wide distribution of shares and restriction on their ownership will give Canadians a real and direct interest in the future of the company. These ownership restrictions will also ensure that control of Petro-Canada will remain firmly in Canadian hands.

I have sat through the debate. I listened intently to the opposition claims. There are ideological differences between the New Democratic Party, the Liberal Party and the Progressive Conservative Party on this particular issue. The polls I have seen indicate that the majority of Canadians are in favour of privatization of Petro-Canada as long as it is kept in Canadian hands.

I see my hon. friend from Toronto over there shaking his head, indicating no. If he is privy to information that I do not have I would be very happy to see it, but the record shows that security of supply and owning a state oil company does not go hand in hand unless the state oil company owns exclusively all the oil in the country. As a matter of fact, Petro-Canada accounts for only 6 per cent of the upstream activity. The other 3,000 energy companies account for the rest.

So, it is very important to understand that Petro-Canada, although playing a very important role, primarily in marketing because it has 19 per cent of the market in the downstream activities is one of many players in the energy industry. It is time that it it set free so that it can expand without having to come cap in hand to government for funding. Now it can go to the private sector for

funding. It can raise it through the normal means of financing these companies similar to its competitors and at the same time remain in Canadian hands.

• (1130)

There are numerous changes being made in this country. If you listen to the opposition day after day after day, they do not want anything changed. They want it all to remain the same. They do not want us to economize. There is not one area of the economy where we have had to economize because of a fiscal situation, and we have had to make cutbacks in many, many areas there is not one area where they have agreed that we should cut back. Not one. Neither the Liberals nor the New Democratic Party. They want it exactly the way it was.

Well, the world is moving very quickly. We have seen changes that no one could have predicted two, three or four years ago. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this government has kept up with those changes and is leading Canada into the 21st Century as a progressive country, not one that is constantly playing catch-up, but one that would be right up there leading in the economies of the world. That is what this is all about. That is what change is all about. We can no longer sit back and ignore these changes that are taking place in the world, as much as the opposition would like to. At least that is what I am hearing from them. Do not cut VIA Rail. It does not matter that people do not ride it, do not cut it. Do not cut the CBC, just give them more money. We give them $1,034,000 now, give them another $110 million. That is their solution to all the problems of the country, to give more, more, more. It does not matter what issue it is. If we are talking about structural changes within our economy, they oppose that. They want to go back to the old ways.

Well, in 1984 the Canadian people made it extremely clear that they did not want to go back to the old ways. They were not happy with the old ways. Change was coming and they needed a group of men and women who could bring that change forward and that is what this government is doing. Some of them are difficult decisions. Some of them cost us dearly in the popularity polls we see published monthly. Tough decisions have to be made and this government and the Prime Minister who leads this government is prepared to make those tough decisions and stick with them because we know in the long-run that they are going to be for the good of the country.

I can even say that former Liberal Cabinet Ministers understand that times change and we have to look at things differently today than we did 15, 16 or 17 years ago when the NDP forced the Liberal government into creating a Crown corporation known as Petro-Canada.

As recently as six weeks ago, the hon. Marc Lalonde, the former minister of energy, a former finance minister and, I guess, a former everything in the former government led by Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, was interviewed on the Gzowski show as part of a panel. He was there with Rosemary Brown from the New Democratic Party and, I believe Dalton Camp was representing the Progressive Conservative Party. It was a regular round-table that they had discussing what was going on in politics.

One day the subject was the privatization of Petro-Canada. I know my colleague, the Minister of Energy Mines and Resources will refer to this later in the debate today. What he said at that time was: "No, I am not opposed to the privatization of Petro-Canada". His opinion was that Petro-Canada has served its purpose and now it is time to get on with the change that is taking place, that it is not a window on the industry any more. We have organizations within governments now that have the ability to collect all the information necessary to know what is going on in the energy industry.

Rosemary asked him if Petro-Canada was not there to control energy prices. Marc Lalonde said that it was was never envisaged to control prices in this country. That was never one of its mandates. One would think from listening to the New Democratic Party that that was the reason Petro-Canada was there, to control prices. They stand up and say: "Why does Petro-Canada not lower oil prices or gas prices at the pump?" They do not care if it loses money, but say: "We'll prop them up with subsidization from government." That is not the way it should work.

The socialist ideas around the world are being thrown out. Privatization is taking place in every country of the world by governments of every political stripe, including the communists, the socialists, the liberals, and the conservatives.

It is not an ideological thing. It is a common sense thing. The New Democratic Party says: "It's ideological, it's a Conservative bent." It is Conservative philosophy because it works, but it is being adopted by communist countries and by members of Socialist International, to which the New Democratic Party belongs.

One of the interesting things is that a number of these countries are coming to my department for advice on privatization and how they would enact privatization in their countries. We have had them from Australia, New Zealand, and Venezuela. Members of my staff on the privatization side of my department have been in Poland and Czechoslovakia providing advice on privatization. It is happening around the world.

Mexico has privatized something like 260 companies since President Salinas has taken over. He knows it is right. He knows that is the way to go, that governments can no longer pour billions and billions of dollars into these Crown corporations to keep them afloat, and that it is totally irresponsible to the taxpayers of the country.

Privatization is a fact of life. Crown corporations, yes. There are certain Crown corporations we need. I have never denied that. There are certain services of government that must be provided by government. I have never denied that. There are services that the private sector cannot or will not provide that must be provided. Governments have to provide them. That is why many of these Crown corporations came into being, but they have outlived their usefulness.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**An hon. member:** Name one.

**Mr. McDermid:** I will give you a prime example. Air Canada was formed as a Crown corporation to provide air transportation for regions of the country that no other company would do. Today, there are other airline companies in the country that are providing that service. A competitive service is there now which was not there when the Crown corporation was formed. That is a prime example of a Crown corporation that was formed to provide a specific purpose. We have outlived that now and it is time for them to fly on their own. They are and they are doing very well, thank you very much. They are happy about it. The employees are happy about it. The corporation is happy about it. The country is still being served and served well. That is a prime example, Mr. Speaker, of what I am talking about.

But I want to get back to Mr. Lalonde. This disturbs the Liberals, I understand that. I understand why the Liberals do not like this because it really hurts them. They want to go back to the old ways. They want to go back to pouring billions of dollars into Crown corporations and propping them up. That is what they want to do.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. McDermid:** They want to control everything. It is the old marionette stuff. That is what the Liberals like to do. They do not believe in the private sector. Oh, they say they do, sure. They say they believe in it, but they know that the public service can do it better. They know that. They say that all the time.

One thing I have to say about the New Democratic Party is that we know where they stand. We do not see too many of them, but we know where they stand. With Grits, we never know. We do not know where they stand. They are against everything, but they do not tell us what they are for. They are against everything over there, except keeping Crown corporations no matter what their state in life is. Mr. Speaker, I must tell you that Mr. Lalonde, in his interview, made it very clear that the time has come for Petro-Canada to be privatized, that it no longer serves a public policy purpose, and that he cannot envisage one for it in the future. Times have changed. He has turned his thinking around. It is unfortunate he is still not on the benches over there, because maybe he could convince his colleagues that the time has come for the privatization of Petro-Canada.

• (1140)

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Come on, John.

**Mr. McDermid:** I hear my friend, the hon. member for Nickel Belt, saying: "Come on, John." We are going to hear a speech today like we have never heard on Petro-Canada. The hon. member will be ranting and raving that we are destroying some great Canadian institution and the crocodile tears will be coming down.

The reason NDP members are upset about it is because they were the ones who blackmailed the Liberals into creating it, back in the early seventies, when our deficits started to take off in the country, irresponsibly. The former Minister of Finance, now the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, was the guy who had to do it. He had to say: "Well, we are going to stay in power, so we

are going to give them this and we are going to start running up our deficit." That is how it all started. I want people to remember that.

The time has come for Petro-Canada to be privatized. We have had a good debate on this. We have had to bring in time allocation—

**An hon. member:** A muzzle.

**Mr. McDermid:** My friend over there does not sound as if he is muzzled, to me. I have been hearing him yell all day. I do not think he is muzzled at all.

We have had to bring in time allocation on this bill because we tried to get a set amount of time to debate this bill and the opposition was not prepared to co-operate and that is fair ball. I understand that. When we were in opposition, we gave the government a hard time too.

The rules of the House provide that we can bring in time allocation and that is exactly what we did. We have given it a fair debate and we had good hearings in committee. When the committee asked me to appear, I appeared both times I was asked. It cannot be said that we were not forthcoming in committee, we were. We provided the committee with all kinds of information and briefings, well before we debated the bill, as well as any briefings required during the debate on the bill. The committee was well informed about the whole transaction. Mr. Speaker, I must say that we have had a good debate on it.

Petro-Canada's time has come for privatization and I encourage the House to move expeditiously through this stage of debate. We will be voting on it this evening and I look forward to that vote because I believe that the government is doing the right thing in privatizing Petro-Canada. Its time has come.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address the House today as the lead-off speaker on behalf of the Official Opposition at third reading stage of the Petro-Canada privatization bill.

It is with a little sadness, on this side of the House, that we embark on this task. It is our last chance to change our minds and to save what was and what could be in the future a valuable Canadian institution which has languished over the last few years as a result of the absence of government leadership.

There are two things that strike me about the way we have begun this privatization. The first is the haste with which the government has addressed this. If we recall, the matter was first placed before the House of Commons on October 1. That was about two and a half months ago. There have been a lot of other bills around the House which have been here a lot longer than two and a half months.

I have only been here since 1988. I could be wrong, but I cannot recall another bill that did not have unanimous approval zipping through this House as quickly as this one has. I think that is unfortunate because, aside from the simple procedure of selling off, we also have a recognition of the issues surrounding the thrust, reasons and policies of privatization. It is long past time when Canadians must begin to address the issue of privatization.

This government has embarked upon a long series of privatizations. I would concede that one privatization by itself would not make a trend or would not make or break the future of this country, and we could live with that. In fact, I would have to concede, as I am sure most members of the House would, that there is the odd enterprise which can be privatized and not materially impair the many other policy goals that the government has and should have. For the record, and so we will know the extent of privatization, I will mention a few by name.

We have had de Havilland, Canadair, Nordion, Route Canada, CN Hotels, Canadian Arsenals Limited, Northern Canada Power Commission and Northern Transportation Company. The sale prices for these are all in the many millions of dollars. I say that only to indicate that there is a large volume of money involved here. It is not simply a sale of a few excess Crown assets such as paper clips and the like. There was Northwest Tel Inc., which is a CN subsidiary; Pêcheries Canada Inc., Teleglobe for half a billion dollars; Terra Nova Telecommunications, another CN subsidiary; Canada Development Corporation, Fishery Products International, Nanisivik Mines Limited and Theratronics International Ltd.

There are other smaller interests which I will not mention, interests that the government acquired by taking as security for loans and financings. The list is a very, very long list and what it should serve to show all of us is that we have not got a simple one-time privatization, but what we have is a long string of dismantling

of enterprises which for the most part—not in every case—were put in place to serve Canadians, not just Canadians in Ottawa, Montreal or Toronto but Canadians all over the country.

The way in which this government is proceeding with these privatizations, I fear that we are taking a lot of sand out of the sandbox. When you take sand out of the sandbox and get down to a certain point, the kiddies will not want to play any more. They do not regard it as a sandbox. It is just a box. If the government proceeds on this ideologically-driven—and I maintain it is ideologically driven—course of privatization, it will succeed in selling out, but we will have left for all of us a geographic shell without Canadian presence. That drive to divest Canada of these institutions and corporate enterprises, to me, manifests a bankruptcy in the pursuit of policy.

• (1150)

The government sees that there is no Canadian goal that must be accomplished and therefore sells off the vehicle.

I am a temporary resident of Ottawa in my responsibilities as a member of Parliament and I represent a riding in Scarborough. Canadians living in major cities such as Vancouver, Montreal and Halifax, are surrounded in our urban environment by many, many institutions. You cannot leave your house without tripping over them; sidewalks, sewers and stop signs. But these cities only represent a part of Canada.

There are the people who do not live in the urban areas like Ottawa, who are not surrounded by all of these national institutions like Parliament, like the grandiose city halls. They are working people who do not get a chance to see, participate in, or pursue goals that are related to these Canadian institutions. That is one area where this government has missed the boat. It has forgotten that it must provide to Canadians in every region, not just to the concentrated pocket of voters in urban areas, leadership in institutions, a presence, a reason for feeling for being Canadian.

The Minister has just told the House that Petro-Canada did not serve any public purpose. Well, we all know that is true. The only reason, however, that Petro-Canada did not serve a public policy purpose was because the government took it away in the first place in 1984. It removed it. It publicly required Petro-Canada to pursue profit-oriented enterprise with no public policy mandate, and that is not the reason why Petro-Canada was created in the first place.

It is very easy for the government to say that Petro-Canada does not fulfil a public policy purpose. It could not possibly do so because the government sucked that out of Petro-Canada in 1984.

I have also noticed how the government has changed the semantics of privatization as it pursues its goal of privatization. When the thrust of privatizing began 10 or 20 years ago it was called selling off or divestiture, then it became privatization. But that term has not sanitized it enough, so now we have the euphemistic titles of this and other bills where the process is called public participation.

What would constitute public participation in an enterprise more than a Crown corporation? How could you get any more public than that? Have we gone full circle? Public participation, the way it is discussed in relation to the government's privatization initiatives, means selling shares on the market. That is not the only perspective on public participation that we have in this country, so why the drive to sanitize? Why does the government have to change what it calls it? Well, I submit it is because there are some ugly truths that lie behind divestiture, sell-offs, sell-out, privatization.

We like to call it participation. It is not going to fool anybody. It is not hard to sell off. This is the easiest initiative this government has ever had to undertake. It is really easy for a liquidator to come in and sell off the corporate asset—any asset.

All you do is take it and hold it out in the marketplace for the best price you can get. In fact, you do not even care what price you get because you as a liquidator get a commission. That is what every broker or underwriter obtains when that group participates in a divestiture, a sell-off. I do not knock that. They are doing their work. But boy, is that easy. It is a dead end policy if all we are going to do is sell, sell, sell. Where does it end? I suppose in the end there is nothing left.

Will there be a post office? Why not sell it?

**An hon. member:** Good idea.

**Mr. Lee:** My friend opposite says good idea. I am afraid we differ once again. I think a lot of Canadians will differ with the hon. member. However, there is lots of time to discuss, as long as the government does not try to ram it down our throats in another two and a half months.

What will happen to the CBC? Who knows. We will wait for the new agenda. Unfortunately for the government, that Ronald Reagan–Margaret Thatcher neo–Conservative agenda that was there, led by an eminent politician from the United Kingdom who is no longer with us as Prime Minister, is disappearing. I feel that the government has lost its true leader in this. As it embarks on other potential privatizations, it is going to find itself not knowing where it is going. That is when Canadians will take notice.

Everyone in this House knows that the opposition stands in fundamental disagreement with the privatization of Petro–Canada. For that reason, it has been a little tough at committee and in the House being constructive about a sell–off because once it is sold, it is gone. It is not there any more. That makes it tough.

It is also tough to show that you are opposed and then be required to put forward a constructive amendment to make the sell–off better. I do not know if you can make a sell–off better, but a number of members at committee tried to do that. We addressed several issues. I am going to repeat them here so that the record will show the areas of sensitivity that we have to address in the House of Commons and in committee in this particular privatization. Some of these themes pertain to other privatizations as well but these are the Petro–Canada ones.

One of them had to do with the Canadianization policy. That was one of the driving forces that gave rise to Petro–Canada's birth, Canadianization. We in the early days of Petro–Canada were very fearful as Canadians that our petrochemical capability and the energy capability related to that were being managed by non–resident corporations, the seven sisters. We were quite concerned. I remember the time very well. For whatever reason now perhaps we are not so concerned. I do not know why. I am still concerned. In any event, Canadianization was one of the driving reasons. Canadianization is still a policy of this government. The energy minister stated very clearly, very honestly at committee that it was.

• (1200)

If we look at the foreign ownership provision contained in this bill, and there is one, it says that non–Canadians can own up to 25 per cent. It does not say they will own 25 per cent. It says that they can own up to 25 per cent. It is simply logical for me to submit to the House that the Canadianization policy thrust of this government has now just been reduced with reference to Petro–Canada by 25 per cent, potentially. Let us take off a mark in this government's pursuit of its Canadianization policy. It has one strike against it there.

There is a relationship between that provision and the free trade agreement. When this government negotiated the free trade agreement it secured a concession that permitted this government to sell a Canadian enterprise or Crown corporation and to maintain the Canadian ownership. It went to the length of securing that in its negotiation of the free trade agreement. The provision says that once we do privatize—and I am paraphrasing—whatever level of foreign ownership is put in place at that time is the lowest threshold that we can ever impose.

Therefore, hypothetically, if there is a change of heart in relation to this legislation a year or two or three from now, under the free trade agreement, if we stay true to the agreement and if it is fully implemented, we will never be able to require Canadian ownership of greater than 75 per cent. Once we cross this bridge it is finished. We cannot go back. I wanted to bring that to the attention of the House.

We also dealt with the prospect of a piece of Petro–Canada, which under the current provisions could not be greater than 10 per cent, being purchased by a foreign state. I thought it would have been fairly obvious to members in the House and in committee that we would not want a foreign state to own a piece of what was our national oil company. I guess it was too complex to deal with that because the amendments proposed to preclude a foreign state or agency from owning a piece of Petro–Canada were not passed.

We can only hope that we will not as a Parliament have to deal with an issue in the future—and it will be a public issue; it will be a headline in the newspaper—where a foreign government or agency of that government or a state oil company of another government purchases a piece of Petro–Canada because it thinks it has a good

marketing opportunity or a good outlet for its oil. I am talking about one of the mid-east oil companies, Venezuela, or our friends in Mexico. Maybe Canadians will not mind. I just feel we should have addressed that in this bill, and we did not.

Dealing with the area of strategic assets, when Petro-Canada is gone we will have sold a vehicle, a tool or a piece of machinery that should have permitted us to address petrochemical energy supply problems in this country. Petro-Canada is a company that has facilities from the east coast to the west coast.

I believe that the legislation should have permitted us to prevent Petro-Canada from selling or disposing of an asset that our government believed was strategic in purpose and objective, at least for as long as the government held shares in Petro-Canada. This would include the disposition, sale, liquidation, bankruptcy, dismantling of means of distribution of petrochemical supply or a refinery or a pipeline, any asset.

I agree that would be a burden on the shareholders of Petro-Canada, but it must be remembered, and the people who buy these shares have to remember where Petro-Canada came from. In that period of transition, from the sale of the first share to the sale of the last share, they know that we in government and they with their private investment have one foot on the dock and one foot on the boat. They know that now, because we are not selling Petro-Canada all at once. We are doing it in segments and tranches over a period that might run up to ten years. We do not know.

In any event, our ability to address the need for retaining strategic assets is not in the bill.

I agree we have had a healthy discussion on official languages. I agree with the minister. In my view and in the view of most of my colleagues, the provisions in the bill dealing with our official languages, French and English, within the Petro-Canada enterprise are not adequately dealt with. The bill provides that Petro-Canada would be the arbiter of how it will dispense its goods and services in both languages. It will decide.

That criteria, that mechanism that is contained in the articles of incorporation and I am a little confused as to how an individual in Canada who is not a shareholder of Petro-Canada, just a consumer, the guy with the chain saw that I referred to earlier, can deal with the issue of official languages in Petro-Canada.

It is no good to say that this is a private corporation, let them do whatever they want. The government has already seen the need to address official languages in the act. It is in the act. I say if you are going to address it, do it right. Do it comprehensively. The recommendations of the Official Languages Commissioner, Mr. Fortier, were rejected.

There was some discussion of another provision dealing with accounting and the Auditor General and it had reasonable debate in committee and in the House. But I am of the view, given the difficulties the Auditor General has had and obstacles he has encountered in obtaining the true financial information regarding the acquisition of Petro-Canada, those obstacles will still be there when he, as part of his responsibilities, pursues, investigates or monitors this particular series of sale transactions. Do not even suggest to me that he will not want to do so. This is the largest privatization, divestiture in Canadian history. Our Auditor General is going to be right there watching it.

The Minister of State for Privatization has told the House that the Auditor General and all of us will have access to the prospectus filed with the various securities commissions around the country. That is true, but the Auditor General is not concerned with the prospectus. The Auditor General will be curious about the movement of the money from the underwriters through to the government and what happens to it after that. I am very sure that if cabinet discussions involving the accounting for those moneys takes place, our Auditor General will not have access because of cabinet confidentiality rules. That is not true. I am speculating, but I have seen problems that the Auditor General has had before. I have no reason to believe that it will be different in the future.

• (1210)

I am not suggesting the government will intentionally try to cover up anything. I am simply saying that our Auditor General needs access, and there were amendments proposed to provide that access subject to commercial confidentiality necessary to protect Petro-Canada.

As the words of the song go, "You don't know what you've got till it's gone". As sure as I am standing here, this issue will come back to haunt us later, after it has gone. This is, practically speaking, an irreversible step.

I noted just a few days ago an article in *The Globe and Mail* dealing with the shutdown of the pipeline from southern Ontario to Montreal. It said that there was a plan to shut down this pipeline which carries, I understand, conventional light crude in 1991. That is about two weeks away. I suggest that is a very significant matter because, as the headline says, Quebec would depend totally on imported oil after the closing of that pipeline. Petro-Canada does not have anything to do with this particular pipeline. I am not suggesting it does.

However, we have a decision being made in relation to a pipeline which may mean after its shutdown Montreal would be cut off from Canadian sourced crude. The government has yet to express an opinion on it, but I believe that means of delivery of crude is important to Montreal just as Petro-Canada's role in delivering energy supplies in various parts of the country is important to Canadians.

Once it is gone it is gone. Once Petro-Canada decides it wants out of the refining business in a particular location, once the refinery is gone, it goes into the hands of individuals who may shut it down, mothball it, or use it for something else that may not be consistent with our national interest as seen by the National Energy Board.

The government says it has mechanisms in place to deal with energy issues of national importance. I am waiting to see what this institution, or series of institutions such as the National Petroleum Monitoring Agency can do if they can do anything. Are they toothless wonders? I shudder to think that they are simply sham institutions set up to show Canadians that we have this pretence of action. I do not know, but I am skeptical.

The issue of the financing of Petro-Canada came up. Were there any alternatives to going to the private sector? We all know that there were, but Petro-Canada executives were of the view expressed publicly that the private sector, the marketplace for common share security, was where they felt they had to go now and in the future.

They are not the only sources of capital. For equity capital, yes, we have to sell the shares, but we have other institutions in this country that finance themselves otherwise. The two most obvious examples were the monopoly electrical utilities in Quebec and in Ontario. As is already in the record of the debates, these utilities have debts in the $20 billion range.

On the same day as the pipeline issue was in *The Globe and Mail* there was an article about Ontario Hydro and its financing needs. It did not have a problem going back to the market. Petro-Canada in the first crunch wants about $750 million. Ontario Hydro in 1991 is going to raise $4 billion. Its bonds were very hot, snapped up in the marketplace. In fact, I think it was able to reduce the interest rate a little bit. They were snapped up, $1.25 billion. I think it took a few days or a week but the issues were all snapped up.

I know that Petro-Canada would prefer to have equity capital because it is cheaper. The dividend pay-out might be in the vicinity of 4 or 5 per cent when dividends are payable, whereas debt capital costs in the vicinity of, in the case of the Ontario Hydro rate, 10.25 per cent. In any event, the other financing options included preferred shares, special shares with a guaranteed rate of return plus participation. They could have been sold to the private sector and the control over Petro-Canada as a state oil company could have been maintained. In any event, we are trying to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. We cannot do it.

Just a few moments ago the minister indicated, with reference to a quote of the Hon. Marc Lalonde, that Petro-Canada was never intended to control prices. That is true. No one on this side of the House ever suggested Petro-Canada's role was to control prices. Why does he suggest that that was the case? No one suggested that Petro-Canada was a monopoly and would control prices. It is a player, it is a participant in an oligopolistic petrochemical industry so that we know automatically that Petro-Canada has an influence on price. It does not control price and no one ever said it did. No one ever said it should. It was our window on the price setting mechanism. It was not control. It is unfair of the minister to suggest that that was the intention. He is putting words, intentions, he is attributing these things to the opposition when that just is not true.

Yesterday in debate at report stage, the minister and other members suggested that the birth of Petro–Canada came about because it was ideologically driven. There is some ideology lying behind all of us in this House. We are not stupid. It is not as if we do not have any ideas. Of course, there was some ideology behind Petro–Canada. What did I hear in this House from the opposite side? I heard the minister a few moments ago admitting that there was conservatism, if I can use the term—he used it, small *c* conservatism—lying behind the drive to privatize. Therefore, the privatization of Petro–Canada is just as ideologically driven as was the move that gave birth to it, if it even was. I am not sure that it was ideology which gave birth to Petro–Canada.

[*Translation*]

Since the 1984 federal election, the Conservative government has tried to whitewash its actions by using all kinds of euphemisms like divestiture, dismantling, privatization and public participation. And the debate on this bill is no exception.

• (1220)

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that although the Conservatives may try to disguise their privatizations, Canadians like me know perfectly well this is about killing Canadian initiatives that have served Canadian interests well. Openness and integrity are definitely not part of this government's character.

Mr. Speaker, the Mulroney government must take the responsibility for killing Canadian initiatives in the energy sector.

This bill to privatize or divest Petro–Canada makes no sense at all, especially at a time when we are facing a critical energy situation and when a full–blown energy crisis could flare up in the Middle East. This is not the right time to consider selling a fundamental instrument of our energy sector. If the government succeeds in privatizing Petro–Canada, we will lose our window on the industry, an industry now controlled by foreign interests. This means that Canadians will have no presence that will protect and defend our interests in this crucial activity sector.

The big oil multinationals will now be able to call the shots. I fail to see why this government has tried to rush through this legislation. Bill C–84 was introduced on October 1, and after only a few days of debate, the process is now almost finished. I think there are some serious contradictions between this government's policies.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, Bill C–80 concerning firearms was introduced in June, and today, this bill is nowhere near coming into force.

I tried to discuss this in the legislative committee as well as in the House when I introduced some amendments, but unfortunately, my motions and those of my colleagues were voted down.

Paragraph 9(1)(e) describes the provisions requiring Petro–Canada to ensure that any member of the public can communicate with its head office and obtain available services in either official language, where Petro–Canada determines there is significant demand. The problem is that it is up to them to determine whether there is significant demand or not.

There is no provision for the eventuality that Petro–Canada ignores the provisions in its articles concerning official languages. These provisions, which relate to certain aspects of services in official languages, appear only in the articles, which practically no Canadian will ever see.

And even if a Canadian citizen were acquainted with these provisions and felt that they were not being observed, I wonder whether this Canadian citizen would have any way of making Petro–Canada respect these provisions. The people to whom these articles apply are the corporation's agents. Other Canadians will have no recourse.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this government's privatization policy is more important than respecting Canada's two official languages and the rights of Canadians in this respect. This was clearly demonstrated by a refusal to consider suggestions made both by the Commissioner of Official Languages and myself and my colleagues, concerning respect for official languages rights.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, we do not run Canada for a profit. In fact, we do not run it, but Canadians do not run it for a profit either. Our job is simply to make this country work, to make it live, to give it direction, to give it purpose. That is our job in the House of Commons and that is the job of every Canadian who holds a position of leadership in his or her community.

The step this government is taking in the privatization of Petro–Canada is one of a chain of privatization initiatives and it is one which we believe is irreversible. What Canadians want is a government which cares and feels for Canadians in every region of this country, not just in the urban centres; a government that knows what is necessary in all of the regions to create a country that has a healthy economy and a purpose.

We on this side of the House want to participate in achieving that goal. We believe that the government—

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** On a point of order, the hon. member for Nickel Belt.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Mr. Speaker, I do not see a quorum in the House at the moment.

*And the count having been taken:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** There is a quorum. Debate. The hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River.

**Mr. Lee:** Mr. Speaker, I regret the intervention by the hon. member, just as I was reaching the pinnacle of my remarks, the conclusion of my scintillating remarks. As a result, I will resist the temptation to go back to the beginning of the conclusion.

This debate should crystallize the views of Canadians with respect to the continuing policy of this government in divesting, getting out, selling out, privatizing public participation, whatever is meant by that.

• (1230 )

I also cannot abandon this portion of my remarks without noting that the government felt it necessary to introduce and use time allocation at each stage of the bill. The government says—and if I am wrong I am sure government members will correct me—that the reason it had to be done was to catch the marketplace in the spring. That may be true. The government may have wanted to, but I do not think Canadians wanted the government to catch any marketplace. It is regrettable that the debate did not permit many members to address, not just the privatization, but the long sequence of privatizations and the effect they are having on the institution of government in the country and the perception of Canadians that the government is leading in a precise direction that will provide prosperity and unity to all of the country. I urge all members in the House to vote against this bill at third reading.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt):** Mr. Speaker, the Tory minister of state for ideology earlier said that Petro–Canada did not serve any public purpose. Well, this Conservative government does not serve any public purpose at this moment. I only wish that it would go, and go quickly.

In debating this bill at third reading, I have to go back and think about the way it was in 1972–73, in the early seventies, when there was what was called an energy crisis, brought on by the Arab embargo. At that time, there was no Petro–Canada and those who owned the oil industry in the country were predominantly foreign. Ninety per cent of the energy sector of this economy was foreign–owned. In fact, it had all the answers. It had its books and it kept its books close to its chest.

In Canada, we were faced with the problem of the National Energy Board not knowing what the inventories of energy were in the country. The government had no ability to go into the books of the private oil companies to examine what was going on. The oil companies were giving erroneous figures to the government. They were skittish. They would not put any investment into exploration.

At that time, Canadians and the government were concerned about what was called energy self–sufficiency. In fact, the common phrase used was: "Let the eastern so–and–sos freeze in the dark", and it became the language of bumper stickers. We all recall that.

I would say that, at that time, ideology had little to do with the establishment of a national oil company. Petro–Canada was formed at that time, I would say, not so much from ideology, but more from the economics of the situation at the time.

There was a desire on the part of the government of the day, which was a Liberal minority government supported by the NDP, to establish a national oil company and Petro–Canada was formed. If I recall, the Conservatives fought that every inch of the way. They went to the wall opposing it. The man who became Prime Minister shortly after it was formed, the hon. member who is now the Secretary of State for External Affairs, called it a white elephant at the time, if I recall correctly. In fact, he went down to defeat in 1979. He went down to

defeat because he attempted at that time to privatize Petro–Canada. That was one of the causes of his defeat.

Petro–Canada was established and it became an integrated oil company from well–head to gas pump. Canadians began to identify with their oil company. We know that Canadians spent in 1990 some $6.8 billion to build up Petro–Canada.

We have to ask ourselves why we established Petro–Canada? First, we wanted to have a window on the industry. That was the phrase at the time, a window on the industry. We Canadians and the Government of Canada had to have the information. It had to know what was going on in that sector because if any government was to plan economically, it had to have that important information because energy is at the very basis of economic activity.

Second, we wanted to have a leverage point in the energy sector because 90 per cent of that sector was foreign–owned. Petro–Canada was an attempt to start putting Canadians on the scene of ownership in the energy sector.

A third reason was to discipline other oil companies, not to set the price, but to prevent Canadians from being gouged in times of what were called energy crises. In fact, today I suggest that if Petro–Canada was not in the field, the gouging would be even greater than it is right now.

A fourth reason that has become even more apparent today, given that total PR job of a so–called green paper, is a public policy purpose.

Petro–Canada had four reasons and I have to ask myself if those reasons are still valid today in 1990. Do we still need to have a window on the energy sector? Do we still need to have a leverage point in the energy sector? Do we still need to be concerned about disciplining the other oil companies, and do we need to make that a public policy instrument? Yes, now more than ever Petro–Canada justifies its existence as a publicly–owned corporation.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** What the Conservatives are following is an ideological position. They are ideologically driven. Petro–Canada has become a symbol. What the government is attempting to do to Petro–Canada, if it succeeds with the vote today to dismantle Petro–Canada, is to send a signal to the world that Canada no longer has a government that is a guardian of our national heritage.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**An hon. member:** They applaud that.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** They applaud it. I noticed Tory back–benchers applauding that.

**An hon. member:** Shame!

**Mr. Rodriguez:** The message is clear. By getting rid of Petro–Canada, we consume our children's inheritance. We are destroying a symbol of national pride. That is what they are doing.

Second, there is this window on the industry. A considerable amount of knowledge has been gained by the government through its oil company about how that sector works. It has given the government an expertise which it never had before, an expertise that is important and information that is important for any government concerned about planning the economy of the country. Petro–Canada is certainly not a corporate welfare bum. It pays its way.

• (1240)

The other question is the leverage. Selling off Petro–Canada starts moving foreign ownership in the energy sector back up. It will go up to 60 per cent if the government is successful in selling off Petro–Canada.

As for disciplining other oil companies, in my view Petro–Canada has certainly minimized the greed of the oil companies. Every time there is a crisis they move in very quickly and take advantage of the roller–coaster prices and get the benefit of windfall profits. Wait until the books are reported for this year. We will see massive windfall profits that will make the banks look like a kindergarten in the way of profits. Petro–Canada is a brake on those oil companies who are out to gouge Canadians. There is no doubt in my mind.

Then, there is the public policy purpose. If ever there is a time for a national oil company to serve a public policy purpose, now is the time. The government is bereft of any kind of practical, specific environmental strategy. The green plan is simply a public relations exercise.

Petro–Canada can be used in a very practical and specific way with respect to the environment. One, we have suggested that we can use Petro–Canada stations to recycle ozone–depleting CFCs from automobile air–conditioners. Petro–Canada can do that by setting up reclamation centres at its stations. It can recycle used engine oil. It can promote alternative energy resources, for example fuel ethanol from grain. It will give the grain farmers a more solid income base and, of course, there is employment to be gained in that activity. Petro–Canada could be promoting research and development, and commercialization of alternative energy sources, such as solar and wind power.

In other words, Petro–Canada becomes an active participant. It becomes an activist. It plays an activist role in researching and developing these alternate approaches to energy.

Surely, the whole idea is not to keep on consuming non–renewable fossil fuels. Surely, the role of a national energy company, owned by the taxpayers of Canada and built up with their investments, is a legitimate public policy purpose for a national oil company. I believe that that is what Canadians want their oil company to do, not to be so–called sold off after having written down the book value of its assets.

Imagine this. My colleague here knows all about these things. He is a tax lawyer. If I came to him for advice, what would he tell me if I said: "Here, I own this oil company. Energy prices are going up through the ceiling and we are into an energy crisis. Is this the time that I should write down the value of my oil assets?"

**An hon. member:** It is shameful.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** He says it is shameful. Of course, it is shameful.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine not even in any tidy bookkeeping way of getting maximum money? You do not write down the value of your assets when you are holding an asset that is in demand at this point in time. The government is doing that. It wrote it down to $1.8 billion.

I will deal with these Tories in a minute. I will deal with them.

There is another reason for keeping Petro–Canada in public hands. That is because all the profits made by Petro–Canada stay in Canada.

In the 1980s the private oil companies transferred $7 billion of their profits out of this country, $7 billion. The taxpayers of this country spent $6.8 billion in 1990 building this company and the government is prepared to sell it all off. You know something, the taxpayers will not get one penny of that. Not one penny of that will come back into their pockets. All the previous exercises in ideological sell–offs and privatizations have not resulted in one penny coming back into the coffers of Canada because they gave it all back to the companies that were just sold off. We will never see one penny. We are going to sell off our birthright and we are not going to get one penny back.

The next question is a logical one. Why does the NDP oppose this, and is there still a purpose for Petro–Canada? That is the first question.

The next question is an even more important one. Why would the Tories sell off Petro–Canada? Why would they do that? That is the question. Why would they? I suggest to this House and to Canadians watching that the Tories are selling it off because they are locked into an ideology, and that ideology is a corporate agenda. It seems to me that that is what they are doing. Let us face it. Who brought these people into government? Who brought them? Their corporate friends, their big greedy corporate friends. They brought them in here.

Imagine. I want you to imagine it. Here are the Tories after they came to power in 1984 having a banquet, and who do they invite to sit at the table, to draw up at the table? First of all they have their big banker friends. They have the tables near to the head table. Then they have their investment dealers. They are sitting at the table. Then they have their corporate lawyers. They are sitting at the table. They have their chartered accountants. They are sitting at the table. They have the BCNI, the Business Council on National Issues. They are sitting at the table. Their lobbyist friends, the Frank Moores of this world, are sitting at the table. They are eating; they are getting a meal. They are gorging themselves on this meal that is Canada. First, Air Canada—

**An hon. member:** Is this from the trough?

**Mr. Rodriguez:** From the trough. The trough is put on the table—first Air Canada, then de Havilland, Petro-Canada. They put them on the table and they say "more!" They have no shame. Their gluttony has no shame. But we all know that gluttony kills more than the sword, brothers and sisters, so repent before you end up in the fires of eternal damnation.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** See, their consciences do not even bother them. They are not even repentant. What do the people of Canada get at this big table? They get GST crumbs, that is what they get. The crumbs. And even on the crumbs there is a GST.

I see you are giving me the fingers, Mr. Speaker. That is all right. I like to see two. It is when I see one that I worry.

What does the government say? It says Petro-Canada needs cash.

• (1250)

From all that we can discover, the long term debt equity ratio is quite within the acceptable limits for this sector. If Petro-Canada needs money, it can go out and borrow, like other companies do.

This government reduced the book value $1.8 billion. Now, who is going to sell the first tranche of shares? R.B.C. Dominion Securities; it contributed $80,000 to the Tories in the last election. Burns Fry is going to sell them; it contributed $56,919. Gordon Capital, Wood Gundy contributed $68,000. That is a total of $218,000 contributed to the Conservative Party. I guess you have to dance with the ones who brung you.

What do they get for that? They get $37.5 million commissions on the first tranche; a total of $200 million for selling all of Petro-Canada. What do the people of Canada get? Zip-all. Zip-all. I therefore move:

> That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" and substituting the following therefor:
>
> Bill C-84, an act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada, be not now read a third time but be referred back to the legislative committee for the purpose of reconsidering clause 9 and for the purpose of adding a new clause which would specify that the bill would come into force on a date five years after its adoption.

Having said that, I hope it carries because this bill should not be passed.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The Chair will consider the motion to amend put forward by the hon. member for Nickel Belt. We now proceed to the 10-minute question and comment period.

[*English*]

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleague for his excellent and entertaining discourse this morning. He expressed to us that the tranche is in the trough and that the government is feeding us crumbs. I do not want to say that his speech was crummy because it was not. It was an excellent speech.

I want to ask our colleague for Nickel Belt about the intentions of the government in this privatization scheme. In the unlikely event that the government is so ill advised that it will not consider the thoughtful amendments of our colleague—and there is always the possibility of that unlikely event. His speech was so excellent that most of us will be moved by it, but nevertheless the proposition still remains that some Tories might not be swayed.

As unlikely as that proposition may be, I want to ask our colleague if he would agree with me that at the very least those charged with the disposition of the share offering should, through some mechanism, compete in order to get that business. This would ensure some fairness and the best possible deal for the taxpayers of Canada.

I say this not because I happen to like the idea of the government privatizing a Crown corporation. But in the event that this government will not understand the right thing to do, will the hon. member agree that the government should ensure that fairness is put in the system so that we do not give the appearance that some might be rewarded just because they happen to be friends of the government?

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his very good question. I think it is an excellent suggestion. Sums of this size, and given what I have pointed out—I am not a cynical person so I would not suggest that there was a connection between those huge contributions made to the Conservative Party and the fact that they end up with this bonanza and they get all this largesse in their lap.

In a recent article, Lévesque–Beaubien, which is the investment bureau arm of the National Bank in Quebec, complained that it did not get a piece of the action. A guy phones me up. I say: "Look, brother, you did not contribute to those guys, so he is not going to dance with you because you did not bring him". I guess they are going to be wallflowers at this dance. They are not going to be asked to dance. But I think it is an excellent suggestion that whenever these moneys are being paid to agents to do work for the government it should be done on the basis that there should be an open tender and they should bid.

I do not think it should be left up to the government to choose its corporate friends to massage them with millions of dollars. We are not talking about a few hundred dollars, we are talking about a total, when the whole tranche is complete, of $200 million. The whole of Air Canada was sold and the commission was even less than the $37 million on the first tranche of this operation.

So we are not talking about peanuts here and there. It must not only be seen to be fairness in the public business, there must be actual fairness in public business. I think that is very important to keep in mind.

So I thank the hon. member and I agree with the suggestion. I think it is an excellent one.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Questions or comments? Resuming debate. The hon. member for Surrey—White Rock—South Langley.

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in being able to speak to this particular motion and to respond somewhat to what my friend from Nickel Belt had to say.

He made quite an exercise of rewriting history. I mean, talk about a revisionist, he really did characterize it all the way. He says Petro–Canada was formed because of the embargo of 1972–73. I think we have to go back a little further than that. We have to go back to the election of 1972 and Mr. Trudeau's campaign when the slogan was "The land is strong". That campaign slogan got him a minority government and Mr. David Lewis—Oh, do not leave now, come on, you have to get the correct version of history. Come on, John, stay here.

Then came the New Democratic Party rump over there which thought it had the balance of power. In fact, it probably did because Mr. David Lewis was negotiating with Mr. Trudeau on how the government agenda should develop during that minority government. So Mr. Trudeau naturally wanted his close friends and soul brothers the socialists to work together with him on the government agenda. He met with Mr. David Lewis, that successful labour lawyer from Toronto, all those run down at the heels people in the socialist party. Mr. Lewis is one who did quite well.

He made a deal with Mr. Trudeau and said, "We will co–operate with you but the price is going to be pretty steep. You will have to enact some of our agenda and our agenda is to have a Crown corporation known as Petro–Canada, the window on the industry". It really had little to do with the oil embargo. It had more to do with a few needs that the Liberal government had at the time. Talk about a dependency, we were not so much dependent on the Arabs at that time as Trudeau was of the socialists at the time. That is where the dependency was. It was not an oil dependency, but a political dependency at that time. So, Petro–Canada was born.

My friend says that Petro–Canada pays its way. What a way to pay your way. Does he remember the Canadian ownership tax that the government imposed on the Canadian people? Now there was a cool $1.65 billion handed over to Petro–Canada. Now would not another company in Canada love to have a gift of $1.5 billion just to start out, a little bit of petty cash to start out with. That is the way Petro–Canada pays its way.

Now, he talks about leverage in the sector. We saw the leverage when we had the National Energy Program with 25 per cent back–in provisions. When a company could confiscate the resources of any other company, that is what you call leverage. It had leverage imposed on it by Mr. Trudeau's government. We do not need that kind of leverage in a marketplace.

So my friend has revised history a little bit.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please.

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

## AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

# STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 31

[*English*]

## ATLANTIC CANADA

**Mrs. Coline Campbell (South West Nova):** Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, Atlantic Defence Industries Ltd. in Bridgetown, Nova Scotia closed, with the loss of 200 jobs. That combined with the 300 jobs which will be lost when Dominion Textiles closes its plant in Yarmouth, an area that has had a textile plant for over 100 years, shows that something is seriously wrong with the way in which this government funds regional economic projects. Both companies were major recipients of government funding yet were unable to survive.

I call on the minister responsible for ACOA to study the factors that make it difficult for Atlantic companies to compete against central Canadian and American companies. The agency should start by asking these fundamental questions. Why are capital investment costs lower in Ontario and Quebec than in the maritimes? How can these costs be made equal in a way that does not violate the free trade agreement?

We must have programs that will allow our region to retain and expand its share of economic growth in Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MGR. ALBERTUS MARTIN

**Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond):** Mr. Speaker, the people of the riding of Drummond were saddened by the news of the death of Mgr. Albertus Martin, who passed away last Sunday. He had been the spiritual leader of the diocese of Nicolet for nearly 40 years.

A highly cultivated and intelligent man, with the class of the most prominent clergymen, Mgr. Albertus Martin compelled recognition at all levels because of his exceptional personality and his humanist approach to the basic problems of this century.



Be it with his flock in his diocese or sitting on Vatican II in Rome, he relentlessly devoted all of his energy and his remarkable scholarship to propagating the Catholic faith. He was renowned not only as a pastor with avant-garde ideas, but also as a great builder and an informed manager.

His death leaves a great empty space, but also the memory of a full life devoted to the advancement and edification of a Church more accessible to the people, a Church in tune with its members and their aspirations for surpassing themselves.

Monsignor Martin, you will not be forgotten!

* * *

[*English*]

## POVERTY

**Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing):** Mr. Speaker, today the Canadian Association of Food Banks released preliminary figures from its 1990 HungerCount showing that half a million Canadians rely on food banks each month, up 30 per cent from last year.

These figures should be especially distressing because this government continues to follow the same policies it has in the past. We can expect another large increase in the HungerCount next year.

What will happen when UI runs out early for thousands of people, thanks to Bill C-21? What will happen when Bill C-69 squeezes money for vital social programs? What will happen to thousands of low income Canadians when the inflationary effect of the GST is felt?

The answer to these questions is that more and more Canadians will sink deeper below the poverty line and more will be forced to rely on food banks to feed themselves and their children.

I urge this government to rethink and reverse these totally unacceptable policies which are forcing low and middle income Canadians deeper into the mire of poverty.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton):** Mr. Speaker, the decision to cut 18 positions and several programs at the

CBC in Moncton will hit at the very heart of the Acadian community in my riding. The cancelled shows are *Télé–Débat*, *Spec–Art*, *La Revue* and *Bulletin de Nouvelles Dimanche Midi.*

[*English*]

The minister has stated that regional programming would be strengthened by the cuts. In fact CBC cannot maintain minimal levels of programming. Radio–Canada from Moncton services the entire Atlantic region. At a time in our country's history when so many Canadians feel disenfranchised, we can ill afford these cuts.

Acadians need to maintain strong cultural and linguistic links. The dollars saved compare little to the cost of maintaining this heritage.

CBC links our region into the wider information network of Canada. The minister must restore the necessary funding to ensure that minimal regional programming is available.

* * *

## HOUSING

**Mr. Felix Holtmann (Portage—Interlake):** Mr. Speaker, as Christmas approaches, I ask members of this House to remember a family in Edmonton who are living in a substandard house. Let us just call this family the Smiths.

The Smith family is large, needs a five–bedroom home, but cannot find an affordable one, so it rents a draughty nine–year old house with no hot water.

The affordable government subsidized house that would be available is occupied. It is occupied by the New Democratic member of Parliament from Edmonton East. This New Democratic member lives in a five–bedroom government assisted home and pays only $622 per month. His salary is five times that of the Smith family.

This is outrageous. It is scandalous. The New Democratic member for Edmonton East should hang his head in shame.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is one thing to put forth facts. It is another thing to use language which becomes a personal attack on hon. members during the 60–second statement. I would ask hon. members to restrain themselves from that temptation.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**M. Guy Saint–Julien (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, the residents of Lac Malartic, in Abitibi, told me they were bothered by the flashing lights on the CBC transmission tower for Channel 6 in Lac Malartic. Permanent and summer residents whose homes are located near the tower feel that the intensity of the stroboscopic flash is exagerated, considering the amount of air traffic in the region, and that it is a source of visual pollution.

Mr. Speaker, I know the people at the CBC are making the necessary checks to deal with the problem and satisfy local residents.

* * *

## ASBESTOS FIBRES

**Mr. Yvon Côté (Richmond—Wolfe):** Mr. Speaker, some opposition members stake their reputation on the fact they have always defended the interests of workers and unions. Recently, they claimed that the presence of asbestos fibres in certain federal buildings in Ottawa was endangering their health at work, and that it might adversely affect certain workers engaged in renovating the buildings.

A team of researchers from several countries, whose findings were published by Harvard University in 1989, does not agree, and I quote: "Average levels of airborne fibres inside buildings where material containing asbestos is found are extremely low, and the health risk as a result of the presence of asbestos in the buildings is minute, both in absolute and relative terms".

That being said, Mr. Speaker, I urge all opposition members who are campaigning against asbestos to look at the scientific evidence that shows that asbestos is not harmful to one's health

* * *

## LEADER OF LIBERAL PARTY

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Quebec City, after the submission by the Leader of the Liberal Party, the Hon. Jean Chrétien, the

federalist option regained lost ground. While the Prime Minister prefers to sit on the sidelines in these debates on the Constitution and national unity, the Leader of the Liberal Party leaps into the fray.

All Canadians saw yesterday that the man who will lead the fight to safeguard and unite our country and defend the rights of all citizens is none other than Mr. Chrétien. Mr. Chrétien roused his audience by calmly analysing the economic, social, cultural and political realities facing our country, including Quebec.

The Liberal Party knows very well that unprecedented changes are about to took place in this young country of ours, and we intend to meet these challenges.

Jean Chrétien wants these reforms to ensure we will have a united Canada, based on co-operation, friendship and pride.

* * *

[*English*]

## BILL C-43

**Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind the House, and especially the Minister of Justice, that the end of the GST debate means a new beginning for the fight against criminalization of abortion.

With Bill C-43 about to resurface on Parliament's agenda, the Minister of Justice should consider this. A new survey released by the Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists suggests that her attempts to build credibility with Canadian doctors have failed and have failed badly. Even after the minister's 10-page letter to them trying to alleviate their fears, more physicians than ever—almost half the number now performing abortions—say they will stop that service if it is criminalized by this government.

I therefore call on the Minister of Justice to reaffirm, to restate, to repeat her promise of two months ago not to proclaim Bill C-43 as law until Canadian doctors, in her own words, "feel comfortable with it". Right now they do not.

* * *

## CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Peter L. McCreath (South Shore):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the CBC president and board for recognizing that we live in times of restraint and that we have to cut the cloth according to the pattern.

• (1410 )

However, I do take issue with certain choices they made in making their cuts. In particular, I urge them to reconsider their decision to cut the unique regional program *Land and Sea*. No other program more effectively shows the economic and social life of Atlantic Canada.

CBC President Veilleux, in announcing these cuts, said that the CBC would move away from local broadcasting and concentrate on regional and national programs. This makes sense to me. However, surely cutting a program like *Land and Sea* goes against this guideline.

As for local station cuts, why start with smaller stations in communities with no alternative service? Surely more money would be saved and the objective of leaving local service to the private sector more effectively served by leaving stations in places like Sydney, Corner Brook or Windsor to the last and by cutting first stations in places like Toronto, Montreal or Vancouver where alternative local stations exist.

* * *

[*Translation*]

## LEADER OF LIBERAL PARTY

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell):** Mr. Speaker, fortified by his integrity and his passion for Canada, the hon. Jean Chrétien appeared before the Bélanger-Campeau Commission to talk about the political and economic reality of a sovereign Quebec. Liberals from coast to coast are proud to see a sincere federalist defend the interests of all Canadians, including those who live in Quebec.

[*English*]

Our leader, the hon. Jean Chrétien, spoke openly and honestly about our history and that of our constitutional accommodations to come. He spoke eloquently of our country, for the well-being of the people matters more than the ambitions of a few.

On behalf of all Liberals, I congratulate and I thank the hon. Jean Chrétien for his courage, his conviction, and his leadership.

[*Translation*]

Canada needs leadership, eloquence and integrity. In other words, Canada needs Jean Chrétien.

*S. O. 31*

## PROJECT HAVEN

**Mrs. Nicole Roy-Arcelin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works):** Mr. Speaker, family violence is a social problem and a serious crime. The federal government has a key role to play in the fight against this plague. Housing is a precious tool in such situations, for it can be a shelter for women and children. This is the kind of assistance offered by the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation through "Project Haven".

To help the 25,000 women and children who are mistreated every year, $22.2 million have been set aside to provide 500 housing units. These funds are available to private non-profit groups and Indian bands seeking to create shelter homes by erecting, renovating or transforming existing buildings.

Mr. Speaker, 178 housing units have been promised. I urge all provinces, municipalities and communities to support this measure. The federal government has done more than its share to assist the victims of family violence and will maintain this policy.

* * *

## LEADER OF LIBERAL PARTY

**Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil):** In the debate over Quebec's sovereignty, many individuals are trying to frighten Quebecers. Mr. Chrétien is one of them. He wrongly maintains that a sovereign Quebec would be in a bad position. He maintains that in a soveriegn province Quebecers will have to cope with their share of the national debt.

Does he mean to say that Quebecers are not now affected by the federal debt? Do they live at the expense of the rest of Canada? I suggest that Jean Chrétien has missed the point altogether. Quebecers already shoulder their heavy share of the deficit and the huge debt. It is precisely because they have no control over mismanagement and waste that they want to be sovereign.

* * *

## TRAWLER *BOUT DE LIGNE*

**Mr. Charles-Eugène Marin (Gaspé):** Again, Mr. Speaker, the residents of the Gaspe area have been saddened by the loss of three young men. The fishing boat *Bout de ligne* with three people on board, Normand O'Connor and Gino Cotton of Rivière-au-Renard and Roger Reeve of Anse-au-Griffon, made its last radio contact at 1 p.m. on Thursday, December 13. In spite of the valiant efforts of the Coast Guard, the Department of National Defence and a number of commercial fishing vessels we are still without news from our Gaspesian friends who disappeared with their boat.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members of the House will join me in expressing our heart-felt condolences to the relatives of the victims.

* * *

[*English*]

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, we all know that Allan MacEachen is a wily political strategist who gave the impression that he and his Liberal senators and the Liberal caucus were against the goods and services tax. But was he really?

Did he defeat the GST when leave was sought in the Senate to introduce the goods and services legislation? No, he did not. Did he defeat the goods and services tax legislation when it was read a first time? No, he did not, in spite of the fact that the Liberals had a majority in the Senate. Did Allan MacEachen and his majority Liberal colleagues defeat the GST at the second reading stage when the principle of the bill was dealt with? No, they did not. Did Allan MacEachen and his Senate colleagues defeat the goods and services tax when it was in committee for April, May, June, July, August, September and October? No, they did not.

In other words, on numerous occasions the Liberals in the Senate had a majority to defeat the GST but they chose not to. The hon. member for Hamilton East, on April 2 in Winnipeg, said about Mr. Chrétien that perhaps he was implicitly supporting the GST. I suspect she was dead on.

* * *

## LATVIA

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax):** Mr. Speaker, as the Christmas season approaches and our thoughts in this Chamber return to our homes and our families, we

cannot cease to be aware that murderous tensions exist in our world even as we look upon the season of peace.

In the Baltic states things have worsened considerably in the past few weeks. Nine bombs have exploded in Latvia over the last two weeks, three bombs yesterday alone in Riga, at the Prime Minister's office, the Red Army office and at Communist Party headquarters. Latvian Canadians believe that this is a set-up. They believe it is being done to justify future strong arm tactics by the Soviets.

There has been a request by the Latvian Vice President, Andreas Krastins, for the world to recognize that Latvians are not responsible.

Canada must be a voice for restraint and for peace in Latvia.

---

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

### THE ECONOMY

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister.

Today the federal government's own Superintendent of Bankruptcy reported that more than 6,000 individual Canadians and businesses declared bankruptcy in November, an increase of 59 per cent compared to the same period last year, startling evidence of the serious nature of the recession created by this government.

Why is this government waiting for this recession to get worse and worse? Why will this government not bring in new economic policies right now before another 6,000 Canadians are forced into bankruptcy due to the recession caused by the economic policies of this misguided government?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asks why we are waiting. We are not waiting. We have brought down interest rates 200 basis points, more than two percentage points, since the early part of the spring of this year. That is designed directly to address the weakness in the economy.

As my hon. friend has heard me say many times in the past, I would like to see interest rates lower. We do have these concerns about inflationary pressures that are causing us to be prudent, to be vigilant about these problems, but our objective, clearly, is to address the problems of weakness in the economy with lower interest rates.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, James Frank, chief economist of the Conference Board said:

> The government kept interest rates too high for too long—Without some relief on the interest rate front, I have major concerns that this recession will turn out to be much more severe than we currently expect.

Why will the Minister of Finance not admit reality in terms of he and his government waiting too long on the interest rate front? This is a serious recession. People are not just being laid off from plants temporarily, the plants are closing permanently.

James Hoicka, an official of the Ontario Ministry of Treasury and Economics said:

> The people being laid off won't be returning, because there isn't any facility to return to.

Where are the adjustment programs the government promised for workers who are losing their jobs due to the free trade deal? Where are the government programs to create new jobs and retrain workers involved in the facilities being closed permanently in our manufacturing sector? Why will this government not do something right now for the workers and their communities right across this country? It is time for the government to act. Why will it not do it?

• (1420)

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, there have been a number of things going on and, in fact, now that we have Bill C-21 we can do considerably more.

We have increased the budget for work sharing. We have increased the budget for training for UI recipients. The funds we received for training and adjustment programs this year total $1.8 billion and, of that, $181 million is going to social assistance recipients.

I am really surprised to hear the hon. member suggest that there is nothing going on. We have only had since November, when we finally got our bill through the other place. These could have been working a lot sooner if hon. members opposite had taken their responsibilities seriously.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, why will the minister not admit that Bill C–21 cutting unemployment benefits is forcing more and more people on to the welfare rolls of this country? Why will the minister not admit that the money that is supposed to come from the unemployment insurance fund for training, most or all of it will not come until next April?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, during the past ten months more than 3,700 people or businesses filed for bankruptcy in Quebec, and of that number more than 2,000 did so last month. We have every reason to believe the situation is going from bad to worse. I therefore want to ask the Minister of Finance: How much longer will Canadians have to suffer the disastrous policies of this government? And when will he introduce new policies that will get us out of this economic morass? When?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, we have acknowledged that the economy is now in a recession. We have reduced interest rates since last spring. There has been a 2 per cent drop in interest rates but it is also very important to reduce inflationary pressures. If those pressures are also reduced, interest rates can then be allowed to go down further.

* * *

[*English*]

## TRADE

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade. In his usual display of foot and mouth disease, the minister, in commenting yesterday on Canadian participation in the U.S.–Mexico free trade agreement, was quoted as saying: "We have cleared away the underbrush now and we can start to fell the big tree very quickly".

Does the minister really believe that up to 226,000 lost Canadian jobs are mere underbrush and how many more Canadian jobs must fall before the minister comes to his senses?

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, there are not, of course, 226,000 lost jobs, nor anything approaching that figure, as a result of the free trade agreement.

As a matter of fact, there has been a very considerable net increase in jobs in the two years since the free trade agreement went into effect. There is no doubt, however, that in a recessionary climate there has been some loss of jobs due to the recession, not due to the free trade agreement.

With respect to the discussions with Mexico, these are only consultations to determine whether or not we are, and the Americans and the Mexicans are interested in a tripartite negotiation of a possible free trade agreement with Mexico. We have not started any negotiations yet. There is nothing for the hon. member to be alarmed about. When we fell the big trees, I will let her know.

**Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East):** Mr. Speaker, I dare the Minister for International Trade to go to St. John's to tell the fishermen that there are no lost jobs, to go to Hamilton and tell the steel workers that there are no lost jobs, and to go to the west and tell the farmers that there are no lost jobs. You produce the figures. We have produced figures and we want to see your figures.

My supplementary question is for the same minister. He actually had the nerve yesterday to tell the people of Canada that all he is waiting for is approval from the Congress of the United States. The last time I looked it was still the Parliament of Canada that made decisions for this country.

[*Translation*]

I would like to ask him this question: When will he come to the House to get the approval of the Parliament of Canada and not of the U.S. Congress, to make changes in the free trade agreement or to conclude a free trade agreement with Mexico and the United States? When will he come before Parliament?

[*English*]

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member cannot provoke me no matter how shrilly she screams at me. I am going to treat her—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Crosbie:** I am going to treat her with the utmost deference.

Several months ago the hon. member who just asked that question said this with reference to the question of the free trade talks between the U.S. and Mexico. She was appointed as the industry critic in the shadow cabinet, and is certainly in the shadows. She said: "I am

not sure that we should become a negotiating partner, but I think we should make sure we know what is going on. If we are not anywhere near the table clearly we are not going to be in a position to monitor that."

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**An hon. member:** Who said that?

**An hon. member:** It makes a lot of sense.

**Mr. Crosbie:** The hon. member from Toronto, the justice critic I believe, the hon. Kaplan, said Canada should try and get the largest role that we can in the talks to protect our interests. I am simply taking their advice, Mr. Speaker, in these conversations.

I am glad to see that the Liberal Party is supporting us in this attempt and I encourage them to continue to show—

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade. Over the weekend the United States gave Canada an unrealistic deadline as to whether we would or would not participate in the U.S.–Mexico trade talks.

Yesterday, instead of standing up for Canadian families, instead of standing up for Canadian sovereignty and Canadian workers, the Minister for International Trade gave in to the U.S. ultimatum and said that Canada would be a part of the talks.

The Canada–U.S. trade deal has cost Canadians dearly: 226,000 jobs in two years and double the bankruptcies because of this government's policies. I ask the minister responsible for international trade what is the price that Canada is prepared to pay for participation in the U.S.–Mexico trade talks?

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, this government is going to see that Canada participates in the world. We know that Canada cannot survive on its own, isolated, with high barriers against trade with just about any other country in the world, including the less well developed countries that the hon. member's party is supposed to support but whom they abandon every time there is an attempt to improve their lot by increasing trade with them. The hon. member's party abandons the less developed countries.

With reference to the discussions yesterday, there have been no ultimatums and no deadlines. Since last September we have been discussing with the United States and Mexico the possibility of a trilateral negotiation for a North American free trade arrangement. Our discussions are about technical matters to ensure that this would not take any longer time, would not be any more difficult than bilateral discussions between the U.S. and Mexico. It is becoming quite obvious that there are no technical reasons why there should be any delay.

I would expect that within the next few weeks there will be a decision by these three countries whether there will be a trilateral negotiation or not, if the U.S. Congress in March or April approves the participation of the United States. That is all that we are doing. We are neither taking ultimatums, making them, or accepting them. We are defending the interests of Canada and its people.

The hon. member should know that the figures she quotes of job losses—

• (1430)

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Yukon.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I do not think there is a Canadian today who is going to believe that this government cares about Canadian jobs. It has destroyed more than 200,000 others.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Ms. McLaughlin:** U.S. officials are quoted as having said that Canada cannot discuss Canadian job losses because it will cause undue delay in the talks. President Bush himself has said that Canada can only participate if we do not cause undue delay. In other words, if we do not raise issues about Canadian workers and Canadian families, we can participate.

The minister says that he is concerned about international workers, about the workers of Mexico. Yet, he says there will be no preconditions to these talks.

Why not, Mr. Speaker? Why not preconditions that Mexican wages, working standards for Mexicans, and environmental standards in Mexico will come up to Canadian standards and not Canadian standards go down?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, this would be a new method of international negotiations. You deal with a country and you tell that country that, before you will speak to them or negotiate with them, their wages must equal yours. Where would that have put Canada?

I can remember when the wages of woods worker in Newfoundland in 1959 were $1 an hour. What if other countries had told us they would not negotiate trade agreements with us until we brought our wages up to their wages, whatever they might have been. What a silly suggestion.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Crosbie (St. John's West):** How can the hon. lady ask to be taken seriously—

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Yukon.

**Ms. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon):** Mr. Speaker, I hope the Minister for International Trade will share those thoughts with the European Common Market which is in fact putting exactly those kinds of terms—

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. McLaughlin:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister for International Trade said in Washington that because of the GATT charter we needed a free trade zone consisting of Mexico, Canada and the United States. A meeting is scheduled on January 15 in Geneva to continue the GATT talks, and I therefore want to ask the minister: Why has this government already dropped the whole idea of GATT?

[*English*]

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, this country is one of the foremost supporters and exponents of a successful conclusion to the Uruguay Round. As any one of the 107 countries that participated will say, Canada led the way on almost every one of the 15 sectors that was negotiated.

Yesterday, I met for an hour and a half with Mrs. Carla Hills and her deputy, Mr. Jules Katz, to discuss the situation with respect to the Uruguay Round and how we might successfully conclude the Uruguay Round between now and March 1. It is one of our highest priorities.

We will be attending, our officials will be attending in Geneva on June 15. We will be doing a lot more that I can reveal to the House or to anyone else to ensure a successful completion of that round.

One thing is certain. There would be no successful conclusion if the NDP party were in power, either there or anywhere else in trade in the world. We would be isolated behind huge tariff barriers, cowering in our homes, worrying about what the rest of the world was going to do to us.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## THE ECONOMY

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. As he well knows, in the last four months over 60,000 Canadians and businesses have been forced into bankruptcy by the government's economic policies. For each statistic, there is a real story, a story of shattered pride, broken dreams, and wasted promise.

When is this government going to stop treating this mounting human calamity in such a cavalier and statistical fashion, and take action now to stop this mounting economic inhuman carnage that its own economic policies have caused?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of exaggeration in that.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre):** It does not help matters to have that type of exaggeration. No one is happy at all about the number of people who are going bankrupt. I should point out to the hon. member that this is not to the same extent as it was in the last recession. But we do have a recession now.

It is a recession that has come about after seven and a half years of very strong growth in the country. It is a natural phenomenon with economies as it is with individuals. They have to slow down after they have been running too hard. That, unfortunately, is the result of what is happening in the economy today.

We are not happy that it is there. We are getting interest rates down to respond to that weakness in the economy. As we become confident that the inflationary

pressures are lowered, we will be able to get interest rates down further.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. MacDonald (Dartmouth):** Mr. Speaker, that answer is certainly going to be cold comfort at this time of the year when thousands of Canadians and thousands of businesses are being thrown out onto the thrash heap by the government.

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister responsible for Consumer and Corporate Affairs. As he well knows, with each business bankruptcy tens, hundreds, or even thousands of workers lose their jobs, pension benefits, vacation pay, and back wages because the government has inconsistently failed to amend the Bankruptcy Act to protect the interest of workers across the country.

What Canadian workers need now is not more promises of action sometime in the future on this particular aspect. I challenge the minister to bring in those much needed amendments today, tomorrow, or before Christmas, because Canadian workers can no longer afford to hang by their fingernails waiting for the government to take some type of action.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Pierre Blais (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture)):** Mr. Speaker, I should remind my hon. colleague that his party, when it was in office during the recession of 1981–82, failed four times to bring in a new legislation. We do not have any lesson to learn from the people opposite.

We have worked with the whole community in this sector to try to find the right thing to do. We are close to making a decision. As soon as the government has made its decision, it will be announced.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## PERSIAN GULF

**Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. I would like to ask the minister what contingencies he has prepared and what will happen to the 1,700 young Canadians in the Persian Gulf in the event that there is a resort to force on or after January 15. Could he tell us what the plan is, please?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asks a question for which he knows that I would not be able to give him a fulsome answer at this time.

**Some hon. members:** Fulsome.

**Mr. McKnight:** I can assure the hon. member that contingency plans are in place. They have been in place since the Canadian Forces accepted tasks in the Persian Gulf area.

At this time, their tasks are that of defence. They are doing tasks which they are capable of doing. As for the future, they will be assigned tasks which they are capable of fulfilling.

**Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception):** Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you are aware and everybody in the House is aware, this is an item of great concern to all Canadians, especially the families of the 1,700 people involved. I do not want to make political hay of this and I appreciate the thrust of the minister's question. Perhaps in the interest of giving some indication of what the options are, we could approach the question another way.

In the event there is a resort to offensive force in mid January, would the Canadian Forces be expected to maintain the economic blockade? Will they be expected to withdraw? Or, will they be involved in the actual offensive action itself? More than anything else, I think the House would like assurance from the minister that Parliament would be reconvened before any decision is taken by the government in this regard.

**Mr. Lewis:** Will you be here to vote?

**Mr. Mifflin:** I will be here. Yes, sir.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** I am pleased that my hon. friend said that he would be here. We missed him when we had the last opportunity to vote on this.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

• (1440 )

**Mr. McKnight:** The member can rest assured that the Canadian forces presently involved in a multinational effort in the Persian Gulf, in recognition of 12 resolutions by the UN Security Council and in recognition of those actions taken and supported by the countries of the world in the condemnation of the action of Iraq, will be assigned tasks which they are capable of fulfilling. They were assigned those tasks from the outset. The rules of engagement have been established. There is no need at this time, in my opinion or in military leadership's opinion, to change the rules of engagement that have been identified.

As I and my colleagues on this side have said, when there is a change in the commitment or a change of significant numbers of Canadian forces involved in the Persian Gulf, Parliament will be consulted at the earliest possible convenience.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture.

As the Minister of Finance will know, the GST will tax international transportation at zero percent. However, a recent interpretation by Revenue Canada states as follows:

> The cleaning, mixing and drying of the grain is considered to constitute further processing with the result that the portion of the journey within Canada to the export terminal is a service of domestic transportation and is subject to GST at 7 per cent.

This means that grain moving from farm gate to the ports of Vancouver, Prince Rupert, Churchill, and Thunder Bay will now be charged GST. This decision is astonishing, considering the existing burden on our grain producers.

I want to ask the Minister of Finance if this interpretation is correct and, if so, what is he going to do about it?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member omits a very important part of the question. When any GST is charged on any services or goods purchased by the farmers in the course of their farm business, they will receive a full credit so that the net tax impact is zero.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona):** I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance. If the farmers are going to get this money back eventually anyway, why on earth would the government want to visit such a bureaucratic nightmare on western Canada, on the farming community, and everyone else who will have to do all this paperwork, only to get the money back in the final analysis probably about a year later?

**An hon. member:** Bureaucratic Tories.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, again, the hon. member's question omits a very important part of how the GST will work. We have just recently released a list of a number of products on which there will not be any GST charged. The result of this is that the cash flow impact on the farmers is about 25 per cent of what it would be if all of those products would have been charged the GST.

The net effect of the GST replacing the existing federal sales tax is to save farmers right across the country, in the first year, $250 million. That is a major benefit for the farm community.

To put it down into some very easily understood terms, a pickup truck that today costs the farmer $20,000 will cost him $2,000 less as a result of the shift from the federal sales tax to the goods and services tax.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

* * *

## RAFFERTY–ALAMEDA DAM PROJECT

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice and concerns the government's application for an injunction to stop construction of the Rafferty–Alameda dam before a full environmental assessment could be completed.

It was widely reported this week that the judge who turned down the application, a senior partner in a Saskatchewan law firm, was a legal representative of Luscar, a company with a financial interest in the dam's proceeding as quickly as possible.

When did the minister know that the judge hearing the injunction application had been Luscar's legal representative, and what did she do when she found out? If she did nothing, why?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Kim Campbell (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, this matter is before the courts and it is not appropriate for me to comment on it in this place.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** My question was directed to the minister's responsibility and to whether she took every step possible in the first stage of this case, in this important precedent-setting capacity of the government's ability to protect the environment.

I ask again, when did she know about the judge's representation of Luscar, a firm with a direct interest in the case and what did she do about it?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member is putting a question relating to certain public comments with respect to a certain judge in a certain case. The hon. Minister of Justice has said that as the matter is still under litigation, she has no intention of remarking further on it. That is her privilege.

I have some difficulty with the question because I am not entirely sure that the Minister of Justice has any particular part in picking a judge when an application is filed in a court. I think perhaps more consideration should be given to the whole issue before the matter is proceeded with further in the House.

* * *

## FISHERIES

**Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands--Canso):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. It concerns the 1991 groundfish management plan, specifically cod allocations to the area known as 4VN.

The minister will know that in determining the inshore and offshore allocations for this area, he violated key principles in the Atlantic Groundfish Management Plan. These proposed allocations directly jeopardize fish processing jobs in Petit de Grat, Louisbourg and Canso.

My question is this. Why is the minister breaking his own departmental guidelines to take away employment from these communities?

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, the winter fishery 4VN is a fishery in which the Gulf fishermen in 4T, which is all the Gulf area, have claimed for over a decade was hurting the fishery in the Gulf.

I had been asked by the Gulf fishermen to simply close down the winter fishery in 4VN. Instead of doing that, because of the severe impact it would have on jobs in Cape Breton and in Prince Edward Island, I decided to attribute a larger portion of the reduction of the 4TV and quota cut. I did that in order not to create in the southern Gulf the same situation and the same problem we have in the northern Gulf of St. Lawrence. I did that to conserve fish and to reduce the heavy harvesting of younger fish in 4VN where, as the hon. member should know, the Gulf stock migrates during the winter to grow. That is the reason why I did it.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands--Canso):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is for the same minister. If the allocation of the cut for 1991 in 4VN is maintained in 1992, the Richmond Fisheries plant may be forced to close. It is the sole employer in Petit-de-Grat. The 375 workers facing lay-off deserve an explanation. Why were the guidelines changed to alter their lifestyle? Does the minister believe that the community is not worth saving?

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, my record, as Minister of Fisheries, proves my determination to do a lot to save communities and the hon. member for Canso should know that. I did not hesitate to act.

He sould also mention that--and I would like the Liberal Party to be consistent on this--on the issue of northern cod fishing in Newfoundland, the representations made to me by representatives of his Party are to the effect that I should not touch, I repeat not touch at all, to the inshore fishery. As regards the Gulf area, the Liberal party may be less interested in that area, but nonetheless the inshore fishermen of that area are requesting equal treatment to that of their Newfoundland and Labrador counterparts.

That is why, instead of attributing the full reduction exclusively to deep-sea trawlermen or to inshore fishermen, I split it 50-50 between them so that the inshore fishermen could pursue thier traditional fishing in the Gulf area and have a life instead of vegetating.

* * *

• (1450 )

[*English*]

## PERSIAN GULF

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

Canadians are becoming increasingly concerned about the possibility of a U.S. led military offensive against Iraq soon after January 15, leading to a war with devastating consequences.

Will the minister tell the House precisely what role Canadian troops will play in the event of such a military offensive, and will the minister assure the House that there will be absolutely no change in the role of Canadian troops without a full debate and vote—not consulting, as the minister said today, not advising, as the associate minister said yesterday, but a full debate and vote in this House? Will the minister give the House that assurance?

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether the hon. member has been following the debates that have taken place in this House on two separate occasions, the debates that have taken place in the United Nations since the aggression, since war was declared by Saddam Hussein on August 2 when they attacked Kuwait. I am not sure whether the hon. member has been following the answers that my colleagues and I have given to other members in the House.

The member from Regina should listen because I am sure this is of interest to him. He understands more than some of the other members of his caucus that Canada, supporting the United Nations since its foundation, now has an opportunity with other countries in the world, such as the U.S.S.R., Great Britain, Bangladesh, the United States and France, to bring about a more stable and peaceful world. That is what Canadian troops are doing at this time on behalf of the Canadian people, and that is what Canadian troops will do in the future on behalf of the people of Canada.

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, the minister has refused to give the commitment to Canadians that we have asked for.

Yesterday the NATO foreign ministers, including Canada's foreign minister, appeared to endorse a move to war soon after January 15. We have the evidence of many experts, including the retired chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the United States, William Crowe, who said that if in fact the sanctions will work in 12 to 18 months instead of 6 months, the trade-off of avoiding war with its attendant sacrifices and uncertainties would, in his view, be worth it.

Given that evidence, what concrete steps is Canada taking to ensure that sanctions are given full time to work and that peaceful alternatives, including a regional international peace conference at the appropriate time, will in fact be implemented to avoid the tens of thousands of deaths that would result from a war? What leadership are we taking, as a country, to avoid war and to promote peace?

**Hon. Bill McKnight (Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I have not met anyone in the House of Commons or anybody in my travels within the Persian Gulf region who wanted war. Every member of this House of Commons, every member of the Canadian Armed Forces, every member whom I have had the opportunity to speak to wants peace.

Canada has been working since the outset to bring about a peaceful solution. The hon. member should know because he travelled there. If sanctions are given time to work, does he believe that there will be any Kuwaiti nation left? He has heard and seen firsthand the torture, the absolute destruction of a country where men are shot on the street, where women are attacked and raped, where the whole of the national well-being of the Kuwaiti people is being destroyed.

**Mr. Robinson:** What about war?

**Mr. McKnight:** The hon. member says "What about war?". I bring to his attention what the NATO members said: "We firmly support Resolution 678 and all other relevant resolutions adopted by the Security Council and reiterate our hope that their implementation can be achieved by peaceful means".

[*Translation*]

## HEALTH

**Mr. Yvon Côté (Richmond—Wolfe):** Mr. Speaker, for the past few days we have heard complaints about the presence of asbestos in federal buildings, and among those who made the complaints were several members of the NDP. However, a study conducted by a number of scientists has shown that the levels of airborne asbestos fibres are not dangerous and that the health risk is very low. All this is typical of the contradictory policies of the New Democrats who, ostensibly to protect the health of some people, are destroying the economy of regions in Canada that have contributed to our economy. That being said, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether the government intends to change its policy on the controlled use of asbestos in government buildings.

[*English*]

**Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, regarding the circumstances on the Hill, as Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, I cannot respond to that. The Speaker would know that that lies within the Speaker's purview as well as departments that are participating, namely, Public Works and National Health and Welfare.

With respect to the controlled use of asbestos, we recognize that the product is useful, that it must be controlled and handled under a system of regulations for controlled use and, in fact, those regulations have been endorsed internationally, both by the World Health Organization and the international labour organizations.

* * *

## TRADE

**Mr. Felix Holtmann (Portage—Interlake):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister for International Trade. A distinguished agricultural economist by the name of Dr. Clay Gilson spoke to a group of farmers in my riding. He stated with regard to agricultural trade that this winter will be a winter of tremendous uncertainty and frustration across western Canada, especially for young farmers. I would like to know if the Minister for International Trade can tell this House what his view is with respect to the GATT and what other areas of trade farmers in western Canada can find for their produce if they fail in Europe.

**Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, it is indeed pleasant to hear that somebody is interested in what is happening with respect to the GATT negotiations and is asking a rational question about it. The situation is that the Secretary General of the GATT, Mr. Dunkel, is now having consultations with some of the main players in the Uruguay Round of the trade negotiations. I met with Mrs. Hills yesterday and Mr. Katz, as I said earlier in the House.

We think there is a reasonable chance that some way through the agricultural impasse can be found, that there will be found to be some flexibility in the position of the Europe Economic Community and in those who, like us, support the Cairns Group and the United States position. Work is continuing to that end. On January 15, there will be a review, in Geneva, of what the present position is. We are going to do everything possible to see that a result is reached on agriculture which will certainly then make it possible for a conclusion to the Round, hopefully during January or February and before March 1, which appears to be the latest date that could be contemplated.

* * *

## CANADA POST

**Mr. Jerry Pickard (Essex—Kent):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister responsible for Canada Post. On March 1, Canada Post proposes massive postal rate increases on newspaper mailings. Rates will skyrocket from as low as five cents per paper to as much as 51 cents, increases as high as 880 per cent. Given that 1991 subscriptions have already been sold, some small publishers stand to lose as much as $20,000. Will the minister intervene now and reverse this outrageous increase?

• (1500 )

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, the weekly newspapers will still get the first 1,000 copies delivered free. In terms of the other publications policy, there was a policy on publications announced by my colleague, the Minister of Communications, wherein the subsidies that were provided will be more directly utilized by the Department of Communications to help Canadian publishers and be more specific, more targeted, in terms of benefiting Canadian publishers than

the current program which represented a subsidy to everybody including foreign owned publishers.

The rate increases were published in *The Canada Gazette*. As of a couple of weeks ago I think there were 26 Canadians who expressed concern about those rate increases.

**Mr. Jerry Pickard (Essex—Kent):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the same minister.

I believe the minister's facts are a little incorrect. When weekly newspapers have to mail outside the areas they are in, they are affected by these 880 per cent increases.

It is a triple unjustified Tory whammy on rural Canada: a 7 per cent GST increase on the written word, a 7 per cent GST increase on postal rates and postal rate increases of 880 per cent. These three initiatives are a vital attack on rural Canada. It is the same type of attack as the CBC.

Will the minister halt this senseless taxation and unfair postal rate increase?

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, the preamble by the hon. member was shrill, loud, inaccurate, and ridiculous.

The answer to his question is no.

* * *

## PRIVILEGE

### CERTIFICATION OF PETITIONS

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to have such an audience for my question of privilege, but I submitted a number of petitions two months ago, on October 17, having to do with the intention of the government, the Department of National Revenue, to charge parking fees to hundreds of workers at the Winnipeg Taxation Data Centre.

I have waited over two months now for the clerk of petitions to render a judgment on whether or not that petition is acceptable. I submit that that gets in the way of my ability to do my job as a member of Parliament representing those constituents who are concerned about that parking charge.

If the petition is to be judged unacceptable, then surely that judgment could have been made by now and I could have found other ways to bring it to the attention of the House. I have not been able to do that because I have been trying to respect the process, and the process has taken two months.

I feel that my ability to represent those people who are concerned about the parking charge and who object to this unfair charge being levied against them has been violated and has been made difficult.

I would hope that something could be done about it. There is no excuse for taking two months to make a judgment as to the acceptability of a petition so that I could then present it or, if I could not present it, find another way to represent their views.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will give the matter some consideration and report back.

* * *

## WAYS AND MEANS

### TABLING OF NOTICE OF MOTION

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I have a Ways and Means motion I wish to table. It will be of interest to those interested in the application of the GST to direct sellers, taxis, and the tourism industry.

Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 83(1), I wish to table copies of a notice of a Ways and Means motion to amend the Excise Tax Act and other legislation respecting the implementation of the goods and services tax, and I ask, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 83(2), that an Order of the Day be designated for the consideration of the said Ways and Means motion.

* * *

## POINTS OF ORDER

### COMMENTS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

**Mrs. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West):** Mr. Speaker, I want to raise a point of order of which I gave you notice during Question Period. I appreciate the comments you provided to me. However, I think it is important to raise

it before the House since I believe the *sub judice* convention should only be used when it is proper to do so and not unfairly used to restrict debate in the House.

I want to quote from Beauchesne's first on the purpose of the *sub judice* convention to protect the parties in a case awaiting or undergoing trial and persons who stand to be affected by the outcome of a judicial inquiry. It is a voluntary restraint imposed by the House upon itself. Citation 336(1) of Beauchesne's goes on to state:

> The sub judice convention has been applied consistently in criminal cases.

However citation 337(1) states:

> No settled practice has been developed in relation to civil cases, as the convention has been applied in some cases but not in others.

Citation 337(2) states further:

> In civil cases the convention does not apply until the matter has reached the trial stage.

Of course, in this case the matter is beyond the initial hearing and the initial judgment and is now under appeal.

I also point to Citation 339 of Beauchesne's which reads:

> The Special Committee on the Rights and Immunities of Members recommended that the responsibility of the Speaker during the question period should be minimal as regards the sub judice convention, and that the responsibility should principally rest upon the Member who asks the question and the Minister to whom it is addressed.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I gave careful thought to my question and you were consulted in advance about the nature of the question that was intended to be put. Citation 339 further states:

> However, the Speaker should remain the final arbiter in the matter—

I am raising this question because I think it is quite important that the *sub judice* convention not be used unduly to restrict debate in the House or to restrict Question Period. I wonder if we could have your ruling on whether in fact this matter is *sub judice* in a way that limits questions and answers in the House.

SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Ottawa West has asked a question, as I mentioned earlier today, with reference to some public reports which suggest that a judge in the Rafferty–Alameda case before being appointed to the bench and while practising law acted for certain clients who are interested in the results of the entire Rafferty–Alameda project. That information has been made public; it is in the public domain.

The hon. member, I know, has been concerned about not trespassing further than a member ought and did make some inquiries through her colleague of me yesterday.

I allowed the first question. The hon. Minister of Justice rose and said the matter is before the courts and she is declining to answer. Whether the Minister of Justice was invoking for her own particular purposes the *sub judice* rule, I do not know, but I want the hon. member to know that I was not invoking the *sub judice* rule.

I accept, certainly for the most part and under most circumstances, the quotations that the hon. member for Ottawa West has given me from Beauchesne's. There is a clear distinction of course in criminal matters and in civil matters.

I assure the hon. member and other hon. members that my concern the second time around was not directed to *sub judice*. My concern was whether or not the minister is in a position as a minister to deal with that particular issue, because it could be said to reflect on the minister's wish or otherwise to direct a case to one judge or another. I have had some time to reflect upon that, and I think that my decision in the first instance in allowing the question to stand was the correct one.

• (1510)

I want to assure the hon. member that my concerns were not turning on *sub judice* at all. It was turning on another matter which frankly had never come before me before. On reflection I think that the question was appropriate and the hon. member may want to pursue it, but it is also very clear that a minister does not have to answer a question. Whatever reasons the Minister of Justice might have in her own mind for not answering it is of course her own business. The minister does not have to answer whether it is *sub judice* or whether it is not.

In any event, I thank the hon. member for putting the question. I also appreciate very much the hon. member taking the effort to come to the Speaker beforehand onan issue which could be difficult, but I do want to

assure her that I am not in this case applying the *sub judice* rule.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, just to clarify the situation, as I understand Your Honour's ruling, then, the question put that Your Honour said you thought might be out of order and did not allow the minister to answer was a proper question, and the minister could have answered the question had the minister chosen to do so.

I note the minister invoked the *sub judice* convention as the reason for refusing to answer the first time which she may or may not do, but as to the propriety on that Your Honour did not comment. Of course we object to the minister using the *sub judice* convention in that circumstance because we do not think it is a proper use.

**Mr. Speaker:** Just a moment. We have heard the point raised by the hon. member for Ottawa West. I hope I have made it very clear what my thinking is on the subject.

Remember, it is not for a Speaker to trespass with respect to a minister who chooses not to answer. As long as we understand that, I think we can close that off now.

* * *

## PRIVILEGE

STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE AND THE SOLICITOR GENERAL

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, as I have given the Speaker notice, I rise to give notice of a question of privilege. The item of privilege arises out of a matter that came before the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General this morning. I believe it pertains to the rights and privileges of all members of the House of Commons.

Because of uncertainty at this time as to the agenda of the House and the agenda of that particular committee, I think it would best serve the needs of the House if my putting of the question of privilege be deferred until a time more appropriate after those uncertainties are cleared up. If that is acceptable to the Speaker, then I would proceed in that fashion.

**Mr. Speaker:** It may or may not be privilege. In any event, I appreciate the fact that the hon. member sent me a note on this.

I will take this as notice, which is not to indicate that I necessarily think it is privilege. It may well be that events will preclude any necessity to pursue the matter further.

---

# GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

## PETRO-CANADA PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. McDermid that Bill C-84, an act respecting the privatization of the national petroleum company of Canada, be read the third time and passed.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** When the House took recess, the hon. member for Surrey—White Rock—South Langley had the floor. Since the hon. member is absent, the Chair will now recognize a member from the other side of the House. The hon. member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon.

[*English*]

**Mr. Joe Comuzzi (Thunder Bay—Nipigon):** Mr. Speaker, a short while ago *The Ottawa Citizen* put very succinctly in 12 words what I think is the whole feeling with respect to Bill C-84 before the House today. It read very simply: "Selling Petro-Canada: wrong time, wrong reason, wrong price, wrong decision". We on this side of the House agree wholeheartedly with that statement.

We heard today, at second reading and in committee, what the sale of Petro-Canada would mean to Canada. We have heard very little about what is Petro-Canada. Let me just emphasize again what this great Canadian corporation really is. It has over 7,000 Canadians working in all of its areas. It has over 3,500 retail outlets where we in this country buy our gas and oil. It holds over 6.9 million hectares of land. It has a production capacity of over 22,000 cubic meters of oil a day and for crude oil and liquid reserves it has a reserve of over 92 billion cubic meters. It has natural gas production of 13.7 million cubic feet per day, and in those reserves in natural gas alone, almost 100 billion cubic meters.

In the year just ending, it had $94 million in profit. Its cash flow, expenditures and reserves, its cash end over its expenditures exceeded $600 million. Its revenue was $4.8 billion. It only has a long-term debt of $1 billion, compared to net assets of over $8.5 billion. Petro-Canada is not only a very healthy, vital company, it is a company that well deserves to stay with the original shareholders for whom it was founded, each and every citizen of this country of ours. Every Canadian should remain a shareholder of Petro-Canada.

Petro-Canada was conceived in 1973 and its genesis came because of the terrible problems we were having in this country to be self-sufficient in oil, particularly with the problems we were experiencing in the Middle East at that time. Those problems then subsided and the world market supply of crude oil and natural gas became constant again, until 1979 when we again experienced another crunch in the oil and gas industry with events in Iran of hostage taking and other events that led up to the problems of 1979-1980.

We now experience the severe problem with respect to the availability of crude oil in our country due to what is happening with Kuwait and Iraq and the world situation, particularly the Middle East.

While some may think these countries are far away from the national scene, every Canadian experiences the problem. It comes home immediately when they get their bill for heating their home every month, or they drive up to the pumps to fill up their cars with gasoline. We all know what the experience of Canadians has been in the last two or three months when gas bills for transportation are in excess of 25 per cent of what they used to be and we see what is happening to the cost of heating homes today.

It would be a tremendous expense to the average household in the country to be without transportation, without gasoline or fuel to heat our homes adequately in this climate of ours.

The mandate given to Petro-Canada when it was created in 1975 provided the Canadian people with the power and the will to exercise control where the country was most vulnerable. What we really tried to do in 1975 was to provide security of supply. Through the creation of Petro-Canada at that time, we wanted to ensure that Canada would always have the security of supply of the vital gas and oil that is so necessary in our country. That was the aim of Petro-Canada at the time; to make Canada independent of any other country in the world and to provide its gas and oil.

• (1520)

It was also created, as we heard from my colleague today, as a window on the industry. We know that the multinational companies which control the oil and gas companies in the world sometimes do not have pricing policies that reflect the needs of a community and of a nation. We thought and expected Petro-Canada to be a window to ensure that the pricing policies for a litre of gas, a gallon of gas or what it cost for a cubic foot of gas to heat our homes, would always reflect something that was tolerable and something with which all Canadians could live. That was another vital reason for the creation of PetroCan.

Another of its three fundamental mandates was to have Canadian control over those vital resources that we in this country need so badly, control over our gas and energy sources.

Those are the three mandates. We had five objectives with those mandates. Petro-Canada was to undertake to explore and develop new sources of energy; to carry out research and development projects relating to all types of fuel; to import, produce, transport, distribute, refine and market hydrocarbons; to produce and distribute and transport other types of fuel, not only for the time when PetroCan was formed in 1975, but for the future availability of whatever energy source we would find.

The fifth objective of PetroCan was to assist Canadian companies, companies other than PetroCan to go into joint ventures, to help finance and provide research funds so that we in this country could be self-sufficient in this vital area that is so necessary to our future economic viability.

In essence, Petro-Canada which was paid for by every Canadian, was intended to look after our national energy interests and the security of our economy in times of crisis as well as in good times. I suggest we failed to do this.

I remember with pride—and I am looking at my friend across the way—the introduction of Petro-Canada in 1975. There was a 2 cent per litre charge put on every litre of gas—

**Mr. Epp:** I know it because you raised it.

**Mr. Comuzzi:** It was put on to pay for the cost of acquiring this vital resource and to secure and ensure that we would always be self-reliant in energy in this country.

As taxation goes, it was not a popular tax, but it was something which I think we in western Canada, we in Thunder Bay, we in eastern Canada looked upon with pride because we knew we would never face again the dilemma that we faced in those years of not being able to properly supply our country and our citizens with the necessary ingredients to heat their homes or to run their automobiles.

Given our vast geography and our economy, Petro-Canada, like the CBC, VIA Rail, rural post and Air Canada, which are either in the process of being decimated or privatized by this government, are necessities in Canadian life. How else can we pretend that we can have a united nation without adequate national transportation services, without a strong national communication policy, without a strong federal presence, without the economic tools to shape our future, the ability to ensure that all regions in this country are treated equally, and in regions like I come from, such as northern Ontario, to ensure that the price of gasoline stays at least fairly comparable to those other areas in other parts of the country?

Instead of selling PetroCan, what this government should be doing is giving PetroCan a new national purpose, to find some of the 3.6 billion barrels of light crude oil that we know exist in western Canada, to give it the impetus to go out and explore, to take care of our offshore resources, to make sure that we do define our purpose again in Petro-Canada and to ensure that Canada does become self-sufficient in so far as energy is concerned.

The present Governor General, while he was a member of the cabinet and the predecessor of our present Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, said that the instruments available to the government, taxes and regulations, are not available or have already been expended or used to their limit. He said, "Retention of Petro-Canada, in some form, is so important and so vital to the future of this country." Unfortunately, this man is no longer part of the government of the day.

This government insists that 75 per cent of Petro-Canada remain in Canadian hands. But as a private corporation in an industry dominated by three mega-giants, two of them controlled by our friends in the United States, will this government have some difficulty in controlling what Petro-Canada will be all about?

If the government proceeds with its plan to privatize Petro-Canada, this vital natural resource-based company, the allegiance of the directors of PetroCan will be solely directed to the benefits of their shareholders and not to the benefit of all Canadians.

Canadians not only need a toehold in this vital industry, they need to be in this vital industry up to their knees. They have to have this overriding advantage as it exists today. PetroCan should continue to exist, with its shareholders being all Canadians.

At this particular period of time in our history, given what is happening in the Middle East, is this the time that we should be considering selling Petro-Canada? I have already listed its assets. It has almost a billion cubic feet of natural gas. It has 92 billion cubic metres of crude oil. All of those reserves are owned by this company and are still in the ground waiting to be harvested. Should we be considering selling PetroCan when these assets are increasing in value on a daily basis? Is it a wise business decision to sell PetroCan today? I say it is not.

Any business in this country whose assets are appreciating on the value as these assets are appreciating today should retain those assets and take advantage of them rather than sell them off at distress prices.

In 1984 this government changed PetroCan's mandate and allowed it to become commercial and operate in a commercial fashion rather than its public policy role. It was given the power to act in its own best interest by writing off assets and operating, in essence, like a private company. It immediately began to operate like a private company. It acquired 1,500 or so outlets immediately, laid off 1,000 people, and started to explore for oil outside of this country, which is far beyond the mandate that PetroCan was given when it was formed in 1975.

Now the government is saying that since Petro-Canada is operating like a private company it might as well become a private company and be privatized.

We believe that PetroCan should have its national objectives reinstated, especially in light of current national conflicts. The biggest losers in the privatization of PetroCan are the existing shareholders, every Canadian who invested in this magnificent, very strong company. The taxpayers of Canada have invested in PetroCan and they should not be short-changed now.

The taxpayer of this country has invested over $4 billion in this company. In the final analysis the shareholder of PetroCan is not given the vital vote, the vote to say whether or not we want to sell this company. The shareholders in any other corporation have the right to make that final vote, except this Crown corporation. They are being deprived of a fundamental right as shareholders of this company.

• (1530)

A privatized Petro-Canada will serve the interests of the shareholder only in search of profits and the search for profits may override all other considerations, including the need for the country to become self-sufficient, to continue energy-efficient ways, and to guarantee the security of supplies, not only for what we need today, but what we need in the future.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, and I draw this to the attention of my friends on the other side, that during the free trade debate one of the fundamental issues in the debate was the selling of Canada's energy to our friends in the United States. That was, and I think I can reiterate it fairly accurately, that we had to continue to sell whatever energy sources and supplies that we had in Canada consistent with what we had supplied to our friends in the United States before and at the same price at which we sold it to them before, regardless of what the price increase was in Canada. Given this agreement that we entered into on January 1, 1989, I am wondering what the wisdom now is of trying to sell this vital resource when we have already committed any future development in our energy policy to our friends in the United States.

The reason for the sale that we are given is that there is a need for a substantial amount of cash to be injected into the company. I think it is $500 million, or something like that. Just using this as a guideline, the value of the resources that this company has in the ground in the two to three months since the Iraq crisis developed has increased. The value of the resources that we have in the ground has increased more than the $500 million that is needed for this company to continue its exploratory work to develop more fields for natural gas and oil.

I do not think that that the fundamental reason for disposing of PetroCan holds water or has any logical consequence to it, given the fact of the increase in value of those reserves that we have in the ground today from the time that PetroCan became an issue, two or three months ago, when the government decided to sell off all of its reserves.

I know my time is drawing short. Let me close my speech by saying what I opened it with and that is the 12 words that best describe the current situation with respect to what PetroCan is all about today. It is a vital, Canadian, healthy, prosperous, energy-conservation company. It owns its assets on behalf of every Canadian in the country.

As *The Ottawa Citizen* said, to sell PetroCan today is selling this vital resource at the wrong time. This government is selling it for the wrong reason. It certainly is selling this company at the wrong price, given what we have just talked about, with the increase in the price of the reserves in the ground. It is the wrong decision to sell this Crown corporation today, to the detriment of all Canadians and to put our independence, as it relates to energy, at risk by disposing of this company.

**Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale):** Mr. Speaker, I think all of us were moved by the depth of knowledge and the commitment of the last speaker to this particular issue.

In his opinion, does he feel that the government is in a mode of selling off only the Crown corporations which are making money for the people of Canada and contributing money to our fiscal system on behalf of all Canadians, corporations which have the potential for doing so in the future, particularly with rising energy prices in the case of Petro-Canada? Is the government just in the process of selling off the winners and keeping the losers for the people of Canada?

**Mr. Comuzzi:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Willowdale for that question.

Let me start out by making an analogy of what we have just done in the privatization of Terminal 3 at Pearson International Airport. We all know that for the last several years Pearson International Airport made anywhere between $85 million and $105 million a year. That was money that went into the general levy of Canada as any other taxpayers' money would be placed.

Now, by privatizing and allowing private enterprise to go into Terminal 3, the government took that approximately $100 million profit and allowed a private investor to take $50 million to $60 million directly out of the general treasury and apply it to their own pay-off of Terminal 3 and other things that they would be doing.

That same situation applies with the sale of Petro-Canada to people other than the Canadian taxpayer. I have already gone through the tremendous resources owned by Petro-Canada and I will not go through them again. The government is selling off the resources and the profit of almost $100 million a year to Petro-Canada without any further expense to the Canadian taxpayer. By doing that, the government is depriving the general revenue fund in Canada of that $100 million a year in profits that Petro-Canada has been making for the last several years. It is going to private industry.

**Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean):** Mr. Speaker, I, too, was very pleased to be in the House today when my hon. colleague, the member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon, was speaking on such an important bill as this.

The hon. member mentioned many important points in his concern over the sale of Petro-Canada, but there is one in particular that I wanted to zero in on. Members will recall that under the free trade agreement the Americans, our U.S. friends and cousins, recognized the importance of energy security in the world today as a very strategic commodity. They ensured that it was one of the main features in the free trade agreement that they would have secured energy for the residents of the United States of America.

When Petro-Canada was established, it was my understanding that one of the reasons for its establishment was that we wished to secure our energy in a world where the market is sometimes up and sometimes down.

Would the hon. member agree with me that under the sale—if this government goes ahead with this bill and sells Petro-Canada—that we are in almost a retrogressive mode, that we are slipping back, and that we are leaving ourselves wide open to a possible shortage of energy in the future?

**Mr. Comuzzi:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for asking that question because it is something that perhaps I should have addressed in my initial remarks.

What it does in essence is this. We are going to sell to a private corporation. Petro-Canada will become Petro-Canada Incorporated or Petro-Canada Limited, and it will be owned by the shareholders who buy up the shares. It will be run by a board of directors. It will have its chief executive office such as General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, or any one of those other companies. Or, like Air Canada is today.

What will happen is simply this. It is going to sell its product as a private corporation to whoever will pay the most money for it. That is the essence of business, maximizing one's ability to sell at whatever profits one can. That will simply mean that—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I apologize for interrupting the hon. member but—

[*Translation*]

Gentlemen, I am sorry but there seem to be two debates going on in the House. The Chair would appreciate your co-operation. You are making it very difficult for me to listen to the hon. member for Thunder-Bay—Nipigon. The hon. member has the floor.

**Mr. Plamondon:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The hon. member for Richelieu, on a point of order.

**Mr. Plamondon:** Since there were two debates, Mr. Speaker, you should have given the floor to the more interesting one of the two. I am sure you would have enjoyed it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** As an experienced parliamentarian, the hon. member ought to know this was not a point of order. The hon. member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon.

• (1540 )

[*English*]

**Mr. Comuzzi:** Mr. Speaker, with all of that interception I almost forgot my friend's question.

Let me say that the new company is going to maximize its ability to sell and, if Canadians cannot come up with the price, then we are no longer self-sufficient in our energy requirements in the country. The very fact of us not being self-sufficient puts us in exactly, to use her words, a retrogressive position.

**Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale):** Mr. Speaker, it seems incredible to me, at a time when the profits of this corporation can exceed perhaps 12 per cent of the equity, that the government would consider it sound fiscal management to sell off this company. After all, if it gets perhaps $1 billion for the shares sold, but could be making more than $120 million in terms of dividends, is it not better to keep the dividends and reduce our deficit and our debt that way than to sell it off? To me, with energy prices going up and the prospects for profit in this energy scarce world, this is just stupid fiscal management.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, one of the problems of course relates to the question of the 10 per cent ownership rule, that no one person can own more than 10 per cent of the shares of this company. In the past lawyers have found ways to circumvent these rules in terms of other takeovers. Would the member for Thunder Bay—Nipigon care to comment on these two propositions?

**Mr. Comuzzi:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for Willowdale for asking those two questions. Perhaps I should answer the second first inasmuch as I have always acquiesced to his being a much better lawyer than I. As he well knows, there are many ways to circumvent the 10 per cent rule in any corporation.

Let me give you an example that is before us today. Just over the weekend we heard about some financier on the west coast of the United States having bought something less than 9.8 per cent or 9.6 per cent of Chrysler Corporation. Now that does not sound like a great deal of ownership in this company. What it has done is that he will find himself on the board of directors and he will exert a lot of control. He has that corporation rather upset inasmuch as they have already had several meetings as reported in the business periodicals in this country.

So, 10 per cent ownership in one corporation by one individual can be a tremendous amount of ownership by one person considering that all of these assets, every one of these assets, are owned today by every Canadian in the country. Whatever this government does, we should retain every one of those assets that has anything to do with the production of energy in Canada. It should be maintained and held for the interest of every Canadian without necessity of going through a directors meeting or shareholders meeting. It is owned by every Canadian today and it should be retained by every Canadian today.

**Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to follow my friend and colleague opposite, though we might disagree on some views on Petro-Canada. I appreciated his last comments that he felt that the shares should be held by the shareholder. I remind him that under the Financial Administration Act I hold that one share and I appreciate always the confidence that members opposite place in this minister.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address the House on the third reading debate on Bill C-84, the Petro-Canada Public Participation Act. As we look at this bill today, there is obviously a difference of opinion between members opposite and the government regarding the thrust and purpose of this bill.

I would think that a number of my Liberal colleagues would see the wisdom of the need to have Petro-Canada—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please!

I apologize for interrupting the hon. Minister.

[*Translation*]

I would appreciate the co-operation of hon. members, to avoid having several discussions going on at the same time in this House. I am sure I can depend on the kindness and courtesy of my hon. colleagues, and I am sure they will do what is necessary so that we can hear the minister's speech.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

[*English*]

**Mr. Epp:** Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to my Liberal friends opposite that access to financial markets for a company such as Petro–Canada is of vital importance at this stage. There is only a limited access to those markets.

I was here in 1975 when Petro–Canada was formed. There were two reasons why it was formed, quite apart from the reasons my hon. friend cited in his address this afternoon.

First, there was the fear we had in the western world following what was referred to as the first oil shock of 1973–74. We in Canada did not have the line–ups at gasoline stations as neighbours to the south experienced, and there is a reason for that relating back to security of supply quite apart from Petro–Canada. Americans experienced that reality and Canadians did not, both before Petro–Canada was formed and after Petro–Canada was formed. So, in terms of Petro–Canada resolving or absolving us from that reality, quite frankly, that was not the issue.

The second issue was political. I think my friend and I have been in public life for some time, whether in Ottawa or back in our home communities. There was at that time also the need for the Liberal government, as we were debating Petro–Canada, to survive politically. I remember in 1972 when I came into this House there was a difference of two seats between the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party. In fact, there were 23 votes for two seats. That was the difference at the time.

I remember the meetings that took place behind the curtain between the Liberal minority government of the day and the government in waiting of the day led primarily by my friend and colleague from Winnipeg North, now the honorary clerk sitting at the table, Mr. Knowles. One of the prices for survival at the time was the creation of Petro–Canada. It was born out of that period.

In fact, the controversy with Petro–Canada at that time was not that we needed Petro–Canada. I remember speaking to a couple of my Liberal colleagues at the time who were personally strongly opposed to the creation of Petro–Canada and felt that they were being held hostage by the NDP group in the House at the time who were holding the balance of power. That is the historical reality of when Petro–Canada was formed.

If one looks at the history of Petro–Canada primarily through the 1970s, Petro–Canada was steeped in controversy, not because of its existence, but because it was often operating in the oil markets. Although it was a public sector company, it operated both in terms of acquisitions and in terms of what was then referred to as state–to–state purchases in a very questionable manner.

• (1550 )

I just raised two for the hon. member's reflection. One was the purchase of Petrofina. To this day this government has paid a political price for the manner in which we handled Petrofina. When we came into office we had said that we would like to release the information on Petrofina only to discover that we could not release that information to the Auditor General because previous government and cabinet confidences could not be released. I regret that to this day because I think it was an unfair blemish on a company for which I now, as Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, take responsibility. We have not resolved that Petrofina issue in the minds of the public to this day.

I think members opposite, as well as I, feel that our public duty is to give to the people this kind of public information, and we have not been able to do that. I regret that. I wish it could have been different.

Second, Petro–Canada did a state–to–state purchase once with Pemex in Mexico, the Mexican state–owned company. By the way, while they still have Pemex it is interesting to take a look at Mexico to see how that government is changing the role of Pemex in order that it, and Mexico, become more competitive in the oil and gas field. That is for another day.

What happened is that we lost a lot of money when we did that state–to–state purchase with Pemex. That is the oil business. My colleagues around me understand that. We take the highs and we take the lows. That is life, that is business. I understand that and I know my hon. friend opposite understands it. However, because Petro–Canada at that time was in the public arena, where the klieg lights of attention were very clearly focused on it, the question was: "Why did this company make that purchase? Was it because it was so government–directed that in fact it could not respond to the marketplace and

protect the shareholders who are the taxpayers of Canada?" That is the history.

I say to my hon. friends opposite that Petro-Canada was considered to be an instrument of government policy. I accept that. However, as has also been stated, in 1985, under the direction of this government, we gave it a commercial mandate. The corporation's current structure and financial situation reflect its early mandate and the path of development which was established at the time.

I think it is important to note that Petro-Canada's future will depend to a great extent on its ability to access the financing needed to take advantage of the opportunities presented for commercial growth. I only see access to capital in a very limited way. Where has Petro-Canada's access to capital been? It is done by votes in this House. That is how it is done; by votes in this House where we ask the taxpayers of Canada to put more money into Petro-Canada. That is one way. That is the way it has been done to the present time.

Second, Petro-Canada can make a profit. This year it made a profit of approximately $86 million. I am pleased that under my stewardship the company is making a profit.

**Mr. Peterson:** Keep going, Jake. Keep going Jake.

**Mr. Bouchard (Roberval):** Jim, he knows what he will do in the private sector.

**Mr. Epp:** I just know that when one looks at that profit picture, relative to capital used to make that profit, there is not one person in this House who would invest on that basis.

**Mr. Peterson:** So why do you expect Canadians to do it?

**Mr. Epp:** I will get to that, Jim, and I will want your money too.

That is the second way that we can get money for a company.

Third, we can access the financial market and place Petro-Canada against the test of the marketplace for investment.

In response to my friend from Willowdale, I believe Petro-Canada will be of the type where Canadians will invest in this company.

I have said another thing for a long time, whether I was in opposition or in government, about why foreign ownership in Canada is as high as it is and lower, for instance, in the United States. Maybe this is inappropriate for a cabinet minister, but I have wondered how we can change the tax laws so that blue collar workers, average Canadians, will be able to invest in Canadian industry on the same basis as other higher income Canadians. Why do average income Americans have such a higher percentage of investments in industry in the United States than Canadians have in Canada?

Granted, there are the personal pension plans as well as government pension plans. I understand that. When we consider why there is not more investment in Canadian industry and how Canadians can get a piece of ownership of the country, one of the arguments is to see how we change our tax laws so that average income Canadians make decisions on investments, take the risks and get the benefits of the marketplace. I think we have some lessons to learn in that respect. That is a valid observation when one takes a look at where we can increase ownership in our communities, by Canadians, in Canadian industry.

Going back to Petro-Canada and government policy, we obviously have relied more on competitive markets for decisions regarding energy supply, demand, pricing and trade. We consider that competitive prices provide the most appropriate and effective signals to both investors and consumers. Experience has proven to us as Canadians, that a market-oriented approach is better, both in economic terms and in terms of federal-provincial relations, than policies which emphasize heavy reliance upon regulation and government intervention.

My friend opposite made an interesting point. He said what we had to do was make sure that we had control of the oil and gas sector because it is "a strategic resource". I presume, partly because I come from Prairie Canada, that this is a very important issue for me.

When we joined Confederation there were only three provinces that were not deemed worthy of ownership of natural resources. One was my Province of Manitoba. When we joined in 1870 we were not deemed worthy. In fact, it is only this year that we have had ownership of resources for as long as we did not have ownership of our resources, 60 years.

When Alberta and Saskatchewan joined in 1905 they were placed under the same restriction as Manitoba had been since 1870. I am absolutely convinced, as I look at the National Energy Program, that it was not simply a visceral reaction that I had to the National Energy Program, it was also a reaction to the underlying philosophy that in certain areas of ownership, we the Prairie provinces were not going to act in the national interest.

I think that charge has never been substantiated and I think it is wrong in every one of its terms. We have always acted in the national interest. We have asked for that natural resource to be given the same kind of pricing mechanism, the same kind of market approach as any other commodity. That is what we asked for.

• (1600)

I remember the bumper stickers during the height of the National Energy Program. I do not have to repeat what they said. My colleagues opposite know what they were. Did it help federal–provincial relations? No. Did it help understanding between western Canadians and other Canadians? No. To this day we can still go into some parts of the country and they will remind us of that period. Surely we do not want to go back to that.

I remember in 1979—and maybe I should throw my notes away—the short period of time I was Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and responsible for energy north of 60. I wrote a letter to the then two governments of the territories telling them that as minister I expected them to act as if responsible government had been passed in law. It was known as the Epp letter. It still has not been rescinded to this day. Coming from the Prairies as I do, I had the feeling that people living north of 60 had the same ability to govern themselves as I thought we had south of 60.

I remember a predecessor, a former Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, saying to me: "Jake, I think on the constitutional issue you are probably right, but remember on the matter of natural resources, particularly oil and gas, that those resources belong to Ontario". I said to him: "You mean Canada". He said: "No, no. It is our ace in the hole against the west". It is that bottom line that drives me also on this issue of Petro–Canada.

I say to my hon. friends with all the charity I have that it is more than simply a philosophical argument about privatizing a company or not privatizing a company. The real issue is: How do we develop our resources for the benefit of Canada? How do we increase those reserves?

Let us take a look at what our reserves increased after the National Energy Program. Do you know what was happening with our reserves, Mr. Speaker? Obviously there is not going to be cash flow. They will leave it in the ground. That was what was happening.

Today, my hon. friends mentioned the reserves we have in natural gas and oil. Despite the fact that in the western sedimentary basin we are losing according to my last statistics about 1.1 per cent, our production this last 12 months was less than we had projected. We know we have to increase our production in heavy oil. That is why Lloydminster. We know we have to get into the east coast. That is why Hibernia, Terra Nova, Ben Nevis, and hopefully Cohasset–Panuke this year. That is why we did the Vancouver Island pipeline. That is why we changed the energy policy in respect to the National Energy Board that we can get export licences and we can move gas, for instance, into the U.S. northeast, into California, or into the midwest through Emerson. That is why, as I get that cash flow I know I get more energy. That is what has always driven the industry.

I remember opening up Leduc I, not in 1947 but just this last year. It is a museum piece today. There was a gentleman there who had been on Leduc in 1947, a sod buster from Saskatchewan who knew nothing about the oil industry as a young roughneck on that rig in 1947. He knew something about drilling water. He said: "We did it. We brought in a new industry. We did it because we knew we could do it. We didn't need the government behind us, but we knew Canadians would support us".

Petro–Canada is mature enough today with its controls and conditions that I believe it should be privatized. Canadians should invest in it. Canadians should be proud of it. Most of all, through that investment Canadians will ensure their energy resources much more than if it is held in the hands of whatever the name of the energy minister of the day might be.

**Mr. Joe Comuzzi (Thunder Bay—Nipigon):** Mr. Speaker, I compliment my friend on what he has just told us about his experience with respect to energy in Canada. Perhaps I could be allowed to make a comment. I am not so sure I have a question, but this is a period for comments and questions. What we have seen in reply to the statements which the energy minister and I have made today is a vital lesson in how this House operates. On both sides of the House the interests of Canadians are always paramount in our minds. Sometimes differences of opinion arise because we have a different methodology as to how we want to achieve the goal, but the goal is always the interests of Canadians. I compliment my friend, the minister, on his observations.

I have another comment to make. I do not know whether it is because the minister has many years on me, but he gave the history of 1975 when he was in this House, sitting on this side, as the Liberals were putting Petro–Canada into operation. I do not know whether he is that much older than I or whether I am just late in getting to the House. However, I am going to give him the benefit of the doubt and say that I was watching in those years as a citizen interested in government. He is a person who is involved in government. We come from the same age brackets, so I will not prolong that.

When the minister was talking about Petrofina the thought came to my mind that just at that time another government of the day, the Government of Ontario led by Premier Bill Davis, acquired Sun Oil. I am wondering if there was not at that particular period of time the same critique that was given with respect to the Liberal acquisition of Petrofina? Could it not have been applied to the Conservative government of the day in Ontario? Perhaps the minister would like to comment on that, with his wealth of knowledge in the historical energy perspective of this country.

**Mr. Epp:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is too kind in his words. As I have said before, one of my mentors in this House was a predecessor of his, the hon. Bob Andras. Bob and I were good friends. Obviously his contribution to the country was always something that I looked at, and the manner in which he conducted his responsibilities. He possibly did not get involved in the kind of high level partisanship that from time to time some of us might even decry in this House. If he wants to know the real reason why I had some difficulty criticizing him, it is that he had been in the automobile industry before and I had been as well. They say that fellows who have been selling cars always have a certain affinity afterwards.

Coming back directly to the hon. member's point, yes, there was similar criticism when the Ontario government of the day bought Sun Oil. In fact, if the hon. member goes back, there was also an investment, for example, into Suncor at that time, in the oil sands in northeastern Alberta. There has been some discussion when the federal government removed itself from OSLO. It did the engineering but said that it would not invest further in OSLO. There was some hope that the provincial Government of Ontario would possibly consider investing in OSLO.

It will be interesting to see whether the present Government of Ontario, which believes in public ownership and which I am sure has a lot of money to spend, might consider investing in OSLO. We will wait to see whether or not it will repeat the days of the Davis government in respect to investments in the oil and gas industry in Alberta.

• (1610 )

The other point I have to make is that Canadians were led to believe at the time Petro–Canada was formed that Petro–Canada would "keep the price of gasoline down". I think there was a sincere feeling among many Canadians that this would be the case.

At the time, we had the Seven Sisters and we have now moved to the Three Brothers. In fact Petro–Canada raised the price. The hon. member made that point. It was two cents to start with and it went to four cents a litre. Whether you bought gasoline at whatever service station you paid four cents a litre more, through all those years, for the acquisitions that Petro–Canada was making at the time. It is false that Petro–Canada lowered prices. Maybe the impression left was not correct, but it increased the prices.

The second point concerns pricing. When one looks at pricing today, I have the mechanisms as the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, through the Petroleum Monitoring Agency, to do the very things that people thought Petro–Canada should have the ability to do. However, I believe it never had the wherewithal because it was in the marketplace, because it was trying to increase its market share, to be able to exercise that kind of discipline which the PMA is able to do. So, even on that score I do not think Petro–Canada fulfilled or could

fulfil some of the roles that some people had expected or hoped it might do.

**Mr. Jack Whittaker (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt):** Mr. Speaker, I was interested very much in the comments of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and I just wanted to share with him some of what I have been getting in letters not only from my riding of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt but other places throughout Canada.

I think that people were not just looking at the perception that PetroCan would keep gas prices down, I think they had a real sense of pride in the fact that Canada was a major player in their own destiny, in their own retailing and refining of gasoline products. I think they saw PetroCan maybe getting into other areas, such as the recycling of oil, using the oil profits for research and alternate energy areas. There was this feeling, I think, when PetroCan came in that there was partial ownership instead of control of our oil destiny in the hands of large multinationals. There was a feeling that we as Canadians, as Canadian taxpayers, own this company, control it as Canadians, and that it was designed and directed to serve the best interests of Canadians.

Compliments to the minister if it is to his credit that credit is due that PetroCan is now making $86 million in profits, but people are asking why sell off a company that is working, that is making a profit, at a time in Canada when we are trying to find ways of fighting the deficit and the Canadian debt. Why sell off a profitable corporation that we, as Canadians, have been so proud of for such a short period of time. Why is the government selling this corporation now?

**Mr. Epp:** Mr. Speaker, I will try and be brief.

The hon. member makes the point that yes, there were people who were very proud of Petro-Canada. I think they also were able to expand that in the manner in which they advertised when they used the "Share the Flame" concept.

The $86 million that I referred to in terms of profit, though very little relative to capital used, does not come anywhere close to the kind of expansion that Petro-Canada needs in the money markets. We need on the short side, if we are selling short, possibly $400 million minimum and possibly in the area of $500 million to $600 million. So the 86 comes far short, if the kind of mandate that Petro-Canada now has is to be exercised.

The hon. member makes a valid point, in terms of Canadian ownership. I tried to explain at least my own personal views in terms of investment. I would like to see average Canadians invest in Canadian industry and I would like, quite frankly, to see some changes in respect to tax law and the manner in which that might be done.

That is why the provision is in the bill that not more than 25 per cent of this company can be non-Canadian, in fact, it can be 100 per cent Canadian. Even if it was maxed out at 25 per cent non-Canadian, that would change Canadian ownership by about 1.6 per cent, subject to that the oil and gas industry in Canada would have no growth. If there is growth, that 1.6 per cent goes down. I think, in that respect, we have tried to protect as much as possible some of the very issues that the hon. member has mentioned. Where we part company is the value of public ownership versus private ownership.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Before resuming debate, 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 Drummond (Mr. Guilbeault)—Textile Industry; the hon. member for Halifax (Ms. Clancy)—Air Canada; the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand)—Conventional forces in Europe agreement.

Just before lunch today, the hon. member for Nickel Belt proposed an amendment to the motion for third reading of Bill C-84. The Chair took the proposed amendment under advisement at that time. I am now prepared to rule on its acceptability.

The proposed amendment seeks to refer the bill back to a legislative committee and to instruct that committee to add a new clause to the bill which would specify that the bill come into force on a day five years after its adoption.

I will refer hon. members to Beauchesne's fifth edition, citation 804 which deals with the types of amendments that can be moved at third reading. It states that amendments:

—should not seek to give a mandatory Instruction to a committee.

As this is what the proposed amendment seeks to do, I must rule it out of order. Resuming debate, the hon. member for Scarborough West.

**Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West):** Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully this morning to the speech of the Minister of State for Privatization and listened with equal care to the remarks of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. It is very interesting that both ministers took us back in history to their recollections of what occurred when Petro–Canada came into being.

It is even more interesting because I held a public forum in my riding last Thursday on the subject of privatization and specifically the subject of Petro–Canada. The people in attendance at the public forum reflected with me on their historical recollections about how it was that Petro–Canada came into being.

At that time I was not fortunate enough to be a member of this House; I was more concerned then with getting through law school. As I recall the circumstances surrounding the creation of Petro–Canada, it was at a time when Canadians suddenly came to the immense realization that we did not control our natural resources. In fact, most of our natural resources, particularly the oil industry, were controlled by multinational corporations based in countries other than Canada.

At the same time as we came to that rather shocking revelation, we also had the first oil embargo by the Arab countries. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that that was the time when President Nixon of the United States promised that there would be complete autonomy in the United States with respect to energy. He lowered the speed limit to 55 miles per hour and did many other dramatic things. We, on this side of the border, were equally concerned that we would be held for ransom by foreign countries. My recollection as an ordinary Canadian was that those were the two factors that propelled us into forming Petro–Canada. I recall that one of the reasons we had the logo of Petro–Canada with its partial Canadian flag was so that we would feel we were doing something Canadian, something to benefit our country and that we were doing something to benefit ourselves every time we filled up at a Petro–Canada station.

• (1620)

I recall many of my friends and relatives saying: "Well, if I have to go to a Petro–Canada station instead of a Sunoco or a Texaco I will do so, because that is going to benefit my country. Every time I fill up I am making an investment for myself because I own Petro–Canada along with 26 million other Canadians who own shares, if you will, through the House of Commons and through the minister".

That is my historical recollection of how Petro–Canada came into being, why it came into being, and the public policies that it served.

I asked myself in considering Bill C–84 what the reasons are for wanting to privatize it now. Both the Minister of State for Privatization and the minister of energy quite clearly gave us two very specific reasons.

The first one is that in their view government ownership is no longer required to fulfil a public policy role. They were both charitable enough to admit that there are two sides, possibly even more to this debate, and that while the Conservative government holds a particular view, the opposition may, quite rightly, hold an opposite view.

I would like to remind this House of some of the reasons for the creation of Petro–Canada: nationalism, pride in Canada, a direct desire to control our energy industry, a direct desire to be free from the potential of being held to ransom by other countries. We created Petro–Canada which is 100 per cent owned by the people of this country. And what was the result of the creation of Petro–Canada? Well, I have tallied some results which I think are rather important.

Canadians contributed to the creation Petro–Canada. We heard the minister talk about the gas tax that was levied in order to help build Petro–Canada. In fact, over time Canadians have contributed $4.3 billion to this company and quite proudly for the most part.

This company now has assets of $6.8 billion. It has a current debt of $1.9 billion, not a bad ratio. It has net earnings in 1989 of $31 million, so the company is profitable. It has retail outlets totalling 3,295. It has four refineries. It employs 6,468 people across this country. It is the second largest integrated oil and gas company in Canada standing only behind Imperial Oil, which of course is controlled by Exxon, which is a foreign corporation. It is the only Canadian–owned enterprise operating coast to coast on a fully integrated basis within the

petroleum industry. It has a retail market share of almost 20 per cent. It has the second highest oil reserves of any company in Canada and the second highest gas reserves of any company in Canada, according to *Oilweek*. It is first, not second, in Canadian net land ownings.

That is what I call a company, and that is what I call an investment by Canadians. In the short time that Petro–Canada has been with us we have had a major competitor in the oil industry. Unfortunately the Tories want to sell this very excellent enterprise out from under us. Why? Because they say it no longer fulfils a public policy role.

A little more history: the Conservatives have hated Petro–Canada virtually since its inception. The former Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Joe Clark's personal crusade was to privatize Petro–Canada. Since 1984, when the Conservatives came to power, the government has ignored the public policy role that Petro–Canada could play. It is, of course, no wonder that seven years later, after having ignored the public policy role, it says it is no longer fulfilling the public policy role. The public policy role was not nurtured for seven years of Conservative rule.

I say on the contrary that Petro–Canada can and does fulfil the public policy role.

It is 100 per cent Canadian owned just as it was when it was created and for the very reasons for which it was created. It is a strong voice for all Canadians in the industry. It is profitable and well run. It does do things that the private sector would back out of.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources mentioned one of them. It has backed the Hibernia project in Newfoundland. As we know, private corporations were timid about backing the Hibernia project. So which company was it that was not timid? Which company looked at the public policy and decided that there was necessity for an oil industry on the east coast in Newfoundland? It was Petro–Canada, 100 per cent owned by Canadians, working for Canadians.

Petro–Canada helps to protect us from the vagaries of the marketplace. We are no longer completely subject to to what the oil Sheikhdoms will do.

In my view it provides a public policy buffer to the decisions which might be made by the private sector concerning our national interests.

Decisions with respect to operations of a company that are made in the national interests are more important than decisions made for corporate self–interest, which is profit, profit, profit. One of the reasons Petro–Canada was created was to ensure that if there ever was a conflict between the national interest of all Canadians and the market drive for profit, profit, profit, the national interest would prevail.

Here, I admit we are in the realm of speculation. What might happen if Petro–Canada is sold? We heard the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources make the point that he wants Canadians to own a piece of Petro–Canada. He was lamenting the fact that certain tax rules do not permit blue collar workers the kind of access they might otherwise have. Well, the fact of the matter is that all blue collar workers, all white collar workers, all millionaires, all people on welfare, all Canadians already own Petro–Canada. To put it on the market and make us buy it again is the height of folly. We are selling something to ourselves that we already own. To me that does not make a lot of sense.

What is going to happen to the money that is being used to purchase these shares? If that money is being used to buy something we already own, it obviously cannot be used to invest in other markets and other businesses in the marketplace. Therefore, it is going to suck money out of the investment community. Where is that money going to come from if we need more money? Other businesses need that money and if it is not there because somebody has invested in Petro–Canada, where is it going to come from? Perhaps it will come from foreign ownership and we will have come completely full circle, back to a realization that we are not masters in our own home.

Privatization is certainly no guarantee of financial success. We need only look at Air Canada. The Minister of State for Privatization mentioned Air Canada this morning in his remarks. We know that Air Canada was privatized by this government. What have we seen since that privatization? Among other things, we have seen falling profits and the cutting of Air Canada's workforce. Is that what is going to happen with Petro–Canada? If not, its motive is going to be profit, profit, profit, to make sure that does not happen. When there is a conflict between perceived national interest and profit, it will be profit every time in the private sector.

• (1630)

Both ministers also suggested a second reason for privatizing Petro-Canada at this time. It needs money, or at least that is what the chairman of Petro-Canada says. It needs an infusion of capital of $500 million so that it can do some of the projects that it wishes to do.

What kind of projects? It wishes to continue exploration and development, the same kind of exploration and development that it has done since its inception, financed by the people of Canada. Why? Because the people of Canada own Petro-Canada. They have a piece of it already. In any event, it needs that $500 million.

The minister was quite right. Either it comes from the private sector, or it comes from the people of Canada through this House. That is a major philosophical difference between the two sides of the House as to where that money comes from. It does not make sense to me that we should sell ourselves something that we already own in order to get that $500 million. That is the same as saying that we should appropriate it through the House since we already own it, in my view.

I would say that careful and sound business management of this company, showing a profit, as the minister has said—and I applaud him for the fact that it shows a profit—will produce the same results in the long run. Certain things may have to be held off or financed in a creative way, but that is what we call business. That is why businessmen are employed to head companies such as this, to come up with the methods to do it. One of them is not to sell us back what we already own and to give up control of what we need, and that is control in the national interest of the second largest oil company in Canada.

As we have heard, the increases in world prices since the unfortunate events have unfolded in the Persian Gulf have also obviously increased the assets of the reserves, which we know are the second largest held by any company in Canada. Surely, there can be something done there at this time in order to creatively finance to come up with whatever moneys are needed for further capital investment.

I reflect the views I think of my constituents, based on the polling that I have done, the discussions I have had, the letters I have received, and the public forum that I held last Thursday, when I say, as a concerned Canadian, as a member of Parliament, as someone who looked at the history of the development of Petro-Canada from perhaps a different vantage point than someone who was in the House and saw what was going on behind the curtains, as he said—I just saw what was going on in the newspapers and television—this is not the time to sell Petro-Canada. Rather, this is the time to preserve and promote it as a unifying force benefiting all Canadians.

**Mr. Al Johnson (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend mentioned a number of times that he feels that the government is selling us back what we already own. I find this a rather extraordinary thought. If I live in a house and I have an enormous mortgage on it, I do not frankly believe that I own that house. I believe that the bank owns it until I have paid for it.

The problem that I see with what he is suggesting is that we are in a situation where we have an enormous debt associated with the acquisition of Petro-Canada. In my view, we do not own anything. All we are doing in selling Petro-Canada is that we are getting this debt off the backs of Canadians.

I would appreciate if he could elaborate or explore this concept a little further and explain to me how he thinks we are buying something that we already own when we have such enormous debt associated with its acquisition.

**Mr. Wappel:** I thank the hon. member for his question. I think I can explain it using the analogy of the house, but first let us take a look.

What kind of a company do we have? We have a company with present assets of $6.8 billion and a debt of $1.9 billion. Simple mathematics show me that it has some value, in fact a great deal of value.

If we buy a house, pay into that mortgage, and develop an equity over a period of time, we may still have a mortgage and we may very well have paid in a lot of money by way of interest payments, but that property is still ours. The equity in the house is still ours. We still go around saying: "That is my home." We do not say that is Canada Permanent's house because it holds the first mortgage. We say: "That is our house. We own that house, subject to a mortgage."

We have invested $4.3 billion of our own money into building this company that has assets of $6.8 billion. Having invested that money, surely we are entitled over

the course of time to reap the benefits of that investment? Apparently not. We are going to privatize it and then, if we wish to continue to have ownership, we will have to buy those shares individually in the marketplace. The people who do not have the income will not be able to buy the shares. Yet, right now, every single Canadian owns a piece of the action. No one will be able to say that when privatization takes place.

Sure, we have paid a lot of money in, but in the meantime, we have developed a company with significant assets. So we do, in fact, own it.

**Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean):** Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to be able to ask this question of the minister and time did not allow it, so I will ask the question of my colleague from Scarborough West.

We know that the Crown corporation has had many involvements around the world. There are some that have been in countries where human rights violations have occurred. Canada, being a peace-loving country, has always been concerned. It certainly has been to me and to most members of this House. I believe in May a question was asked of the minister with regard to Petro-Canada International, which is the development arm of Petro-Canada.

It has withdrawn from a country called Myanmar because of its serious human rights violations there. Petro-Canada itself continues to operate a $22 million oil-drilling contract. There seems to be a contradiction there. The minister was asked about this and yet responded at that time that he had no intention of asking Petro-Canada to withdraw from Myanmar. Even as recently as September, the Secretary of State for External Affairs outlined his very deep concern for the human rights violations in that country.

I know that this is not a question that probably relates to the sale of Petro-Canada but, as the human rights critic for the opposition party, I am very concerned about this. Has the government asked Petro-Canada to suspend any development with any country that has proven human rights violations? Does the hon. member agree with me that if it has not, it certainly should?

**Mr. Wappel:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I very much regret the fact that my colleague for Nepean was not able to put that question to the minister after his speech, but perhaps he will have an opportunity to address it.

Yes, I agree that we should be looking at human rights violations and we should be encouraging corporations that are based in Canada to suspend business from those countries which grossly or, indeed, minorly abuse human rights. However, this is a perfect example of what I am talking about. If it is the Government of Canada's objective to promote human rights, what better way to promote it than through a corporation which is owned by the people of Canada and which can manifest the national interest including the preservation of human rights? What kind of control are we going to be able to have over Petro-Canada when it is in the private sector and decides to operate such a refinery in Myanmar?

If it was a corporation with one share held by the minister, as he pointed out, perhaps it would be more possible to attend a board meeting and explain to the board of directors that this is not in the national interests of Canada.

I thank my hon. friend for drawing it to my attention. It is just another reason why we should have control over this company and why it should not be privatized.

**Mr. Johnson:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It occurs to me that that question would certainly have been more appropriate if directed to the minister. I wonder if there would not be unanimous consent to allow the minister to answer it? I am sure the House would like to hear his answer.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is the House agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

• (1640 )

**Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I will try to respect the time that the House has given to me to try to answer the question.

There is no doubt with Petro-Canada International Assistance Corporation that when contracts are made at this stage, they are made directly with Petro-Canada. The budget is in the neighbourhood of $52 million a year. I may be out a bit, but it is in that area.

In Myanmar, there was a commercial agreement that was signed and under the auspices of the terms of that

commercial agreement it was not seen to be possible to withdraw from that agreement. That is why the answers are in the manner in which I gave them.

It is the plan of the government presently to examine the role of Petro–Canada International and in a new regime, when Petro–Canada itself is privatized, it has been my position, as Minister of Energy, that I think it gave us an opportunity, along with CIDA, to get us involved in high technology areas in the developing world, other than simply food aid. I am not trying to deprecate food aid, but we also had a look at how could we expand the commercial interest of the countries involved. The decisions have not been finalized in Petro–Canada International.

What the hon. member raises is true, whether it is a Crown corporation, such as Petro–Canada, or a privatized Petro–Canada. In a number of countries we have commercial contracts for the purposes of advancing their oil and gas. Governments change. Coups take place, and human rights violations occur. The hon. member is absolutely right.

I find it difficult to see, once a commercial agreement has been signed, how we could then get out of that commercial agreement. The other point that is valid is, prior to those commercial agreements, what kind of evaluations we place into them as we make a decision as to whether or not to finance through Petro–Canada International any activity.

I am well aware of the situation. I am being somewhat cautious in this, but I point out to her, in looking at some work, for example, in a number of countries where we are involved in Latin America, that in a number of those countries human rights violations cases can be made and have been made by various international organizations. For us, however, as Canada, where we are trying to get involved more and more in Latin America, Petro–Canada International has been one of those vehicles.

The balance between the human rights issue and the other issues relating to influence and investment opportunities have to be balanced off, even though I think the hon. member made a valid point about the situation in Myanmar.

**Mr. Lee:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Recognizing that the House will terminate debate very shortly, I rise on a matter involving an item unrelated to Bill C–84, but involving Private Members' Business. I understand that if I have the unanimous consent of the House to introduce a motion, which I have made known to all members by correspondence, that I may introduce it.

I would ask the Speaker if I do have unanimous consent of the House to introduce this Private Members' Business motion dealing with permitting the continuation of Private Members' Business through the sessional adjournment and prorogation which we anticipate will occur. Would the Speaker ask if I have the unanimous consent of the House?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to move his motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** There is not unanimous consent. Resuming debate, the hon. member for Calgary Southwest who has one minute remaining.

**Mrs. Barbara Sparrow (Calgary Southwest):** Mr. Speaker, in the one minute I am pleased to stand again with regard to Bill C–84 and the privatization of Petro–Canada.

I think most people here in the House do not realize that when an oil company sells a barrel of oil or an mcs of gas, it has to replace it, and the cost of exploration, the cost of development and production is extremely expensive.

Petro–Canada is now in a financial bind where it needs money to expand and pursue an aggressive oil and gas investment activity. What we are doing here is really untying the apron strings or letting it out into the marketplace where it will be able to access funding and capital.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please. It being 4.45 o'clock p.m. pursuant to order made in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78(3) on Tuesday, December 11, 1990, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of third reading of the bill.

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 yeas 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 agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 384*)

YEAS

Members

Anderson
Andre
Atkinson
Attewell
Beatty
Belsher
Bertrand
Bird
Bjornson
Blackburn (Jonquière)
Blais
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bouchard (Roberval)
Bourgault
Brightwell
Browes
Cadieux
Cardiff
Casey
Chadwick
Champagne (Champlain)
Charest
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Clifford
Cole
Collins
Cooper
Corbeil
Corbett
Côté
Couture
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Danis
Darling
Dobbie
Domm
Dorin
Duplessis
Edwards
Epp
Fee
Feltham
Ferland
Fontaine
Fretz
Friesen
Gibeau
Greene
Grey (Beaver River)
Guilbault
Gustafson
Halliday
Harvey (Chicoutimi)
Hawkes
Hicks
Hockin
Hogue
Holtmann
Horner
Hudon
Hughes
James
Jelinek
Johnson
Joncas
Jourdenais
Kempling
Koury
Landry
Langlois
Larrivée
Layton
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lewis
Littlechild
Loiselle
Lopez
MacDonald (Rosedale)
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Malone
Marin
Martin (Lincoln)
Masse
Mazankowski
McCreath
McDermid
McDougall (St. Paul's)
McKnight
McLean
Merrithew
Monteith
Nicholson
Oberle
O'Kurley
Plamondon
Plourde
Porter
Pronovost
Redway
Reid
Reimer
Ricard
Richardson
Robitaille
Rocheleau
Roy-Arcelin
Saint-Julien
Schneider
Scott (Victoria—Haliburton)
Scott (Hamilton—Wentworth)
Shields
Siddon
Sobeski
Soetens
Sparrow
Stevenson
Tardif
Tétreault
Thompson
Thorkelson
Tremblay (Québec-Est)
Tremblay (Lotbinière)
Turner (Halton—Peel)
Van de Walle
Vankoughnet
Venne
Vézina
Vien
Vincent
Weiner
White
Wilbee
Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia)
Wilson (Etobicoke Centre)
Winegard
Worthy—138

NAYS

Members

Allmand
Althouse
Angus
Assad
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bélair
Bellemare
Benjamin
Berger
Black
Blackburn (Brant)
Blaikie
Boudria
Brewin
Butland
Caccia
Callbeck
Campbell (South West Nova)
Catterall
Clancy
Comuzzi
Copps
Crawford
de Jong
Dionne
Duhamel
Ferguson
Finestone
Fisher
Flis
Fulton
Gaffney
Gagliano
Gardiner
Gauthier
Gray (Windsor West)
Harb
Heap
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Hunter
Kaplan
Keyes
Langdon (Essex—Windsor)
LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
MacAulay
MacDonald (Dartmouth)
MacLellan
Maheu
Manley
Marchi
Marleau
McGuire
McLaughlin
Milliken
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
Nunziata
Nystrom
Pagtakhan
Parent
Parker
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard
Proud
Prud'homme
Rideout
Riis
Rodriguez
Rompkey
Simmons
Skelly (Comox—Alberni)
Speller
Stewart
Stupich
Taylor
Walker
Wappel
Whittaker
Wood
Young (Beaches —Woodbine)—84

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—BILLS

[*English*]

### CRIMINAL CODE

MEASURE TO AMEND

**Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan)** moved that Bill C–271, an act to amend the Criminal Code (facsimile advertising), be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, perhaps some members think that today is the adjournment debate as opposed to some other point in time.

I am pleased to rise to speak on Bill C–271, an act to amend the Criminal Code, facsimile advertising, commonly known as junk faxes.

The reason I presented this bill is to deal with an emerging problem within the business community and in other sections of society that are using facsimile machines in their places of work. The bill is very specific. It is an amendment to section 426 of the Criminal Code of Canada and it reads as follows:

> Everyone who sends to a person or organization through a telephone network an unrequested facsimile communication advertising for sale or goods any service is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction and is liable to a fine not exceeding $200.

What I would like to do is lay out for members in the House some of the background to the problem of junk faxes. Fax machines are not new. They were around in the mid–1970s, very cumbersome, very expensive and out of the reach of most offices and certainly, very slow and very expensive to utilize.

However, since the new generation of faxes were introduced in the mid–1980s there has been an explosion. In 1986 there were only 100,000 such machines in Canada. By the end of 1989 that had grown to 210,000. By the end of this year, that number doubled again to 420,000, and it is estimated by Evans Research Corporation that by the end of 1993 there will be one million facsimile machines in operation in this country. That does not include the proliferation of what is called a fax board in micro computers. That is a computer component that you can plug into your computer that can list as many as 999 telephone numbers which you can utilize to send out an electronic facsimile message in one command.

A *La Presse* poll shows that 95 per cent of Montreal businesses had fax machines in November 1989 and of the remainder, half planned to buy a fax machine within six months. So it is definitely a growing situation, at least in terms of the machines.

Let me turn to the problem of the junk faxes. Fax advertising is a dream come true for advertisers who can force an unwilling audience to shoulder a substantial burden of their costs. All of us in this House get complaints about junk mail, about those advertising flyers that come to our mailbox unsolicited. Those flyers do not cost the recipient anything, other than aggravation and most times just go into the round filing cabinet. But in terms of junk faxes, anyone can send to you at your place of business or at your home if you have a fax there, a message offering for sale the good or service that particular company wants to sell and you have to pay the cost of printing that flyer. That is the difference.

The Canadian Federation of Independent Business in their membership survey in October 1989, asked if there should be regulations protecting the public from advertising by businesses via fax machines. Eighty–one per cent of the respondants said yes; 10 per cent said no; 5 per cent were undecided and 4 per cent had no interest in the issue.

• (1720 )

The Canadian Radio–television and Telecommunications Commission believes it cannot deal with junk faxes because it has no authority over the content of what is carried on telephone lines. That is according to one of their information officers. Also, neither they nor Bell report hearing any complaints on unsolicited fax advertising. I will come back to that in a moment.

In the United States, two states have passed laws banning unsolicited faxes; Maryland and Connecticut. Lobbying, favouring and opposing the law was intense. The Maryland law provides for fines of up to $5,000 for repeat offenders, while the Connecticut law has fines of up to $500, or three months in jail. As well, a U.S. federal panel approved legislation to establish lists of

telephone subscribers who do not wish to receive unsolicited messages.

I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that my particular bill calls for only a fine of up to $200 and does not include any kind of incarceration whatsoever.

There is also an environmental angle as opposed to the harassment and the cost angle. One basic tenet of environmentalism and the efficient use of resources is that those who use resources should be the ones to pay for them. Thus there is incentive to conserve and to use paper products more efficiently.

Unsolicited facsimile advertising shifts the cost of resource–use, paper, electricity and mechanical wear and tear, away from advertisers, reducing the incentive for efficiency.

Moreover, the end product, almost invariably destined for our overloaded waste disposal system, is chemically treated and cannot be recycled with technology currently in use in Canada.

There are at least two suggestions as to why this bill should not be considered and let me deal with them. The first is that limits on unsolicited fax mail violate free speech. Nobody can force someone to buy a book or newspaper that they do not want and yet this is not seen as a limit on free speech.

This is the one medium requiring the recipient to bear directly a major portion of the cost of advertising. Speaking of freedom and choices, there is no choice for the recipient when junk mail comes through the machine.

The second argument may be that this is a basic tool in modern advertising. Taking it away puts businesses at a competitive disadvantage. On the contrary, it puts them on that level playing field businesses find so attractive. Besides there are some things more important than competitive advantage. This is an issue of equality.

Let me go back to my bill for a moment because there are two key elements in it. One refers to "unrequested facsimile communication". Those of us who have fax machines have them for a reason, to send and receive information.

If we are in the business of communicating with others via fax, we do not want our machines tied up by an unsolicited fax message, selling us something or other, perhaps the menu at the local restaurant, unsolicited. Those machines are important business tools and should not be used frivolously.

The key part is the unrequested part. Manufacturers who wish to use facsimiles to inform customers of new products can make prior arrangements with those companies to receive fax messages dealing with the sale of goods or services. That is all that is required, a courtesy call to the potential recipient to see if they are willing to receive information via facsimile on new products that are available. I think in a lot of cases, people would say yes to selected suppliers.

The other part is the element that says, "advertising for sale any goods or service". That is very specific, very clear. It is not talking about faxing a letter to a minister dealing with a subject matter; not preventing faxing of a letter to a company requesting information, but specifically banning advertising for sale any goods or services.

I think the matter is worthy of study and implementation. I just want to make two final comments. One of the responsibilities of members of the House of Commons is to anticipate problems, to not wait until a problem has developed into an issue; to not wait until there are people pounding on our doors demanding some protection.

Our job is to anticipate, and where we have information to suggest that there is a change in society. We are in an ever–evolving society particularly when it comes to technology. We should anticipate problems and provide the administrators of our law with the tools in order to protect people who are being abused by what is currently legal activity.

I would urge my colleagues in the House of Commons to consider the positive aspects of this bill, to agree to support the motion and refer it to a legislative committee so that we can put on the books a law that protects the owners of facsimile machines from unsolicited junk mail being sent to them at the recipients' expense. I appreciate the opportunity to address my bill and I look forward to the comments of other hon. members.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** On a point of order, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons.

**Mr. Cooper:** Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties and the members of the House, and I am sure that you will find that there is unanimous

consent for this motion dealing with the adjournment of the House for the Christmas recess.

I move:

That, no later than five o'clock p.m. on Wednesday, December 19, 1990 the debate on Government Notice of Motion dated December 17, 1990 in the name of the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, regarding winter adjournment, be deemed to have been completed and all questions necessary to dispose of the said motion will be put forthwith and without further debate, provided that each opposition party has had an opportunity to move an amendment or subamendment.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is there unanimous consent for considering the motion of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Shall I dispense with reading the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**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):** Agreed and so ordered.

Motion agreed to.

[*English*]

**Mr. Rob Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, I am of course speaking as a private member, as is my right in private members' hour.

Bill C-271 is an act to amend the Criminal Code. It makes it a crime to send advertising by means of a fax machine. It places it in the Criminal Code for the first time and, as I said, makes it a Criminal Code offence. When I heard about this bill this afternoon the first thing I said when I heard that somebody wanted to make it a crime to use a fax machine to sell something, I said, "I bet it is a member of the NDP who is sponsoring that bill", and I was right. I will tell you why I knew immediately that the NDP would be in favour of this.

Mr. Speaker, you show me any ill in society, you show me any nuisance in society, you show me any problem and I will show you a socialist who wants to make it a crime and wants to put it into the Criminal Code. I want to say to members of the NDP and the mover of this bill that you cannot solve all of the world's problems with the Criminal Code. We have to get away from the idea that the Criminal Code is a panacea for all the ills and nuisances that we find in society today. That is why I knew for sure that the NDP would be supporting and moving this bill.

I suggest to them that they look at this problem in its whole context, not take the simplistic view, the band-aid solution, and make it a crime but look at everything. Where in this bill is there any suggestion that we get provincial co-operation? Where is that? There is no reference to that. Where is there any reference for the kind of money that we are going to need to try to solve this problem? There is nothing here. This proposed legislation is completely bankrupt, all it talks about is using the power of the Criminal Code to fix this nuisance. I disagree with that. I say to members of the NDP, go to the root of this problem, go sit down with the people, find out why they have this urge to use facsimile machines for the purposes of advertising, spend some money on it.

**An hon. member:** It is money and greed.

• (1730 )

**Mr. Nicholson:** The hon. member says that it is money and greed. If it is money and greed that has caused this problem, why do members of the NDP not advocate spending some money to correct the problem? Why do they not talk to some of their friends in the union movement? I bet they would be pretty interested to know about this. Maybe some of them are already aware. Get on the phone to Bob White and say: "Bob, we have a heck of a problem here in Ottawa. Today, people are using facsimile machines to sell greeting cards. Tomorrow it could be automobiles". Then Bob would be worried. The next thing we know, they will be wanting to sell North American cars by facsimile machine. I think they will get his attention then. That is all I can say to the members of the NDP.

The Criminal Code has been with us for 100 years. It can do many things. I say to the hon. member to exhaust every avenue, do everything possible to solve these problems before we resort to legislation.

This is a nuisance. Obviously I disagree with the bill, and I urge the House to turn thumbs down on the suggestion of the hon. member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan.

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address this private member's bill dealing with the paper burden and inconvenience that has arisen from the unauthorized use or the overuse of facsimile machines in Canada and perhaps around the world.

I commend the member on his initiative in taking note of a problem area in the business world, one where there have been many complaints. I think it is fair to say that there has been a great deal of waste of facsimile paper. However sympathetic I am to the problem, I see that there are two or three items in the bill that should be addressed here in the House before it continues to committee, if that is to take place.

The first item I would like to address is the issue of the burden of proof, if I may put it that way. This is a Criminal Code amendment. If passed, this will become a criminal law. What it actually requires, if there is to be a conviction, is that a prosecutor or complainant must show beyond a reasonable doubt what is basically a conceptual negative, because the wording refers to everyone who sends an unrequested facsimile communication.

When the prosecutor goes to charge and present the evidence, the prosecutor or the complainant must show that the facsimile was unrequested. It may be alleged in defence that the fax transmission was impliedly or specifically requested. That is a difficult thing for a prosecutor to prove. It is impossible to prove a negative. In most circumstances, at a minimum, it is very difficult and therefore procedurally the challenge on the prosecution to prove this negative should be addressed. There might be another way of stating the burden of proof within the section to preclude that problem.

Another one is that we are dealing with a machine, not a person. The bill suggests that a facsimile must be sent to a person or an organization through a fax machine. Yet, the whole focus of the offence is the receipt by a fax machine. That is a fairly innocuous event. Fax machines are made to receive communications.

It is actually similar to an unsolicited telephone communication. There are telephone solicitation techniques being used now where those doing the solicitation simply program into a computer a pre-recorded message. It runs through the phone bank and makes all the phone calls. The same thing could happen with a fax machine. It is an area that is not easy to address in the criminal law. The fact is that this is not a very good way of advertising. Perhaps if you are advertising fax paper it might be, but because these machines are very impersonal a lot of this stuff is simply trashed upon receipt. An item in this debate that was addressed earlier is that the receipt of this unsolicited material is an annoyance. It might be a waste of paper as well, but it is merely an annoyance. I do not believe it may be something we want to address with the Criminal Code provision. I suspect it is not significant enough that we must resort to the Criminal Code.

For that reason, if the matter is to go on to committee I really think that that issue should receive some scrutiny.

One thing that is not within the bill is a definition of a facsimile transmission. We have to recall, as the hon. member who introduced the bill pointed out, that times are moving quickly technologically and while his proposal to the House is very much in keeping with that, it is an appropriate, timely response to a perceived problem, and we have to always be prepared to do that in this House, I am not so sure that the technology will not pass up and we will have a new generation of communications on our doorstep in another few years.

Therefore, the reference in the bill to facsimile may quickly become outmoded. I recall the House passing an amendment to the Criminal Code dealing with arson a few months ago and we managed to purge from the Criminal Code phrases referring to grain store houses and ammunition arsenals, terms that are just not used any more. I think the committee, if it is to go to committee, must look at the way in which the member has addressed the technology here as facsimile transmission.

Finally, and I am sure the hon. member will agree, there is the possibility of a charter issue here, the issue of free speech. Freedom of expression may cause us to question whether or not we wish to put restrictions on a communications device where an individual could, in error or perhaps in that grey area where you are not sure of the exact intent, send an unrequested facsimile transmission and thereby conceptually impair his or her freedom of expression and freedom of speech.

Having said all of that and tried my very best not to poke so many holes in this that it would collapse under its own weight, I would like to express my general support for the bill in attempting to address this problem. I would be hopeful that the matter could be sent to committee for further study of the issues I have referred to and other issues that the House and other members will likely want to raise.

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, I think if you check with the House you will find unanimous consent to consider that the hour for Private Members' Business will have expired on this one item and that we would move on to the two other items that we have for Private Members' Business at this time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

• (1740)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1), the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

* * *

## CANADA PENSION PLAN

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House proceed to the consideration of Bill C–260, an act to amend the Canada Pension Plan, as reported (with amendment) from the legislative committee.

**Mr. Bill Kempling (Burlington)** moved that the bill be concurred.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Kempling** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Kempling:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to the members of the House for allowing Bill C–260 to pass report stage and third reading at this time. I had great co–operation from the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, the hon. member for Kamloops, the hon. member for Halifax, the hon. member for Mississauga East, the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby, and the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier. I appreciate their support very much.

* * *

## WORKERS MOURNING DAY ACT

MEASURE TO ENACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C–233, an act respecting a day of mourning for persons killed or injured in the workplace, as reported (with amendment) from the legislative committee.

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill)** moved that the bill be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Murphy** moved that the bill be read a third time and passed.

**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):** Motion carried.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

[*English*]

**Mr. Murphy:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the House for the co–operation in having Bill C–223 adopted at report stage and third reading this afternoon. I, like one of the previous members, would like to thank the members of the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party who have enabled this bill to go forward. There was great co–operation in the House at both second reading and in committee hearings. I would like to thank the members for the work that they have done. I must say I hope that we get as quick a consideration and as much co–operation in the Senate.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Does the House agree to call it six o'clock?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

### TEXTILE INDUSTRY

**Mr. Jean-Guy Guilbault (Drummond):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak to a subject that is of particular interest to me, a subject I have already discussed in this House, and I am referring to the textile and clothing industries which are facing three major trade challenges.

First, they must adjust, efficiently and successfully, to the new Canada-U.S. trade system that has been in place since 1989. Second, they must adjust to the uncertain future of the Multi-Fibre Arrangement. And third, these industries will have to adjust to new changes in the tariff on textile products that will be introduced by the federal government to bring Canadian tariff levels more in line with those of our main trading partners.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I may recall that sales generated by the clothing and textile industry are worth respectively $8.5 billion and $5 billion annually in this country. We must also remember that these industries tend to be the most labour-intensive.

I may also recall that under the free trade agreement, Canada and the United States agreed to eliminate, over a ten-year period starting January 1, 1989, all tariffs and other restrictive measures applied at the border. Both countries will, however, apply their tariffs to imports from other countries.

The agreement contains four clauses relating to trade in textile products and clothing which are particularly important. First, rules of origin; second, tariff quotas; third, duty drawbacks; and fourth, duty remissions.

I may also recall that since 1974, trade in textiles and clothing has been regulated by the Arrangement Regarding International Trade in Textiles, better known as the Multi-Fibre Arrangement. Under the MFA, Canada has negotiated several bilateral agreements on quotas with certain countries in order to restrict imports of clothing and textile products.

This arrangement, which expires July 1, 1991, is currently the subject of multilateral trade negotiations under GATT. In connection with these multilateral trade negotiations, Canada and the United States have suggested terminating the MFA. Both countries are in favour of global quotas.

Furthermore, the European Economic Community and developing countries are anxious to see a gradual reduction in customs tariffs on textiles.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, on March 22 this year, the federal government announced a tariff rebate program to improve the competitive position of Canada's textile and clothing industries. The program consists of three parts: first, an immediate reduction in tariffs on 13 special fabrics and yarns not manufactured in Canada; second, new duty remission programs; and third, a textile tariff reduction program that would gradually bring these tariffs in line with levels set by other industrialized countries.

Mr. Speaker, Canada's tariff on textiles is substantially higher than in most other industrialized countries. The Canadian industry seems to be adjusting relatively well to free trade with the United States in the present circumstances. However, we must not forget that the exchange rate is still a major factor in maintaining our competitive position.

In fact, our industry will be able to compete with the U.S. as long as the Canadian dollar does not exceed U.S. $0.85 or U.S. $0.86.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, increased investment following the free trade talks reflected a desire to make the textile and clothing industries more competitive. It seems the textile industry stands to benefit more under free trade than the clothing industry.

In fact, the clothing industry is afraid that removal of the duty drawback program in 1994, together with the new double processing rule and low tariff quotas, will have a negative impact on future production.

In the textile industry, Canadian producers are afraid that as tariff barriers are lowered by importing countries, the American textile industry will act as a powerful magnet for future investment.

• (1750)

Others believe that the multilateral tariff reductions in the Uruguay round would not necessarily brighten export opportunities for clothes manufacturers since it might instead make it easier for Europeans to export their goods to this country.

Yet others fear that freer multilateral exchanges might reduce the Free Trade Agreement benefits for Canadian exporters competing on the American market with third world countries, for the United States might very well endorse multilateral tariff reductions. In that case, imports from low-wage countries would increase somewhat. This would lead to the implementation of certain quotas that have not been filled at this time. Now if we assume that lower textile tariffs resulting from the multilateral trade negotiations would be in addition to the tariff reduction proposed by the external trade Canadian tribunal, what might be in store for the textile and clothing industry?

As early as September 1986 at the beginning of the Uruguay round on multilateral trade negotiations, the ministers involved agreed to consider the possibility of integrating the textile and clothing sector under GATT.

Last November 16, a *Journal of Commerce* article entitled "Textile Management Fearful of Lopsided Agreement" reported that a group of eleven leaders representing seven professional associations and four American fibre, textile and clothing manufacturers wrote to special U.S. trade representative Carla Hills to warn her against the danger of endorsing an extremely lopsided agreement.

Here is how they put it: We simply cannot understand how the United States can be working with Hong Kong to find an acceptable formula with respect to fraud and regulation avoidance in the textile and clothing sector, when manufacturers in this country have participated in major fraudulent shipments.

Mr. Speaker, Europe and Portugal are also concerned that textiles might be adversely affected by a GATT agreement. By deleting the multifibre agreement, are we not removing the only true protection the textile and clothing industry has?

[*English*]

**Mr. Ross Belsher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for his continued interest in the textile industry of which many companies are in his riding.

On March 22, 1988, the government announced a three-part program of tariff relief initiatives designed to meet the needs of both the Canadian textile and apparel industries and to strengthen their competitiveness.

The program included tariff reductions on certain specialty fabrics which came into effect in 1988 and 1989; new duty remission programs which came into effect on January 1, 1989; and a plan to reduce textile tariffs, over a 10 year period, to levels comparable to those of other industrialized countries.

On February 6, 1989, the Minister of Finance asked the CITT to provide the government with advice on its plan to reduce textile tariffs bearing in mind a number of factors, including the economic importance of the textile industry; the textile industry's ongoing efforts, through heavy investment and rationalization of production, to enhance its viability and adjust to the international trading environment; and the major changes which will be occurring in Canada's trading arrangements as a result of the Canada—U.S. Free Trade Agreement and the Uruguay round.

In his request to the CITT, the Minister of Finance asked the tribunal to hear the views of all interested parties before determining the manner in which tariff reductions could best be implemented.

The CITT conducted a very open and transparent study. As the Minister of Finance has already noted in the House, several industry associations and close to 500 firms in the textile, clothing and other downstream industries participated in the year-long inquiry. More than 80 provided testimony during the six weeks of public hearings.

In addition to these representations, tribunal members visited more than 40 companies across the country to get a first-hand view of Canadian production operations and the challenges they face.

The CITT's inquiry gave interested parties every opportunity to make their views known. Since the CITT report was tabled in March of this year there has been ample time for industry to register its objections. The government has received additional comments from both the textile and apparel industries and officials have carefully considered them in their review of the CITT's recommendations. At the request of the textile and apparel industries, the Minister of Finance announced in July that the government's final response to the CITT recommendations will be made in the context of decisions to be taken in the current round of multilateral trade negotiations still under way.

I want to thank the hon. member again for his continued interest in this subject.

* * *

## AIR CANADA

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax):** Mr. Speaker, when I rose in this House two weeks ago, I had hoped that somehow this government would be able to do something about another disaster that had befallen Atlantic Canadians.

The policies of this government have been less than kind to my region. The abandonment of the fisheries, the economic recession, taxes, taxes, and more taxes—coupled of course with the worst tax of all, the GST—rising unemployment, escalating bankruptcies, record receiverships and even more lay-offs.

When it seemed that nearly all the candles were out in the Atlantic region, the government's policies snuffed out yet more. Air Canada, this government's privatization wonder child, announced that two reservation centres will be closed at the cost of at least 150 jobs in the metropolitan area of Halifax. At that time I asked the Minister of Transport to use his considerable influence with Air Canada's board to revoke its decision to close Air Canada's reservation centre in both the city of Halifax and at the Halifax airport.

The minister replied by saying:

> —Air Canada is now a public corporation. The shares are widely held.
>
> I think the last thing in the world the shareholders of Air Canada want is the government telling it which reservation counters to keep open and which ones to close.

Mr. Speaker, we are seeing the results of this kind of policy. The government's sell-all mentality has reduced it to a mechanism which seems to only serve Canadians by raising taxes. This of course is a service that Canadians are not too fond of. This government has become little more than a taxation office.

This government has been unable to come forward with direction or vision. It failed with free trade. It has failed with constitutional reform. It failed with protecting women. It has failed with providing child care. It has failed with a toothless environmental plan. Now it has failed with the privatization policy.

Each and every one of these policies has led to the same thing, most particularly in my region of the country, unemployment and higher taxes.

There are Air Canada personnel in Halifax with 16 years experience who have been told that their seniority is marginal, after 16 years of service to an area. We know that the technology is available. We know that the phone calls could be made to anywhere from anywhere. Why do the jobs have to be in Toronto instead of in Halifax?

One of the things, and I heard this discussion in the Halifax airport not too long ago, has to do with the particular regional flavour in the Atlantic. As I heard one person say—and I will not attempt to reproduce the accent but if my colleague, the member for Dartmouth, or one of my colleagues from Newfoundland were here I think you could understand—that if people from their particular areas call up, sometimes an ear that does not come from the Atlantic may have some difficulty in comprehending that this person wants to fly from Gander to Deer Lake, or from Moncton to Charlottetown. They will not understand the particular sensitivities and situations of Atlantic Canadians and that a service that supposedly is set up to care for the public will become much less caring and much less a benefit to the people it is supposed to serve.

We have all had experiences good and bad with airlines. But I remember in particular assistance that I have received from the people in reservations at Air Canada. That is the number you call. I was bringing a sick relative home from a fairly long trip. I reached the Halifax office from my out-of-town departure point, told them what the problem was, said I had no idea how serious the illness was, and those Air Canada personnel handled the situation so that the person who was ill was treated with the greatest kindness. Everything possible

was done to ensure her comfort and safety on her way home. Those people were there when we got to the airport, and to this day some of them still ask.

• (1800)

This is a service that rises out of the corporation's involvement in the community, the fact that those people know their clientele and their clientele knows them.

Suddenly, 150 of those people, the ones who have the most direct contact with the public, are being told to move to Toronto, take early retirement, or lose their job. It is unfair. It is not right and it is not something that we in the Atlantic region want to put up with any longer.

Perhaps I was being naive in asking the Minister of Transport to help. Perhaps I was being naive to think that this government cares to create a transportation policy that is meaningful to all regions of the country. Perhaps I am naive to believe that this government really has eyes to see, ears to hear, and a heart to feel the concerns of people who live outside the central core of this country. If it does not hear soon, the voices will be louder and louder, and they will be knocking on the very doors of this Chamber.

**Mr. Ross Belsher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for again raising this important question. I am pleased to participate in this debate this evening.

The hon. member raises the issue of cuts in Air Canada's work force in Atlantic Canada. She suggests for some reason that the federal government should get involved in a matter that is the exclusive responsibility of a private sector corporation responsible to its shareholders. How does the hon. member expect the shareholders, management and the employees of Air Canada to respond to the federal government's interference in the day-to-day management of the corporation?

One of the fundamental reasons Air Canada and 15 other Crown corporations have been privatized by this government was so business and commercial decisions such as these could be made by the private sector without the meddling of government and political interference such as that suggested by the hon. member.

The hon. member has suggested that deregulation has been a failure and has impacted on air travel in Atlantic Canada in a negative way. Informed opinion would beg to differ from her. The National Transportation Agency recently reported that in 1989 aviation activity was 20 per cent higher in Atlantic Canada in terms of passengers and air carrier activity than it was in 1985 pre-deregulation. That means more choices for consumers, more options for air carriers, and more business for the transportation, hospitality, tourism and general business community in Atlantic Canada and throughout the country.

The hon. member will recall that the special parliamentary committee examining the Canada-U.S. air services agreement was in Halifax just two weeks ago. During those hearings the Atlantic Provinces Transportation Commission said that economic deregulation of the aviation industry had benefited the Atlantic region significantly.

The commission reported that deregulation has led to greater frequency of flights, better schedules, more fare options, and superior service with the type of aircraft that are better suited to the short haul nature of the regional market.

The commission told the committee that the Canadian airline industry was second to none in the world and that it wanted Canadian carriers to be able to decide what markets they wanted to serve without having to go back and forth to the government every time they wanted access to a new city in Atlantic Canada and throughout the domestic and Canadian-U.S. markets.

Joseph Randall of Air Nova told the special committee that his company has been tremendously successful under deregulation. He was most enthusiastic about the potential of his airline in a more liberalized Canada-U.S. environment.

Don MacInnes, the Minister of Transportation and Communications for the Government of Nova Scotia, told the committee that deregulation has led to excellent local service with the establishment of Halifax as a regional hub in Atlantic Canada.

The minister said that the limitations on air services between Canada and the United States are a major impediment to tourism and development, particularly the convention industry in Halifax.

The position of the Nova Scotia government is that the aviation industry supports economic development in the Atlantic region and that the better Canada-U.S. air services will benefit Halifax and the rest of the province.

This sentiment was also echoed by Nicholas Carlson, President of the Hotel Association of Metropolitan Halifax, who also urged the government to liberalize the Canada-U.S. air service in order to give a boost to the local tourism and hospitality industry.

So I say to the hon. member, listen to your constituents, listen to the informed voices of Halifax and Nova Scotia who say that the government and its deregulation has benefited Atlantic Canada and deregulation has led to better service, more fair options and more choices for consumers and carriers.

## CONVENTIONAL FORCES IN EUROPE AGREEMENT

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce):** Mr. Speaker, on November 19, NATO and the Warsaw Pact concluded an historic agreement to significantly reduce their military weapons in Europe and virtually end the cold war. Under the agreement signed on that day, 54,000 tanks, artillery, aircraft and helicopters on both sides will be destroyed or decommissioned. I must point out that most will be on the side of the Warsaw Pact but, nevertheless, it is a two-sided agreement and it is very significant.

Under that particular treaty it would limit each side to no more than 20,000 tanks, 20,000 artillery pieces, 30,000 armoured combat vehicles, 6,800 combat aircraft and 2,000 attack helicopters in Europe. That may sound like a lot but, as I said, it was a significant reduction in what has been there already for over 40 years, and this agreement brought about the end of the cold war.

As a result of that agreement on November 19, I put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs asking him about the impact of this agreement on Canada's military and foreign policy and what plans the government was making for Canada's forces in Europe. Did it have in mind that it should adopt a new role in Europe or should those troops be brought home?

In answer to my question, the Associate Minister of Defence said that Canadian troops, for the most part, would not be affected by the agreement other than the reduction by 1,400 in the number of troops in Europe, but that a new role was possible and that was being studied.

At the same time, I asked the Minister about the 1987 White paper on Defence, a white paper that was drafted at the time of the cold war and was drafted with the cold war scenario in mind. I reminded the Minister that that white paper had never been withdrawn although parts of it, the very controversial part that proposed the acquisition of nuclear submarines for Canada, had been dropped.

My point was that if the defence white paper was developed at a time when the cold war was still under way and has never been withdrawn then it should be withdrawn and the government should come forward with a new white paper that would deal with the threats of today, with the realities of today.

Following that historic agreement, the countries of Europe and North America, the 34 states that make up the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe met in Paris to confirm those agreements and to officially put the cold war to rest and to examine new arrangements for security in Europe. The meeting of the CSCE in Paris was the launching of a new method of collective security and co-operation for all of Europe, including Canada and the United States.

About that conference, it has been said that it attempted to enunciate the principles for peace and prosperity with respect to the future of Europe. It was an attempt to put forward a dream of a European continent free of opposing military alliances, united from one end to the other by its commitment to democracy, economic co-operation and human rights.

In view of all of this, where does Canada stand with respect to the new realities in the world? How is our foreign policy going to change to adopt to this new reality and what about our defence policy? What about our Canadian forces? Where is the new defence white paper and how will it define the role of our defence and military forces with respect to these new challenges.

It appears to me that with respect to these matters the west has been too slow to move in relation to the east.

• (1810 )

President Gorbachev won the Nobel Prize last year for his initiatives and aggressiveness in putting on the table proposals for disarmament and peace. To give them credit, the West responded but sometimes responded too slowly.

Just this very week, we were working on a subcommittee of the Standing Committee on External Affairs to consider the renewal of the NORAD agreement. The NORAD agreement is an air defence agreement for Canada and the United States against the Soviet Union. One might ask: Why do we need to continue that agreement in light of the historic agreements that were signed in Paris and Vienna in the month of November? We were debating whether it should be renewed for five years. That seemed ridiculous to many of us. We thought that if it was to be renewed, it should only be renewed for a short period of time in order to search for a new type of agreement with the United States to survey the air space of North America, but not a NORAD-type agreement.

One could say the same with respect to the conference to amend the partial test ban treaty which will take place in New York at the United Nations in January. If there is no more cold war, why do we continue to build nuclear weapons? Why do we continue to test nuclear weapons?

In conclusion, let me say that Canadians want answers to these questions. They want leadership in these very important matters of life and death with respect to weapons of mass destruction. They are fed up with more rhetoric and drift. I hope tonight the parliamentary secretary will give me some answers.

**Mr. Jean-Guy Hudon (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak to the subject of the Canadian commitment to Europe. I would like to begin by stating that Canada remains fully committed to collective security through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Canada will continue to contribute to the alliance as long as the need exists.

There are many who would suggest that the time has come to move our forces out of Europe. As hon. members are aware, we recently announced that we would be reducing our presence in Europe by some 1,400 personnel as part of the over-all reduction in the numbers of the Canadian forces due to defence budget cuts announced in February 1990.

The decrease in the level of threat in Europe has allowed us this opportunity, and a number of our allies have made similar reductions. However, I wish to emphasize that this in no way affects the continuing commitment of Canada or any of our allies to NATO and to collective security in Europe. Any change in our existing commitments to NATO will be carried out in harmony with our allies and in support of the current arms control negotiations.

Canada welcomes the signing of the CFE Treaty. Canada will play an active role in verifying the CFE agreement. A Canadian military verification organization has been established to deal with all aspects of the treaty. This verification regime could well become the most enduring element of a CFE treaty and the cornerstone of a new European military security framework.

Regarding the need for a defence review that incorporates all the changes now taking place, let me emphasize that a defence review is a forward looking exercise that attempts to set out Canada's defence needs in the 1990s and beyond. The review, which we hope to have completed by the spring, will take account of current operations as they apply to the future of the Canadian forces in Canada and abroad.

Therefore I am certain all members of this House can appreciate that the sudden withdrawal of all allied troops from Europe would be disruptive to the cohesion of the NATO alliance. This cohesion is essential as we enter the next stages of arms negotiations and reductions. More important, however, there is much uncertainty in many European countries as they adopt new democratic models. A stable NATO alliance can help greatly in this delicate transition period.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** The motion to adjourn the House is now deemend 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 6.16 p.m.